

*Volume One*  
*The Life of*  
*Friedrich*  
***ENGELS***



*W.O.Henderson*

# **THE LIFE OF FRIEDRICH ENGELS**

**Vol. 1. A**

Other Works on Friedrich Engels by W. O. Henderson:  
*Engels: Selected Writings*, edited by W. O. Henderson (Penguin Books, 1967)  
*Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England*, by Friedrich Engels, with an introduction by W. O. Henderson (Verlag J. H. W. Dietz, Hanover, 1965)  
“Friedrich Engels in Manchester”, by W. O. Henderson, in *Friedrich Engels 1820–1970* (Schriftenreihe des Forschungsinstituts der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 1971)  
“The Firm of Ermen and Engels in Manchester”, by W. O. Henderson in *Internationale Wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz*, Heft 11/12, pp. 1–10, April, 1971

Books and Articles by Friedrich Engels translated and edited by W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner:  
*Condition of the Working Class in England*, by Friedrich Engels (Basil Blackwell, 1958; new edition 1970; Stanford University Press, 1968)  
*Friedrich Engels as Military Critic* (Manchester University Press, 1959)

By W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner:  
“Friedrich Engels in Manchester” (*Memoirs and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society*, Vol. 98, Session 1956–7)

*This page intentionally left blank*



Friedrich Engels at the age of 25, 1845

# **The Life of Friedrich Engels**

**W. O. Henderson**

*In two volumes*

**VOLUME I**

 **Routledge**  
Taylor & Francis Group  
LONDON AND NEW YORK

*First published 1976 in Great Britain by*  
Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN  
270 Madison Ave, New York NY 10016

Transferred to Digital Printing 2006

Copyright © 1976 W. O. Henderson

ISBN 0 7146 1320 7 (Case)  
ISBN 0 7146 4002 6 (Paper)

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 72-92963

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of Frank Cass and Company Limited in writing.*

Cover Design by Kenneth Williamson

**Publisher's Note**

The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original may be apparent

Printed and bound by CPI Antony Rowe, Eastbourne

**To  
Fay  
and  
Joseph  
Baggott**

*This page intentionally left blank*

## Contents

	<b>Page</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>1 THE ROAD TO COMMUNISM 1820–1844</b>	
I Marx and Engels	1
II Barmen, 1820–38	2
III Bremen, 1838–41	7
IV Berlin, 1841–2	12
V London and Manchester, 1842–4	20
VI Paris, 1844	26
<b>2 THE CONDITION OF THE WORKING CLASS IN ENGLAND IN 1844</b>	
I The Genesis of Engels’s Book	43
II Engels on the English Workers	48
III Engels’s Book in Germany	61
IV Engels’s Book in England	65
V The Significance of Engels’s Book	69
<b>3 THE YOUNG REVOLUTIONARY 1845–1850</b>	
I The German Ideology, 1845–7	79
II The Communist Correspondence Committee, 1846–8	93
III The “Principles of Communism” and the Communist Manifesto, 1847–8	106
IV Revolution and Reaction, 1848–9	133
V Exile in London, 1849–50	165
<b>4 THE MANCHESTER YEARS 1850–1870</b>	
I The Years of Storm and Stress, 1850–60	195
II The Cotton Lord, 1860–70	210

	Page
<b>5 FRIENDS IN EXILE</b>	
I Wilhelm Wolff	243
II Georg Weerth	253
III Carl Schorlemmer	262
IV Eduard Gumpert	271
V Carl Siebel	272
VI English Friends: Julian Harney – James Leach – Ernest Jones – Edward Jones – Samuel Moore	276
VII The “Philistines”: Louis Borchardt – John Watts	282

### Documents

I To the Working Class of Great Britain, 1845	309
II Review of Friedrich Engels, <i>The Condition of the Working Class in England</i> , 1845	311
III Introduction to the Communist Circular against Hermann Kriege, May 11, 1846	331
IV Letter to G. A. Köttgen of Elberfeld, June 15, 1846	332
V Address of the German Democratic Communists of Brussels to Mr Feargus O'Connor, 1846	335
VI The <i>Status Quo</i> in Germany, 1847	337
VII The Free Trade Congress in Brussels, 1847	356
VIII Principles of Communism, November 1847	362
IX Statutes of the Communist League, 1847	380
X Demands of the German Communist Party, 1848	388
<b>INDEX</b>	<b>391</b>

## Illustrations

Friedrich Engels at the age of 25, 1845 <i>(by courtesy of the Radio Times Hulton Picture Library)</i>	<i>Frontis</i>  
Friedrich Engels at the age of 19, 1839 <i>(by courtesy of the Institut für Marxismus-Leninismus, Berlin)</i>	<i>Facing Page</i> 116
Karl Marx as a student, 1836 <i>(by courtesy of the Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis, Amsterdam)</i>	116
Georg Weerth, 1822–1856 <i>(from his Sämtliche Werke, Volume I)</i>	117
Moses Hess, 1812–1875 <i>(by courtesy of the Stadtgeschichtliches Museum, Dusseldorf)</i>	117
Stephan Born, 1824–1898 <i>(by courtesy of the Institut für Marxismus-Leninismus, Berlin)</i>	132
Godfrey Ermen, partner of Friedrich Engels, 1864–1869 <i>(by courtesy of A. G. V. Ermen)</i>	132
Carl Schorlemmer, 1834–1892 <i>(by courtesy of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester)</i>	133
Louis Borchardt, 1813–1883	133
Jenny Marx (née Westphalen), 1814–1881 <i>(from Reminiscences of Marx and Engels)</i>	260
Helene Demuth, 1823–1890 <i>(from Reminiscences of Marx and Engels)</i>	260
Family Group (about 1861) <i>(from Reminiscences of Marx and Engels)</i>	261
Frontispiece of first edition of <i>The Condition of the Working Class in England</i> (1845)	276

Lodgings of Friedrich Engels in Manchester, 1858–1864	276
<i>(by courtesy of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester)</i>	
Desk in Chetham's Library, Manchester	277
<i>(by courtesy of the Guardian Picture Library)</i>	
Advertisement of Godfrey Ermen's 'Diamond Thread'	277
<i>(by courtesy of A. G. V. Ermen)</i>	

## Introduction

The year 1970 saw the 150th anniversary of the birth of Friedrich Engels who was Karl Marx's most intimate friend and collaborator. Today the disciples of Marx and Engels are numbered in millions and the way of life of great states is based upon their doctrines. An understanding of the career and work of Friedrich Engels is essential to an appreciation of the origin and development of the Marxist form of socialism in the nineteenth century. Since the publication of Gustav Mayer's biography of Engels in 1934 – only an abridged version is available in English – additional material on Engels's life has become available and many scholars have been engaged in research on various aspects of the early socialist movement. The studies of Auguste Cornu and Herwig Förder on Engels's career as a young revolutionary to 1848 are of particular value. Attention has also been paid to the activities of some of the disciples of Marx and Engels – such as Georg Weerth and Wilhelm Wolff – in the 1840s and 1850s. My own study of Engels's career endeavours to bring together for English readers the results of this recent research.

My interest in Engels began when Dr W. H. Chaloner and I made a new translation of Engels's *Condition of the Working Class in England* and also edited the military articles which he contributed to the *Volunteer Journal for Lancashire and Cheshire*. The task of preparing a new life of Engels has been facilitated by the University of Manchester which allowed me to have a term's leave of absence and the West German Government which gave me the opportunity of meeting various scholars interested in Marxist studies at a conference held in Trier in 1968. Among those who have helped me – but are in no way responsible for my errors – I should particularly like to mention Professor Ernst Hoffmann, Professor Helmut Hirsch, and Professor Wolfram Fischer. I should also like to thank Dr W. H. Chaloner and my wife for reading the proofs of this volume.

W. O. Henderson  
1975

*This page intentionally left blank*

# 1

## THE ROAD TO COMMUNISM 1820–1844<sup>1</sup>

### I. Marx and Engels

Life in six cities in three countries helped to mould Karl Marx's closest friend and colleague into a communist. In Barmen, his birthplace, Friedrich Engels learned to hate the millowners and the Puritan way of life. In Bremen the life of a great seaport gave him his first glimpse of a wider world than that of a small provincial manufacturing town. In Berlin he gained his first experience of military affairs when he served for a year in the Prussian army while at the same time he received intellectual stimulus from his attendance at University lectures and from his contacts with the Young Hegelians. In London he met a group of exiled German workers who had become professional revolutionaries. In Manchester Engels became aware of the social evils brought about by the industrial revolution and he met Julian Harney, James Leach and other Chartists. And a brief visit to Paris in the autumn of 1844 saw the beginning of his collaboration with Karl Marx that lasted for nearly forty years.

Friedrich Engels became the junior partner of the most famous intellectual team of the nineteenth century. Marx and Engels formulated the doctrine of dialectical materialism and spent a lifetime in applying it to politics, to philosophy, to economics, to history, to literature, to art and to science. Together they founded the international socialist movement and gave it a programme in the Communist Manifesto. Together they started a political movement whose adherents accepted its principles with all the fervour of a new religion. The followers of Marx and Engels came to be counted by millions and fifty years after the establishment of the communist régime in Russia the influence of their ideas is more powerful than ever. Karl Marx gave his name to a new system of philosophical ideas and to a new political movement. His genius was recognised in his own day even by those who most detested his ideas and his political aims.

Yet without Engels the genius of Marx might have withered away. It was Engels who was largely responsible for stimulating

Marx to apply his philosophical doctrines to the study of economics. It was Engels who gave Marx the financial help that saved him from perishing miserably in his London lodgings. It was Engels who readily placed his facile pen at Marx's disposal so that the arid pages of *Das Kapital* sprang to life in *Anti Dühring* which enabled thousands of readers to understand the basic tenets of the Marxist doctrine. Ten years after Engels's death the German socialist historian Franz Mehring declared that there was "more danger of underestimating than of overestimating him".<sup>2</sup> Engels was far more than a mere assistant of Marx or an interpreter of Marx's ideas after his master's death. He worked with Marx as an independent collaborator and he made his own contributions to socialist doctrines.

## II. Barmen 1820–38

The fact that Friedrich Engels was born in Barmen (November 29, 1820)<sup>3</sup> had an important influence upon his formative years. Barmen differed in two respects from many other German towns in the 1820s and 1830s. It was part of a manufacturing district in which the social evils of industrialisation could be seen some time before they became evident elsewhere<sup>4</sup> and it lay in one of the few regions in which most of the Protestant churches accepted the Pietist – or Puritan – doctrines and way of life. Engels's father was both a leading industrialist and a staunch Pietist and these two circumstances dominated Engels's boyhood.

The twin towns of Elberfeld and Barmen – with a population of over 40,000 after the Napoleonic wars – lay in the steep valley of the River Wupper, a tributary of the River Rhine. They formed part of the district of Berg and had been incorporated in the Prussian province of the Rhineland in 1815. In the later middle ages the lime-free waters of the Wupper were found to be suitable for bleaching linen yarn. At first the yarn came from the Low Countries but later some of it was spun and woven locally. By the eighteenth century silk and cotton had been added to the yarns that were bleached in the valley of the River Wupper. Barmen specialised in the production of cotton goods. The first cotton mill to be driven by water power in the valley of the Wupper was erected in 1785.<sup>5</sup> At the beginning of the nineteenth century the spinning process was largely mechanised but much weaving was still done on handlooms. In 1809 P. A. Nemnich described the Grand Duchy of Berg – which included the valleys of the Ruhr and the Wupper – as "a miniature England".<sup>6</sup> After the Napoleonic wars the collapse of the Continental System and the consequent revival of

English competition led to a depression in Elberfeld and Barmen and many of the handloom weavers were out of work.<sup>7</sup>

The fortunes of the Engels family had been founded in the second half of the eighteenth century by Johann Caspar Engels (the elder), who was Friedrich Engels's great-grandfather. This Johann Caspar began his career as a yarn merchant in a small way and in about 1770 he set up his own bleachworks and workshops for the manufacture of lace and ribbons. He became one of the leading citizens of Barmen and had the reputation of being a good employer who assisted his workers to buy their own cottages and gardens.<sup>8</sup>

In the next generation the firm was carried on by the two sons of the founder, one of whom was Johann Caspar (the younger), the grandfather of Friedrich Engels. He expanded the business and carried on the family tradition of social work by founding a school for the children of his operatives (1796) and by setting up a co-operative granary to provide cheap flour during the food shortage of 1816. On the death of Johann Caspar (the younger), his three sons – Engels's father Friedrich and two uncles – inherited the business. This partnership did not work smoothly and eventually Engels's father went into partnership with the brothers Godfrey and Peter Ermen to operate cotton spinning in Manchester,<sup>9</sup> Barmen and Engelskirchen<sup>10</sup> (1837-41). The German firm combined the manufacture of various kinds of cotton yarn and thread with the old established bleachworks. The English firm owned the Victoria Mills near Pendleton.<sup>11</sup> Engels's father is said to have been one of the first millowners in the Rhineland to install English machines in his factories.<sup>12</sup>

As a schoolboy Engels became familiar with the cotton trade since so many members of his family were engaged in it and he was sufficiently observant to appreciate something of the conditions under which the operatives and craftsmen of his native town lived and worked. At the age of nineteen he wrote an article in which he described the wretched lives of the lower classes in the Wupper valley and he pilloried the millowners whom he held responsible for this state of affairs. He declared that the weavers were robbed of their health by bending over their looms for excessively long hours, that the tanners were physical wrecks after only three years, that the carriers were "a crew of utterly demoralised fellows", and that over a thousand children of school age were employed in the factories.<sup>13</sup> Many workers suffered from consumption and syphilis because of bad working conditions and poor housing. At week-ends the inns were packed and disgraceful scenes were witnessed at closing time.<sup>14</sup> Many years later Engels

recalled the evil consequences of the introduction of Prussian brandy into the Wupper valley in the late 1820s. He claimed that he could remember seeing crowds of drunken revellers staggering arm in arm along the streets and that quarrels and knifings were a common occurrence.<sup>15</sup>

All this made a deep impression upon the young Engels. Already he recognised the gulf that separated the two social classes in his native town – the millowners on the one hand and the operatives and craftsmen on the other. He came to detest the millowners – the class to which his own father belonged – for he held them responsible for the wretched condition of the workers. He considered that the middle classes of the Wupper valley were to be condemned not only for the callous way in which they exploited their operatives but for their philistine way of life. “In Elberfeld and Barmen”, he wrote in 1839, “a person is considered to be educated if he plays whist and billiards, talks a little about politics and has the knack of paying a compliment at the right time. These fellows lead an awful life and yet they are quite content. All day long they immerse themselves in figures in their offices and it is difficult to realise how zealously they throw themselves into their work. In the evening all of them regularly go to their clubs to smoke, play cards and talk politics. At the stroke of nine they all go home. One day is just like another without anything changing. And woe to anyone who interferes with this strict routine. The penalty would be to fall into disgrace with all the best families.”<sup>16</sup>

Elberfeld and Barmen were not only industrial towns but they were also one of the main centres of the Pietist movement in Germany. There had been Puritan sects in Germany in the late seventeenth century and in the eighteenth century which subscribed to the Calvinist doctrine of predestination and ran their affairs on Presbyterian lines. Like the English Puritans they tried to regulate strictly the daily lives of their members. They wore sombre garments, they were strict Sabbatarians, and they frowned upon such worldly pleasures as reading novels, dancing, and visiting the theatre or the opera. Pietism had declined in the late eighteenth century with the rise of the rationalist ideas of the Enlightenment. But the movement revived in a new form in the early nineteenth century as a reaction against the excesses of the French Revolution. It was this type of Pietism – known as “Restoration Pietism” – that flourished in the Wupper valley in the 1820s. The Pietists believed in the literal truth of every word in the Bible and they were intolerant of those whose views differed from their own. Their leader in Elberfeld and Barmen was Pastor F. W. Krummacher who eventually became court preacher to Frederick William IV

of Prussia. Krummacher was a fiery preacher whose "narcotic sermons" (as Goethe called them) moved his congregation to tears when he described the fate that awaited evildoers in the next world.<sup>17</sup>

Since Engels's parents were Pietists he had a strict upbringing at home, in church and at school. Engels does not appear to have reacted against his religious instruction during his school days and when he was confirmed at the age of seventeen he was, at any rate outwardly, a believing Christian. But after he had left home for Bremen his attitude changed. In 1839 he wrote to his friend Friedrich Graeber that the Wupper valley was very properly criticised for its mysticism and obscurantism.<sup>18</sup> He claimed that he had never accepted the doctrines of the Pietists and that he was a "supernaturalist".<sup>19</sup> "If, at the age of 18, one has read Strauss,<sup>20</sup> the Rationalists and the *Kirchen Zeitung* one must either stop thinking for oneself or one must begin to doubt one's Wuppertal faith. I simply do not understand how the orthodox clergy can be as orthodox as they are in view of the fact that the Bible is so full of contradictions."<sup>21</sup>

Engels declared that he was "a wholehearted disciple of Strauss"<sup>22</sup> and that through Strauss he had taken "the road that leads straight to Hegelianism".<sup>23</sup> He dismissed the Calvinist doctrine of predestination as a patent absurdity<sup>24</sup> and he attacked Krummacher for being so silly as to expect his flock to believe that the sun revolves round the earth. "The fellow dares to shout this to all the world on April 21, 1839 and yet he argues that Pietism is not leading us all back to the middle ages. It really is a scandal!"<sup>25</sup> In the following year Engels wrote an article describing a lively controversy which had broken out in Bremen when Krummacher delivered two sermons there. Engels attacked "the Pope of the Wuppertal Calvinists and the St Michael of the doctrine of predestination" in no uncertain terms.<sup>26</sup> By this time he had taken the first step on the road from Pietism to atheism.<sup>27</sup>

If Barmen was exceptional because of its relatively early industrialisation and its fervent Pietism, it shared with many other Prussian towns a firm loyalty to the Hohenzollerns. Although the Wupper valley had only been joined to Prussia in 1815 the inhabitants quickly accepted their new rulers. Provided that they could keep the liberal *Code Napoléon* they were quite prepared to become loyal subjects of the King of Prussia.<sup>28</sup> And so Engels grew up in a household in which respect for the throne came second only to unqualified acceptance of Pietism doctrines. Here, too, there is ample evidence that soon after he left home for Bremen, Engels began to deviate from the political views of his parents and school-

masters. In October 1839 he recommended Venedey's book *Preussen und Preussentum* to his friend Friedrich Graeber. He told Graeber that Venedey had shown that the rulers of Prussia favoured absolutism, suppressed political freedom, supported the rich at the expense of the poor, and aimed at keeping the majority of the people in a state of ignorance.<sup>29</sup> And in other letters and articles the young Engels left his readers in no doubt that he held the Hohenzollerns in the greatest contempt. Of Frederick William IV he wrote: "Compared with him Napoleon was an angel. If our monarch is to be regarded as a member of the human race then His Majesty of Hanover is a god indeed."<sup>30</sup>

Until the age of fourteen Engels was educated at the Town School in Barmen. This poorly-endowed school was controlled by a Pietist governing body which normally only appointed Pietist teachers. When he wrote about his old school in 1839 Engels commented favourably upon only two of his former teachers: Philipp Schifflin, the French master, whom he regarded as "the best teacher in the school", and the young Heinrich Köser, a friend of the poet Freiligrath, who taught German literature. Engels's assessment of the intellectual attainments of the rest of the staff may be judged by his anecdote of the small boy who asked his teacher who Goethe was and received the answer: "A godless fellow". Engels was later sent to the grammar school at Elberfeld which enjoyed a high reputation for sound scholarship. It was run by a Pietist congregation but, according to Engels, the clergy generally left the governors to their own devices and interfered little in the running of the school. Engels commented favourably upon the classical scholarship of Dr Hantschke, the acting headmaster, in whose house he lodged since his home was too far away from the school for him to travel every day. His highest praise, however, was reserved for Dr Clausen who taught history and German literature. Engels's final school report showed that Dr Hantschke recognised the wide range of his pupil's interests. He paid tribute to Engels's unusual linguistic abilities.

When Engels left school Dr Hantschke in his final report (September 25, 1837) stated that he had originally intended to go to a university. But he left a year before he was due to take his final examination. It is not clear why Engels's father decided that his son should enter the family business at once. Engels may well have welcomed this arrangement. Had he studied at a university he might have been expected to enter the Prussian civil service and he had no ambitions in that direction. His real interests lay in literary work and in journalism, but his father would not have been prepared to accept this as a suitable profession for his son.

Engels may have felt that a career in business would give him time to achieve his literary ambitions. Perhaps he was influenced by the example of the poet Ferdinand Freiligrath who was able to carry on his literary work although he earned his living in an Elberfeld office. Engels worked in his father's office for twelve months (September 1837–August 1838) after leaving school but no information about his activities in this period has come to light.<sup>31</sup>

### III. Bremen, 1838–41<sup>32</sup>

In the autumn of 1838 Engels left Barmen for Bremen to gain experience in the office of Heinrich Leupold who was the head of a firm of exporters. Engels's father probably sent his son to Bremen not only because he knew Leupold but because the Pietists were as strongly entrenched in Bremen as in Barmen. Engels lodged with a clergyman – Pastor Treviranus – and his father hoped that his son would continue to come under Pietist influences even after he had left home. But Treviranus<sup>33</sup> was no Krummacher. He was less interested in theology than in applying his faith to practical affairs and he founded societies to care for discharged prisoners and distressed Protestant emigrants. Engels's letters to his younger sister Marie and to his schoolfriends the Graeber brothers – and also his newspaper articles – record his impressions of Bremen and show how his ideas on literature and on politics were developing.

Engels was now in a quite different environment from that to which he had been accustomed at home. In the Treviranus household there was little of the intolerant Calvinist orthodoxy that he had known in Elberfeld and Barmen. He was given the front door key so that he could come home when he pleased.<sup>34</sup> And the free and easy atmosphere of the office of Consul Leupold<sup>35</sup> – whom Engels described as “a thoroughly decent chap”<sup>36</sup> – was a welcome change from his father's office where the clerks were expected to apply themselves strictly to their duties.

The Free Hanseatic City of Bremen had little in common with provincial Barmen. It was a sovereign state and a member of the German Confederation in its own right. It was one of Germany's largest ports, importing cotton, coffee, sugar and tobacco from the Americas and exporting linens and other manufactured goods from Westphalia and Silesia. It handled an ever-increasing volume of emigrant traffic from central Europe to the United States. In its streets, cafés, and bars traders and sailors from all over the world were to be found. Bremen was governed by a group of old families whose rule – old-fashioned though it might be – was less oppressive than that of the governments of the large north German states such

as Prussia and Hanover. Despite the influence of an out-of-date patrician oligarchy and of the Pietist pastors, a young man of unorthodox views could enjoy a greater freedom in Bremen than in Elberfeld or Barmen.

In an article of 1840 Engels described the hierarchy of a small Bremen office of the type in which he worked. "The chief clerk already gives himself airs as a person of some importance for his next step will be to start up a business on his own account. He is the general factotum of the firm. He knows the business inside out. He is well-informed concerning the state of the market. When he visits the exchange he is surrounded by brokers. Below him is a senior clerk who flatters himself that he is very nearly as important a person as the chief clerk. Naturally he is not on the same footing as the chief clerk when it comes to discussing matters with the head of the firm but he certainly knows enough to be able to deal with a broker, a warehouseman or a boatman. If the head of the firm and the chief clerk are both away he represents the firm to the outside world and the good name of the firm depends on how he conducts himself. The junior clerk, on the other hand, is an unlucky fellow. He represents the firm only in relation to the packers and to the postman in whose round the office is situated. Not only must he copy out all the business letters and the bills of exchange but he has to make out the accounts and pay small bills. Moreover he has to act as a general errand boy. He goes to the post office to collect and to deliver letters. And he has to wrap up all the parcels and address the crates and packing cases."

Engels, however, found that the duty of copying Consul Leupold's business correspondence into a ledger was interspersed with more agreeable social activities. He occasionally complained of overwork,<sup>37</sup> but most of his references to the office in his letters suggest that life in Consul Leupold's somewhat unconventional establishment could be a very pleasant experience. He wrote to his sister: "There is a bar in our office. We have beer bottles under the table, behind the stove, and behind the cupboards – beer bottles all over the place. And if the old man is thirsty, he borrows one of our bottles and fills it up again afterwards. Our drinking is done quite openly and no one makes a secret of it. A bottle of beer and some glasses stand on the table all day. The empty bottles are in the corner on the right and the full bottles are on the left. I tell you Marie it is quite true that youth gets worse and worse. As Dr Hantschke says: 'Who would have thought 20 or 30 years ago of such goings on as beer drinking in an office?'"<sup>38</sup> A sketch in one of Engels's letters shows the writer reclining comfortably in a hammock after lunch enjoying a cigar.<sup>39</sup>

When the head of the firm and his son were away from the office the clerks left their ledgers to read, write and drink. Engels studied works on philosophy, theology, history and literature and improved his knowledge of modern languages. He carried on his private correspondence and he began to write for the press. In his free time he joined a choir and a fencing club<sup>40</sup> and he read the foreign papers in the Union Literary Institute.<sup>41</sup> He frequented bars, the theatre and the opera. At week-ends he indulged in horse riding, walking and swimming with his friend Richard Roth and he went on a steamship excursion on the River Weser.<sup>42</sup> He obviously enjoyed life to the full – even if he did get into debt.<sup>43</sup> His philosophy was summed up in a letter to Wilhelm Graeber: “To get the most out of life you must be active, you must live, and you must have the courage to taste the thrill of being young.”<sup>44</sup>

In addition to his numerous other activities Engels found time to write for the press. His early articles either appeared anonymously or under the pen name ‘Friedrich Oswald’.<sup>45</sup> They were influenced by the literary movement known as ‘Young Germany’. In 1839 he told Friedrich Graeber that he was “a Young German with all his heart and soul”.<sup>46</sup> The Young Germans were the angry young men of the 1830s. They rejected the fairy tale world of the romantic movement and wrote about live social issues. In politics they were radicals who supported parliamentary government, the right of public assembly, a free press, an independent judiciary and the emancipation of women. Their religious views were extremely liberal. They strongly opposed the narrow-minded orthodoxy of the Pietists. Their attitude towards social problems showed an awareness of the need to deal with the poverty and unemployment brought about by the first phase of the industrial revolution. These doctrines aroused the wrath of the reactionary rulers in Germany. An edict of the German Confederation of December 10, 1835 denounced ‘Young Germany’ for “attacking the Christian religion in a most impertinent manner, for denigrating the existing social order, and for flouting all standards of decency and morality”. The edict named Heine, Gutzkow, Laube, Wienberg and Mundt as the leaders of the movement and ordered all members of the Confederation to ban the publication of the works of the Young Germans.

Carl Gutzkow, a leading Young German and editor of the Hamburg *Telegraph für Deutschland*, encouraged Engels’s literary aspirations by publishing some of his early essays in 1839–41. Gutzkow, who had considerable experience in these matters, revised Engels’s articles so that they passed the censor’s scrutiny. Engels, however, soon found Gutzkow’s tutelage to be irksome.

He objected to changes being made in his manuscripts and after 1841 he ceased to contribute to the *Telegraph*.<sup>47</sup> Gutzkow complained to Alexander Jung of this shabby treatment. "Nearly all these young authors (he wrote) are the same. We give them a chance to think and to write but as soon as they can stand on their own feet they indulge in intellectual patricide."<sup>48</sup>

At the same time Engels was acting as 'Bremen correspondent' for the *Morgenblatt für gebildete Leser* which was published in Stuttgart by the firm of Cotta.<sup>49</sup> Except for an ode to Immermann his essays were concerned with local events such as the theatre, the opera, military manœuvres, the Gutenberg festival, trade and commerce, and the controversy between the Pietists and the Rationalists.

These essays are important partly because they throw some light upon Engels's early life at home and in Bremen and partly because they contain evidence of the writer's progress towards intellectual maturity. In some of the articles—such as "Letters from the Wupper Valley", "A Trip to Bremerhafen" and "Landscapes"—Engels wrote about his home town or about excursions that he had made from Bremen. In these essays the young author showed both remarkable powers of observation and the ability to describe what he had seen in vivid phrases which held the reader's attention. Many years later Wilhelm Liebknecht wrote that Engels "had a clear bright mind, free from any romantic or sentimental haze". "He never saw men or things through coloured spectacles or a misty atmosphere but always in clear bright air. His clear bright vision pierced the surface to the bottom of things. . . . That perspicacity which Mother Nature so rarely bestows at birth was an essential feature of Engels and I was immediately struck by it when we met for the first time."<sup>50</sup> These qualities of keen observation and brilliant descriptive writing were characteristics of Engels's literary work throughout his life. His accounts of the Baden rising of 1849 and of the review of the volunteers on Newton Heath in 1860 can still be read with pleasure as descriptive pieces of unusual merit. And his vivid account of the English slums raised his book on *The Condition of the Working Class in England* far above the level of other works written about industrial England in the 1840s.

It has been seen that Engels's first contribution to the *Telegraph*—the "Letters from the Wupper Valley"—was a bitter attack upon the millowners and Pietists of Elberfeld and Barmen. Engels declared that the manufacturers were responsible for the wretched condition of the factory operatives and the domestic workers and that the Pietist pastors were responsible for keeping their flocks in

ignorance of all modern thought and progress. These articles infuriated the pious citizens of Elberfeld and Barmen. According to Wilhelm Blank copies of the journal were quickly sold and there was much speculation concerning the identity of the author. Some thought that the poet Freiligrath had written the articles but no one seems to have guessed that they came from the pen of the nineteen-year-old son of one of the most respected Pietist millowners in the district. Engels himself was delighted at having thrown the cat among the pigeons in his home town. "Ha! ha! ha," he wrote to Friedrich Graeber, "Do you know who wrote the article in the *Telegraph*? I wrote it myself but I beg you not to say anything about it. If the authorship were known I would be in hot water with a vengeance."<sup>51</sup> So strong were the protests from Elberfeld and Barmen that Gutzkow felt it necessary to print a reply to Engels's articles from an anonymous correspondent.<sup>52</sup>

Engels's article on "Landscapes" gave a brief account of a journey to Holland and England in 1840.<sup>53</sup> His impressions of the Dutch countryside are of interest because of his suggestion that there might be a link between the physical environment of a people and its religious practices. The essay contains a hint of the materialist doctrine which later formed the basis of his philosophy. His description of a railway journey from London to Liverpool was Engels's first reference to a visit to the country in which so much of his life was to be spent. Engels's lively account of a river trip to Bremerhaven in the summer of 1840 was another early essay which gave the young author full scope for exercising his powers of observation.<sup>54</sup> He began by describing some of the passengers who boarded the *Roland* steamship – the office clerks, the craftsmen, the peasants, the prospective emigrants and a sprinkling of merchants who held themselves aloof from the common herd. When he reached Bremerhaven Engels visited an emigrant ship which was lying at anchor. He criticised the unsatisfactory accommodation of the steerage passengers, but consoled them with the reflection that they were better off than those who sailed from Le Havre.

While Engels's essays on life in the Wupper valley and in Bremen show the flowering of his style as a descriptive writer, his early efforts to establish himself as a literary critic are significant because they illustrate the speed with which the disciple of 'Young Germany' outgrew his enthusiasm for the writings of Gutzkow and Beck and became absorbed in the study of Hegel's philosophy, which proved to be the key to his future intellectual development. In July 1839 Engels still regarded the Young German poet Karl Beck as a genius<sup>55</sup> yet only six months later he curtly dismissed Beck's most recent verses as "utterly and childishly naive."<sup>56</sup> Soon afterwards

he condemned the reactionary tendencies and the lack of originality in contemporary German literature but he saw a ray of hope for the future in the increasing influence of Hegel's system of philosophy on German writers and artists.<sup>57</sup> A brief note in April 1840 on August Platen's poems on Poland showed that Engels was already taking an interest in international affairs and that he was strongly opposed to the reactionary Tsarist régime in Russia.<sup>58</sup>

Engels's stay in Bremen enabled him to escape from the stifling restrictions of a Pietist home and at first he appreciated his good fortune in being able to live with the Treviranus family and to work in Consul Leupold's easy going office. And for a young man from provincial Barmen there were new experiences to be gained in a great seaport like Bremen. But Engels never really settled down in Bremen. He made a number of acquaintances but few friends. Adolf Torstrick and Richard Roth were the only new companions mentioned in his correspondence. Engels had a restless disposition and less than a year after going to Bremen he was already discussing with his father the possibility of leaving. But on January 20, 1840 he wrote to Friedrich Graeber: "I have delayed writing to you until I knew for certain if I am going to stay here or to leave. Now at last I can tell you that, for the time being, I shall remain in Bremen."<sup>59</sup> Early in 1841 Engels's father agreed that his son should come home. In a letter of March 8, 1841 Engels wrote to his sister: "Thank God I will soon be getting out of this boring hole where no one does anything except fence, eat, drink, sleep and work – and that's the lot."<sup>60</sup> By April he was back in Barmen.

#### IV. Berlin, 1841–2

Little is known of Engels's activities between his departure from Bremen in April 1841 and his arrival in Berlin in September or October of the same year. Only four letters, written to his sister Marie in these months, have survived.<sup>61</sup> Engels appears to have spent his time in private study and in enjoying himself. On April 5 he wrote that he was reading Italian books, that he had been fencing and that he had recently met a number of his old school friends. He declared that Barmen was as dull as ever and he complained of a boring visit to friends of the family.

Early in May he told his sister that he expected to be in Milan in a week's time. His visit to Switzerland and Italy is described in two essays which appeared in the *Athenäum* in December 1841.<sup>62</sup> By August he was home again and he told his sister that no decision had yet been reached concerning his departure for Berlin. "I do not worry about anything at all," he wrote, "and I am content to

let others do the worrying." On September 9 he wrote to his sister that he expected to leave for Berlin in a week or a fortnight to perform his military service.<sup>63</sup>

The long interval between Engels's return to Barmen and his departure for Berlin was probably due to differences between his father and himself concerning his future career. There is no suggestion in his letters that he worked in his father's office at this time. And this would have been the obvious course to adopt if he intended to continue his training in the cotton business. It may be assumed that his father was pressing him to join the family firm while Engels was hoping to make a name for himself as a writer or a journalist. Eventually Engels went to Berlin for a year to perform his national service. Since he detested the Prussian army and all that it stood for one might have expected that he would have evaded conscription which was quite possible in those days for a young man with wealthy parents. Engels may well have been influenced by two considerations. While he was serving in the forces a final decision concerning his future career could be postponed. Moreover by going to Berlin he would have the opportunity both to attend lectures (as a visiting student) at one of the greatest universities in Germany and to make contact with a group of Young Hegelians with whose views he sympathised.

Engels went to Berlin in the autumn of 1841 as a "one year volunteer" in the Guards Foot Artillery.<sup>64</sup> In later years he became a recognised authority upon military affairs and his friends called him "the General".<sup>65</sup> But there is no evidence to suggest that he took his military training very seriously. He grumbled to his sister Marie about the "accursed shooting range" and the parade ground where men sank up to their knees in sand.<sup>66</sup> He complained about church parades but appears to have experienced little difficulty in avoiding them.<sup>67</sup> He boasted of his success in dodging a night route march by feigning toothache.<sup>68</sup> Although he performed his duties well enough to earn promotion to the rank of bombardier<sup>69</sup> and to secure a satisfactory certificate of discharge<sup>70</sup> his brief spell of duty under Captain von Wedell "did not increase his admiration of the Prussian military system or the Prussian government".<sup>71</sup> But Engels's experience of the parade ground seems to have left its mark upon him. Friedrich Lessner, who met him in London in 1847, described him as one who looked "more like a smart young lieutenant than a scholar".<sup>72</sup>

What Berlin had to offer Engels was not exercises with the artillery but lectures at the university, discussions with Young Hegelians, and a very agreeable social life. He did not have to live in barracks but was able to rent a private room in the Dorotheen-

strasse. He wrote to his sister Marie about his visits to the theatre and the opera and the café which specialised in Rhenish dishes. He was fond of music and enjoyed a choral festival which was held in the spring of 1842.<sup>73</sup> Engels despised the officers, civil servants, courtiers and aristocrats who dominated Berlin society and the petty tradesmen and workers<sup>74</sup> whose way of life Glassbrenner described in countless sketches.<sup>75</sup> Yet Engels probably agreed with Michael Bakunin that the Prussian capital in those days was “a good town to live in”. “It has excellent wine, cheap living, a very good theatre, and many newspapers in the cafés.”<sup>76</sup>

As a contributor to the *Telegraph* Engels naturally made contact with the Young Hegelians in Berlin. They were a lively group of atheists, republicans and revolutionaries.<sup>77</sup> A little later – in July 1842 – they established a society called ‘the Free’. The leaders of the group were not in Berlin when Engels arrived. Bruno Bauer<sup>78</sup> was teaching at Bonn University while Arnold Ruge<sup>79</sup> was lecturing at Halle University. Engels’s closest friend among the Young Hegelians was Edgar Bauer<sup>80</sup> – Bruno’s younger brother – and he also met Max Stirner,<sup>81</sup> Köppen,<sup>82</sup> and Nauwerck.<sup>83</sup>

Engels attended courses at the university including those of Schelling, Marheineke, Werder and Henning.<sup>84</sup> He wrote that “the fame of Berlin University is due to the fact that – more than any other seat of learning – it stands in the very forefront of modern intellectual movements. It is the arena in which the great controversies of our time are fought out. Many universities – Bonn, Jena, Giessen, Greifswald and even Leipzig, Breslau and Heidelberg – have sunk into intellectual apathy because they have ignored these controversies. Unfortunately for many years such a withdrawal has been the hallmark of scholarship at German universities. But in Berlin professors and lecturers have been appointed who hold very different opinions and they indulge in lively controversies which give their students an admirably clear picture of modern intellectual trends.”<sup>85</sup> Engels’s contacts with the Young Hegelians and with the university greatly stimulated his intellectual development and soon involved him in philosophical and political controversies that reverberated throughout Germany.

Engels’s arrival in Berlin coincided with the publication of Feuerbach’s book on *The Essence of Christianity*.<sup>86</sup> In later life Engels declared that only those who had “experienced the liberating effects of this book” could appreciate the impact upon the Young Hegelians of Feuerbach’s attack upon revealed religion. “Enthusiasm was universal and we all immediately became disciples of Feuerbach.” For Engels the significance of the book was that it “enthroned materialism once more” and showed that “nothing exists

outside Nature and Man”.<sup>87</sup> Feuerbach’s ideas – a halfway house between idealism and materialism – profoundly influenced Marx and Engels in their years of “storm and stress”. By analysing and criticising Feuerbach’s views they came to realise how the doctrine of dialectical materialism could be derived from the Hegelian system of philosophy.

When he was in Berlin Engels wrote several articles and pamphlets which helped to establish the reputation of ‘Oswald’ as a political commentator. A new era for writers and journalists opened in 1840 when Frederick William IV came to the throne of Prussia. This brilliant but unstable monarch was conservative and autocratic in outlook. Yet his accession was marked by the cautious introduction of various reforms. In December 1841 the censorship authorities were told to interpret the regulations in a liberal spirit. At the same time, however, newspaper editors were warned not to abuse their new freedom. In 1842 books and caricatures – but not pamphlets – were freed from the censorship. This encouraged radical journalists to express their views with greater freedom than before. Engels took advantage of the new situation to contribute to left-wing journals such as the *Rheinische Zeitung* and the *Deutsche Jahrbücher*. He wrote a little later that during the “temporary relaxation of the censorship of the press . . . papers, published under the authorisation of a government censor, contained things which, even in France, would have been punished as high treason, and other things which could not have been pronounced in England, without a trial for blasphemy being the consequence of it.”<sup>88</sup> But the royal honeymoon with the press was of short duration. In February 1843 caricatures were again censored and soon afterwards the *Deutsche Jahrbücher* and the *Rheinische Zeitung* were banned.<sup>89</sup>

The most important of Engels’s writings while he was in Berlin dealt with the controversy concerning Schelling’s attack upon the Hegelian system of philosophy. When Frederick William IV ascended the throne he persuaded Schelling to exchange his chair at Munich for one at Berlin in the hope that the new professor would counteract the influence of the existing lecturers in philosophy. The King abhorred the rationalist and freethinking tendencies shown by these teachers whose influence upon the students he considered to be wholly pernicious. Schelling’s lectures were held in the winter term of 1841–2. Engels attended the course and gave a vivid description of the scene when the inaugural lecture was delivered.<sup>90</sup> Men of all nations, professions and religious beliefs filled the *auditorium maximum*. Grave scholars and clergymen who had matriculated fifty years before and grey-haired staff officers sat next to students and young army volunteers. It was a great occasion

in the academic world for it was understood that the venerable Schelling – he was 67 years old – would reveal a new philosophical system on which he had been working for many years. And this system would sound the death knell of Hegel's influence upon the learned world in Germany.

Hegel had endeavoured to prove the existence of the Absolute scientifically by historical facts. Schelling now argued that the Absolute could be shown to exist by a process of reasoning. But he went further when he developed his own "philosophy of revelation" and claimed that "revelation must include within itself something more than reason – yet something that can be attained only by exercising one's reason". And as Schelling's lectures proceeded and his arguments were unfolded the philosopher moved into a private world of mystical phantasies into which few of his listeners could follow him. Engels was first in the field to defend the views of the Young Hegelians. In March 1842 – before Schelling had completed his lectures – his pamphlet on *Schelling und die Offenbarung* was published anonymously in Leipzig.<sup>91</sup>

In this pamphlet Engels discussed the development of Hegelian philosophy after Hegel's death in 1830. Hegel's followers had split into two groups – the orthodox disciples and the Young Hegelians. The latter accepted Hegel's principles but not his conclusions. They used Hegel's technique to undermine revealed religion and monarchical principles. Engels argued that the Young Hegelians were the most faithful followers of their master since they had pursued Hegel's ideas to a logical conclusion. He had no difficulty in disposing of Schelling's criticisms of Hegel but – since he dealt only with Schelling's first three lectures – had little to say about Schelling's own "philosophy of revelation". Engels's pamphlet aroused considerable interest. Ruge reviewed it favourably in the *Deutsche Jahrbücher* while Marheineke and Paulus made use of it in their own defence of Hegel.<sup>92</sup>

In a second pamphlet called *Schelling der Philosoph in Christo* Engels denounced the "philosophy of revelation". It appeared to be the work of a devout Christian who was arguing that the new philosophy demolished Hegelianism and supported the Pietist point of view. In fact it was a clever – if cruel – parody of the Pietist style of writing and it showed Engels's contempt for the faith in which he had been raised. This pamphlet fanned the flames of the controversy between Schelling and the Hegelians.<sup>93</sup> At first the Young Hegelians, tongue in cheek, pretended to accept the pamphlet at its face value but before long the *Rheinische Zeitung* admitted that it was a parody.<sup>94</sup> The conservative *Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung* on the other hand declared that the parody was not a matter

for levity. It was an exceedingly offensive attack upon the truths of revealed religion.<sup>95</sup>

The controversy between Schelling and his opponents soon came to a dramatic end. Professor Paulus of Heidelberg published Schelling's lectures with highly critical footnotes of his own. Schelling appealed to the courts for protection since his lectures had been printed without his permission. He lost his case and resigned his chair in disgust. Thus the King failed to stifle the new trends in the teaching of philosophy and theology at Berlin. Next – through his Minister of Education, Eichhorn – he tried to suppress revolutionary and rationalist ideas by dismissing radical teachers and by banning their journals. In 1842 the poet Hoffmann von Fallersleben lost his professorship at Breslau, while Bruno Bauer's licence to teach theology at Bonn was withdrawn. Soon afterwards Nauwerck was dismissed from the staff of Berlin University. Engels – in collaboration with Edgar Bauer<sup>96</sup> – sprang to Bruno Bauer's defence in a satirical poem entitled *Der Triumph des Glaubens*.<sup>97</sup> The verses proved to be of more than ephemeral interest since the authors named all the Young Hegelians who had recently formed the society known as “the Free” in Berlin.

In 1842 Engels wrote regularly for the *Rheinische Zeitung* which had recently been established by leading businessmen in Cologne as the principal organ of Rhenish liberalism. When Karl Marx became its editor in October 1842 the tone of the paper became much more radical than before. The most interesting of Engels's contributions was his article on Liberalism in north and south Germany. He observed that for many years Baden, Württemberg and the Bavarian Palatinate had been in the forefront of progressive political thought in Germany. He argued that “the new German philosophy” – the doctrines of the Young Hegelians – had given an impetus to a new and more powerful radical movement in north Germany which would one day sweep aside the forces of conservatism and reaction.<sup>98</sup> At this time, too, Engels wrote an essay on Alexander Jung for Arnold Ruge's *Deutsche Jahrbücher* – the leading journal of the Young Hegelians<sup>99</sup> – and an article on Frederick William IV for Georg Herwegh's *Einundzwanzig Bogen aus der Schweiz*.<sup>100</sup> He dismissed Frederick William's ideal of a medieval feudal Christian monarchy as quite impracticable in the 1840s and argued that the King would soon be forced to concede both a free press<sup>101</sup> and representative government to his subjects. In the summer of 1842 Engels told Ruge that he did not propose to write anything further for the *Deutsche Jahrbücher* as he wished to devote more time to his studies.

A year later, in an article published in Robert Owen's *New Moral*

*World*, Engels gave his own view of the astonishing progress of the radical and socialist agitation in Germany in 1842 under the stimulus of the Young Hegelians. He wrote:

“The Young Hegelians of 1842 were declared Atheists and Republicans; the periodical of the party, the *German Annals*,<sup>102</sup> was more radical and open than ever before; a political paper was established, and very soon the whole of the German liberal press was entirely in our hands. We had friends in almost every considerable town in Germany; we provided all the liberal papers with the necessary matter, and by this means made them our organs; we inundated the country with pamphlets, and soon governed public opinion upon every question. A temporary relaxation of the censorship of the press added a great deal to the energy of this movement, quite novel to a considerable part of the German public. Papers, published under the authorisation of a government censor, contained things which, even in France, would have been punished as high treason, and other things which could not have been pronounced in England, without a trial for blasphemy being the consequence of it. The movement was so sudden, so rapid, so energetically pursued, that the government as well as the public were dragged along with it for some time. But this violent character of the agitation proved that it was not founded upon a strong party among the public, and that its power was produced by the surprise and consternation only of its opponents. The governments, recovering their senses, put a stop to it by a most despotic denial of the liberty of speech . . . the princes and rulers of Germany at the very moment when they believed to have put down republicanism for ever, saw the rise of communism from the ashes of political agitation; and this new doctrine appears to them even more dangerous and formidable than that in whose apparent destruction they rejoiced.”<sup>103</sup>

Engels left Berlin in the middle of October 1842.<sup>104</sup> He went to Cologne to meet members of the staff of the *Rheinische Zeitung*. He saw Moses Hess, one of the editors, whom he later described as “the first communist” of the Young Hegelian party.<sup>105</sup> Hess, a leading supporter of utopian socialism in Germany,<sup>106</sup> believed that world revolution was inevitable and that France, Germany and England each had a special *rôle* to play in its accomplishment. From France would come the revolutionary spirit of 1789 and from Germany the intellectual stimulus of the Young Hegelian philosophy. But England, where the Chartists were on the march, would be the first country actually to achieve a social revolution.<sup>107</sup> Engels became one of Hess’s disciples. Moses Hess wrote that “Engels was a revolutionary to the core before we met but when he left me he was a passionate communist.”<sup>108</sup> Engels, who had been studying English social conditions,<sup>109</sup> accepted Hess’s view of

England's *rôle* in the revolution of the future. He now proposed to go to England to examine the situation on the spot.

For once, Engels's plans coincided with those of his father. The elder Engels had become alarmed at the dubious company that his son had been keeping in Berlin and was horrified at his son's attitude towards politics and religion. His concern for his son was shown in a letter which he wrote to his brother-in-law, Karl Sneath, in October 1842. He declared that he would not quarrel with his son. "A dispute would only make him more obstinate and more embittered. His salvation must come from above. I know that at his confirmation he had genuine religious feelings and I am certain that anyone who has once felt the power of God's Word in his heart can never be permanently satisfied with new beliefs. He may have to travel a hard road before he descends from his proud heights and realises that he must bow his head humbly before the mighty hand of the Almighty." "It is a heavy cross to bear that I have a son at home who is like a scabby sheep in a flock and openly opposes the beliefs of his forefathers. I hope however to give him plenty of work to do and – wherever he may be – I will arrange for him to be very carefully watched so that he does not do anything to endanger his future career." The elder Engels hoped that his son could be kept out of mischief in England where he could complete his training in the cotton trade. And where better could this be done than in the offices of Ermen and Engels in Manchester?

From Cologne Engels went home to Barmen to prepare for his forthcoming journey to England. On the way to London towards the end of November 1842 he again called at the offices of the *Rheinische Zeitung* and on this occasion he met Karl Marx. Many years later he recalled his first talk with the man who was to become his closest friend. He had a decidedly cool reception. This was because Marx "had taken a stand against Bruno and Edgar Bauer and has announced his opposition to the view that the *Rheinische Zeitung* should be mainly a vehicle for theological propaganda, atheism, etc. rather than for political discussion and action." Marx was also opposed to Edgar Bauer's "windy communism". Marx was also well aware of Engels's friendship with Edgar Bauer and he assumed that Engels shared Edgar's views. Consequently Marx regarded Engels's visit with some suspicion. Despite his somewhat unfriendly reception Engels seems to have been invited to continue to write for the *Rheinische Zeitung* during his forthcoming visit to England.<sup>110</sup>

## V. London and Manchester 1842-4

Engels lived in England from November 1842 to August 1844. Since his correspondence for that period has not survived, his activities can be traced only by piecing together scattered items of information which appeared in his published works. There are also a few references to Engels's visits to England in 1842-4 in the writings of Harney, Weerth and Herwegh.

For most of the time Engels lived in Manchester but he was in London on at least two occasions. The evidence for the visit of 1842 is the fact that an article by Engels in the *Rheinische Zeitung* was headed "London, November 30" (1842). The fact that articles written towards the end of the year were headed "from Lancashire" suggests that Engels was in London for about three weeks. There is evidence for the visit to London in 1843 in Engels's account of the origins of the Communist League, written in 1885. Here he stated that he had met the German refugees Karl Schapper, Heinrich Bauer and Josef Moll in London in 1843. Although they made a deep impression upon him - they were "the first proletarian revolutionaries" he had met<sup>111</sup> - he declined their invitation to join the secret society (the League of the Just) to which they belonged. There is evidence that Engels visited Ostend in September 1843<sup>112</sup> and it is possible that he broke his journey in London. Moreover the vivid descriptions given by Engels in *The Condition of the Working Class in England* of the shipping in the Thames and the slums of St Giles suggest that he wrote from personal observation.<sup>113</sup>

In the first two articles which he wrote in England, dated November 30, 1842, Engels asked: "Is a revolution in England possible or even probable?" And he gave an affirmative answer to his question. He declared that the English stoutly denied that a revolution was imminent. They might admit that there was a social crisis but they considered that England's "wealth, industry and institutions would enable ways and means to be found to overcome the crisis before a catastrophe occurred". Engels considered that the English were deceiving themselves and would soon face a rude awakening. He argued that since the English economy was based entirely upon commerce, shipping and industry, the survival of the country depended upon a continual growth of its output of manufactured goods. But England's industry could not expand indefinitely. The sale of English goods abroad was being checked by hostile tariffs since other countries wished to foster their own industries. And the home market was stagnant since prohibitive

import duties led to high prices which the poorer customers could not afford.

Engels argued that this situation had precipitated the crisis of 1842. Faced with a trade depression some northern manufacturers had attempted to reduce wages. The workers had gone on strike and had resorted to violence but the Plug Plot riots<sup>114</sup> had failed through lack of “preparation, organisation and leadership”. Engels thought that the workers now realised that an improvement of their condition could be achieved only by overthrowing the nobility and the manufacturers by force. He asserted that hunger would soon drive the workers to new acts of violence.<sup>115</sup>

This article is of interest for two reasons. First, its date shows that it was written within a few days of Engels’s arrival in England. The opinions expressed could not have been based upon an investigation of the condition of the factory workers. They were preconceived ideas similar to those held by Moses Hess. Shortly before – in June 1842 – Moses Hess had written an article in which he declared. “England, where distress has reached frightful proportions, is heading for a catastrophe sooner than had been expected. And no one can foretell the consequences that this catastrophe will have not only for Great Britain but also for the Continent.”<sup>116</sup> Secondly, Engels’s article illustrates his belief that he could predict the course of political events in England. As early as the autumn of 1842 he asserted that a workers’ revolution in England was inevitable. Events proved him to be wrong. For years Engels waited for the fulfilment of his gloomy prophecy and for years he waited in vain.

In December 1842 Engels arrived in Manchester and stayed until 1844, working as a clerk in the office of the cotton firm of Ermen and Engels<sup>117</sup> of which his father had recently become a partner. His spare time was spent in free-lance journalism and in examining the life and work of the factory operatives in the industrial districts of the north. In an address to the English workers, written on his return home, he declared that he had come to England:

“to see you in your homes, to observe you in your everyday life, to chat with you on your condition and grievances, to witness your struggles against the social and political power of your oppressors.”  
 “I have done so: I forsook the company and the dinner parties, the port-wine and champagne of the middle classes, and devoted my leisure hours almost exclusively to the intercourse with plain Working Men; I am both glad and proud to have done so. Glad, because thus I was induced to spend many a happy hour in obtaining a knowledge of the realities of life – many an hour, which else would

have been wasted in fashionable talk and tiresome etiquette; proud, because thus I got an opportunity of doing justice to an oppressed and calumniated class of men who with all their faults and under all the disadvantages of their situation, yet command the respect of every one but an English money-monger; proud, too, because thus I was placed in a position to save the English people from the growing contempt which on the Continent has been the necessary consequence of the brutally selfish policy and general behaviour of your ruling classes".<sup>118</sup>

Engels came into contact with various working class leaders, trade unionists, Chartists, and Socialists. He went to Leeds to see George Julian Harney,<sup>119</sup> the editor of the *Northern Star*,<sup>120</sup> which Engels regarded as one of the best newspapers in Europe. Harney later recalled a visit from "a slender young man with a look of almost boyish immaturity, who spoke remarkably pure English and said that he was keenly interested in the Chartist movement."<sup>121</sup> In Manchester Engels attended Chartist meetings in the Carpenters' Hall and met James Leach,<sup>122</sup> who was the author of a pamphlet on *Stubborn Facts from the Factories*. Leach was a member of the committee of the National Charter Association and Engels regarded him as a "good friend".<sup>123</sup> Engels also attended some of the Sunday lectures given by the Owenite secularist John Watts<sup>124</sup> in the Hall of Science in Campfield. At that time he regarded Watts as an "important person" and an able pamphleteer but in later years he took a less favourable view of Watts's activities.<sup>125</sup> Engels's companions on his tours of Manchester and other industrial towns included his girl friend the Irish millgirl Mary Burns and Georg Weerth, a young German friend who was then living in Bradford.<sup>126</sup>

Soon after he arrived in Manchester in December 1842 Engels wrote two further articles for the *Rheinische Zeitung*. In the first he argued that the situation of the British workers was becoming "more precarious every day". It was true that the excitement of the Plug Plot riots had subsided in Manchester where nine out of ten operatives were now in employment. Workers on the Continent would envy their standard of living since they could afford meat every day and drank tea, porter and brandy. But there was unrest among the English coalminers and ironworkers while in Scotland there was unemployment in the Glasgow district. Engels declared that when the next commercial crisis came – and it was due within the next few years – hunger would drive the English workers to revolt.

The second article discussed the Corn Laws. Engels believed that the bread tax would be swept away not so much by the efforts of

the Anti-Corn Law League as by the fury of the "embittered masses". But he thought that the great landowners would fight to the last to defend their privileges. He considered that the propaganda of the Anti-Corn Law League had converted the tenant farmers to Free Trade and that they would now defy their Tory landlords and vote for the Whigs.<sup>127</sup>

In the summer of 1843 Engels contributed four articles on English affairs to a Swiss journal. The first described the English political parties and discussed the agitation concerning the education clauses of Sir James Graham's Factory Bill. The Dissenters bitterly opposed these clauses which appeared to hand over religious instruction in the factory schools to the Church of England. Supported by the Whigs, the Dissenters organised many public meetings to protest against the Bill. Engels attended such a meeting in Salford which ended in disorder when Chartists in the audience tried to propose an amendment to the resolution put forward from the platform.<sup>128</sup> The second article denounced the London correspondent of the *Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung* who had informed his readers that the Anti-Corn Law League was "a power in the land". Engels declared that the League had no influence over the ministry or parliament and that its propaganda was overshadowed by that of the Chartists.

The third article discussed the socialist movement in England and described Sunday meetings addressed by men like Dr Watts in the Hall of Science in Manchester. The fourth article examined O'Connell's agitation for the repeal of the Union. Engels considered that only egoism, vanity and lack of judgment prevented O'Connell from making himself master of Ireland. "Give me two thousand Irish", he wrote, "and I will destroy the British monarchy once and for all." It was characteristic of Engels that in these articles he should have confidently forecast the future course of events in England. His confidence was sometimes misplaced. Contrary to his expectations the Anti-Corn Law League achieved its aims while the Chartist movement failed.<sup>129</sup>

Engels also wrote two articles for Robert Owen's *New Moral World* in 1843 in which he gave English readers a brief outline of the spread of communist ideas on the Continent.<sup>130</sup> While paying a tribute to the communist propaganda of Wilhelm Weitling among the Swiss and German workers Engels emphasised the importance of Marx, Ruge, Hess and Herwegh as leaders of a new communist movement in Germany. In a short third article, which appeared on February 3, 1844, Engels drew attention to the forthcoming publication of the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* to be edited by Ruge and Marx.

The first and only number of this journal appeared in Paris in February 1844.<sup>131</sup> Its youngest contributor was Engels whose "Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy" was his first essay on economics.<sup>132</sup> It is a significant article because it showed the progress that Engels had made on the road to communism before the commencement of his long period of collaboration with Marx. And Marx had a high opinion of the article since he referred to it as "a brilliant outline criticism of economic categories".<sup>133</sup>

In addition to criticising some of the contradictions inherent in the theories of the English classical economists, Engels attacked the entire capitalist system in no uncertain terms. He denounced the factory system because it undermined family life. "It is a common practice for children as soon as they are able to work – that is to say when they reach the age of nine – to spend their wages themselves and to look upon their parental home as a mere boarding house." Engels argued that the exchange of goods under the capitalist system lacked any moral basis and was no better than legalised robbery. "In commerce one is allowed to take the utmost advantage of the ignorance and the trust of the opposing party. One may bestow fictitious qualities on a commodity that one wishes to sell."

In a capitalist society the production and consumption of goods is regulated by supply and demand. In practice, according to Engels, "supply is always either a little too big or a little too small and never corresponds exactly to demand." This leads to "a state of continual fluctuation which never achieves equilibrium" with the result that "we now have a slump every five to seven years". Engels believed that "every new crisis must be more serious and more universal than the last". He warned his readers that eventually "commercial crises will lead to a social revolution far beyond the comprehension of the economists with their scholastic wisdom." The uncertain future of the economy fostered gambling in shares on the stock exchange. "The speculator always gambles on disasters – particularly bad harvests. He tries to profit from every disaster – such as the New York fire."<sup>134</sup> Engels argued that only the national planning of production – based upon a rational forecast of demand in the future – could cure the chronic evil of periodic slumps.

Although Engels had asserted that supply "never corresponds exactly to demand" a little later he described a situation in which "a state of equilibrium is reached between supply and demand and between production and consumption." When this happened "people starve from sheer abundance. England has been in this crazy position for some considerable time." So Engels was arguing

that capitalism failed to work satisfactorily whether supply equalled demand or not.

Engels next criticised Malthus's population theory. He observed that "according to this theory population always presses upon the means of subsistence. . . . The inherent tendency of population to expand in excess of the available food is the root of all misery and vice. . . . Since it is the poor who are the surplus population nothing should be done for them except to make their starvation as easy as possible." Engels argued that there was a simple solution to the problem posed by Malthus. On the one hand there appeared to be a "surplus population". On the other hand there was "surplus wealth". Mankind had enormous productive powers. There was no limit to the potential increase in the productivity of land and factories. "Every day new scientific knowledge increasingly subjects the power of nature to mankind's needs." If human resources were intelligently planned the problem of a "surplus population" would vanish. Industrial societies were perfectly capable of producing all the goods and services required to maintain a decent standard of living for a growing population.

Engels regarded capitalism as inefficient, unfair, cruel and immoral. It was inefficient because of its chronic instability. It was cruel because its slumps condemned hundreds of thousands of workers to unemployment and distress. It was unfair because it tolerated great wealth side by side with grinding poverty. It was immoral because in a capitalist society men's actions were dictated solely by selfish motives of profit. Engels argued that private property – the root evil of capitalism – must be abolished and that uncontrolled competition must be replaced by central planning on rational principles. The essay was a remarkable one because it discussed issues with which we are quite familiar today but were still largely ignored by many of Engels's contemporaries. He examined factors of economic growth, the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty, the phenomenon of the trade cycle, the tendency for free competition to lead to monopoly, the expansion of large businesses and estates at the expense of small firms and peasant holdings. It will be seen that Engels elaborated some of these points in his book on the English workers which was written in the following year.

It was with this book in mind that Engels gathered material on the political and economic history of England at the same time that he was engaged in the study of economics. He wrote two articles in *Vorwärts*, the radical organ of German emigrants in Paris with which Marx was associated. These articles may be regarded as a preliminary survey of the historical background of

his forthcoming account of the condition of the English workers.<sup>135</sup> Engels described the course of the industrial revolution and the creation of a proletariat of wage-earners living in great manufacturing towns. He considered the emergence of a new kind of working class to be the most significant factor in the history of England in the eighteenth century. In his view there were now three social classes in the country—the landed aristocracy, the financial aristocracy, and the wage-earners. The first two shared the effective control of the state while the proletariat had no political power. Such a situation could not last for long. There would be a struggle between the propertied middle class and the oppressed workers. “In England the clash between aristocracy and democracy is the struggle between the rich and the poor.” Engels concluded: “Democracy itself is incapable of curing social evils. Democratic equality is a chimera. The struggle between rich and poor cannot be fought on the basis of democracy—or indeed on the basis of politics. A political struggle between the rich and the poor is merely a transitional phase. It is simply a last attempt to solve the problem by purely political means. Out of this struggle will emerge a new principle overriding political conflicts. This is the principle of socialism.”

Many years later Engels summed up the way in which his intellectual development had been furthered by his stay in England in 1842–4: “In Manchester it was forcibly brought to my notice that economic factors, hitherto ignored or at least underestimated by historians, play a decisive role in the development of the modern world. I learned that economic factors were the basic cause of the clash between different classes in society. And I realised that in a highly industrialised country like England the clash of social classes lay at the very root of the rivalry between parties and were of fundamental significance in tracing the course of modern political history.”<sup>136</sup>

Twenty months in Manchester and London had turned Engels from an inexperienced youth to a young man who had found a purpose in life. Dr Julius Waldeck, a Berlin doctor, wrote in May 1844: “Engels has wrought a miracle in himself. His views and his style are more mature and more manly than they were a year ago.”<sup>137</sup>

## VI. Paris, 1844

In August 1844 Engels left Manchester and returned to Barmen. On the way he paid his first visit to Paris where he stayed for about ten days. At this time Paris was the centre of revolutionary

movements in Europe and many observers considered that the fall of the July Monarchy would be the signal for the collapse of reactionary régimes in Austria, Germany and Italy. In July 1842 Heinrich Heine wrote that “the middle classes in Paris are obsessed by a nightmare apprehension of disaster. It is not fear of a republic but an instinctive dread of communism – of those sinister fellows who would swarm like rats from the ruin of the present régime.” He added that the shopkeepers of Paris “sense instinctively that today a republic might no longer represent the principles of the 1790s. It might become the instrument through which a new unacknowledged power would seize control – a proletarian party preaching community of goods.”<sup>138</sup>

It was in a city where the thunder clouds of social upheaval were already looming on the horizon that Engels met a group of exiles – Bakunin,<sup>139</sup> Bernays,<sup>140</sup> Ewerbeck<sup>141</sup> and Marx. And it was Paris that saw the beginning of the lifelong friendship between Marx and Engels.

Engels subsequently wrote: “When I visited Marx in Paris in the summer of 1844 we found ourselves in complete agreement on questions of theory and our collaboration began at that time.” Engels had already met Marx on one occasion – when he had not been very warmly received – and had been in touch with Marx as a contributor to the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* and *Vorwärts*. With all the enthusiasm of young messiahs they proposed to overthrow the existing political and social order. Capitalism was to be replaced by a new kind of socialism. Established religions and philosophies were to be swept aside in favour of a new materialist ideology. The boldness of their plans was matched only by the astonishing successes that they eventually achieved.

Marx and Engels were well-matched collaborators. As Auguste Cornu has observed: “Since Engels had practical experience in the world of commerce and was always in contact with people in various walks of life he was an ideal partner for Marx who was applying theoretical principles to economic and social problems. On the other hand Marx had made greater advances in working out the basis of dialectical historical materialism and scientific socialism and he was able to help Engels to broaden his outlook on these matters. Marx was the leader in the partnership for he achieved, as Engels later admitted, what Engels could not have achieved by himself.”<sup>142</sup>

After Marx’s death Engels’s verdict upon the years during which they had worked together was as follows: “I cannot deny that both before and during my forty years’ partnership with Marx I had a certain independent share in working out the theory (of scientific

socialism). But Marx was responsible for most of the leading basic ideas – particularly as far as economics and history were concerned – and he put those ideas into their final classic form. What I achieved – apart from work in a few specialised fields of study – Marx could have achieved without me. But what Marx achieved I could not have achieved.”<sup>143</sup>

Karl Marx, two years older than Engels, was born in Trier in the Rhineland on May 5, 1818, of Jewish parents. On both sides of the family he was descended from rabbis who were highly respected in the Jewish community for their scholarship. Among his ancestors were several rabbis of Trier, but Heinrich Marx – Karl’s father – was a lawyer. When Napoleon’s empire collapsed Prussia secured substantial territories on the left bank of the Rhine, including Trier. Jews were not treated so liberally in Prussia as they had been under French rule. In 1815 they were not allowed to hold public office and in the following year they were excluded from various professions. In order to be able to continue to earn his living as a lawyer Heinrich Marx became a Christian. But he did not join the Catholic Church to which the vast majority of his neighbours belonged. He was baptised by the army chaplain Mühlenhoff and became a member of the tiny Protestant community.

These circumstances had a profound influence upon Karl Marx. At an early age he felt that he was different from his fellows. The fact that he had been baptised did not change the blood that ran in his veins. He was still a Jew and he suffered from the anti-semitism that was prevalent in Germany in his day. Yet he was outside the Jewish community. He reacted to the situation by conceiving an irrational hatred for his own race and he condemned the Jews as usurers and capitalists whose only purpose in life was to make money. Marx’s anti-semitism was one of the less agreeable aspects of his character. If Marx could not escape from being classed with the despised Jewish minority he could derive little comfort from his membership of the Protestant Church. The Protestant congregation of Trier was a very small one, so that Marx was again a member of a minority group. While his father was a patriotic Prussian, Marx detested Prussian absolutism and militarism and eventually gave up his Prussian nationality.

As a young man he felt that he was different from his fellows in another way. He realised that his intellectual ability and will-power were greater than those of his contemporaries at school and at the university. In an essay, written for his school leaving examination, he discussed the choice of a profession. He argued that a professional career should not be adopted because it promised

material rewards or honours. The only good reasons for adopting a profession were a sense of dedication and a desire to serve humanity. A profession should be a calling. But he realised that a young man might be restricted in selecting a profession because “his position in society has to some extent already been fixed before he can make his choice.” And a time came when Marx believed that he was destined for higher things than a normal occupation. He was to be a philosopher who would show the world a new way of life. Like his rabbi ancestors he saw himself as a prophet and a teacher though his message to humanity was no religious faith but a doctrine of materialism. A messiah was no ordinary mortal and Marx felt that he was not bound by ordinary conventions of society. He had, for example, no need to concern himself with such mundane problems as earning a living, supporting a family, or even balancing a budget.

Marx secured his school leaving certificate at the early age of seventeen and went to the University of Bonn in the autumn of 1835 to read law. He did not devote himself very assiduously to his studies and in 1836 became secretly engaged to Jenny von Westphalen, the daughter of a titled senior official who was an old friend of the Marx family.<sup>144</sup> Marx's father now decided that Karl should go to the University of Berlin. At this time Berlin had a reputation for hard work. Feuerbach declared that Berlin was an intellectual factory compared with other German seats of learning which were little more than glorified taverns. Moreover Berlin was far from Trier and Karl would have fewer opportunities of seeing Jenny.

In Berlin Karl Marx enrolled for a few courses in jurisprudence but most of his time was spent in private study. In a letter to his father of November 10, 1837 he explained how he had spent his first year in Berlin. Apart from writing romantic verses for Jenny's edification he had studied philosophy and history so intensively that his health had suffered and on the advice of his doctor he had moved for a time to the village of Stralau. Karl explained that the purpose of his studies was to construct an entirely new system of metaphysics. No wonder that Heinrich Marx became alarmed at his son's conduct and that relations between father and son deteriorated. Heinrich Marx had discovered – as Engels found out later to his cost – that Karl was incapable of living within his allowance. More serious was Karl's neglect of his legal studies. Heinrich Marx warned his son that his engagement imposed responsibilities which should not be neglected. If he seriously intended to marry Jenny he should complete his studies and earn his living so that he could support a wife. Philosophy and poetry were no substitute for

bread and butter. Instead of following his father's advice Karl continued to bury himself in his books. Although he had decided to give up law in preference for an academic career he postponed the writing of his doctoral thesis which would have been the first step to securing a university post.

The intellectual stimulus which Marx received in Berlin came not from his university teachers but from his membership of the Doctors Club, the forerunner of the group known as 'the Free' with which Engels was in contact shortly afterwards. The leading members of the Doctors Club – the theologian Bruno Bauer, the historian Karl Friedrich Köppen and the teacher Adolf Rutenberg – accepted the twenty year old student Marx as their intellectual equal and before long he came to dominate their discussions. In 1840 Köppen dedicated his book on Frederick the Great to "his friend Karl Heinrich Marx of Trier". The Doctors Club supported the Young Hegelian movement which emphasised the dialectical aspect of Hegel's teaching – the idea of change and progress – while rejecting the conservative aspect of Hegel's philosophy which regarded the existing Prussian State as the perfect culmination of a process of evolution. The radical ideas of the Young Hegelians found expression in the *Hallische* (later *Deutsche*) *Jahrbücher*, a periodical founded by Arnold Ruge and Theodor Echtermeyer in 1838.

In the autumn of 1839 Bruno Bauer was appointed to the post of lecturer in theology at the University of Bonn and he urged Marx to join him so that they could found a new radical periodical. But first he must procrastinate no longer. He should complete his doctoral thesis without delay. Marx however refused to be hurried. Bruno Bauer was waiting in Bonn to start his journal while Jenny was waiting in Trier to get married. But Marx continued to work on his manuscript until the early months of 1841. It was typical of Marx that his analysis and criticism of the philosophies of Democritus and Epicurus should have been only part of a more comprehensive survey of the Greek natural philosophers which he planned to write. His attitude towards the Prussian universities at which he had studied was shown by the fact that he submitted his thesis to the University of Jena in Thuringia although he had never been enrolled there. It took the philosophical faculty only nine days to award Marx his doctorate.

Any hopes that Marx may have had of securing a post at the University of Bonn through Bruno Bauer's influence were shattered when Bauer's licence to teach was withdrawn in 1842.<sup>145</sup> Marx's extreme radical views were such that it was unlikely that he would obtain a university post and he now turned to journalism as a

career. He began to contribute to the *Rheinische Zeitung*, a newspaper established in Cologne on January 1, 1842 by a group of liberal businessmen in the Rhineland to challenge the powerful *Kölnische Zeitung*. Two young men – Georg Jung and Dagobert Oppenheim – soon secured for themselves an influential position on the editorial staff. They were Young Hegelians and they were influenced by the socialist writer Moses Hess. Jung and Oppenheim tried to secure contributions from fellow Young Hegelians and Marx was one of the first to be approached. Marx wrote a series of highly critical articles on the proceedings of the Rhenish Provincial Assembly which had met for nine weeks in Düsseldorf in the previous year. In October 1842 Marx was appointed editor in chief of the *Rheinische Zeitung*. He resigned in the following March owing to continual difficulties with the Prussian censorship. Soon afterwards the publication of the newspaper was forbidden by the government. His brief experience as a newspaper editor forced Marx for the first time to concern himself with the social problems of the day.

Arnold Ruge now suggested that Marx should join him in establishing a new left-wing periodical in Paris where they would be free from the exasperating restrictions of the Prussian censorship. Marx accepted this proposal. Although his income had ceased – and he had to accept the disagreeable fact that there was no chance of getting any money from his father's estate so long as his mother was alive – Marx was in no hurry to go to Paris. He married Jenny von Westphalen in June 1843 and afterwards Karl and Jenny lived for five months with Jenny's mother at Kreuznach. Leaving his bride to her own devices Marx spent his days in the study immersed in philosophy and French history in preparation for his future work as joint editor of the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*. Not until November 1843 did Marx and his wife move to Paris and it was not until February 1844 that the first – and only – number of the *Jahrbücher* appeared. Arnold Ruge, in a letter to Feuerbach, gave a sketch of Marx as he knew him in Paris. He considered that Marx was a born scholar and writer. But he would never be a successful journalist. He was an omnivorous reader and was capable of working with great intensity when the spirit moved him. Yet he rarely finished anything that he had begun. Half way through a project he would break off to throw himself wholeheartedly into some new plan.

In Paris Marx was soon in touch with French and German radicals and socialists such as Proudhon and Moses Hess. He also met the exiled German romantic poet Heinrich Heine whose work he greatly admired. The failure of the *Deutsch-Französische*

*Jahrbücher* meant that Marx was again in financial difficulties. He had no regular source of income and he now had a wife to support. Fortunately some of his friends in Cologne raised 4,400 francs to enable him to continue to live in Paris. And early in 1845 he secured 1,500 francs advance royalties from a German publisher for a book that he never wrote.

The economic manuscripts on which Marx worked at this time and his criticism of Hegel's philosophy of law in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* show how closely Marx's views now corresponded with those of Engels. The Paris manuscripts of 1844, which were not published in his lifetime, included Marx's detailed notes on the works of the English classical economists and his comments on their views.<sup>146</sup> It is easy to appreciate how warmly Engels would be welcomed by Marx when they met in the autumn of 1844. They agreed to collaborate in the future and they decided that their first task would be to write a criticism of Bruno Bauer and his fellow Young Hegelians. There was a time when both Marx and Engels had regarded Bruno Bauer as their mentor. Now, as convinced communists, they were opposed to their former friend.

## NOTES

- 1 For Engels's early life see G. Mayer, *Friedrich Engels in seiner Frühzeit* (1920); A. Conradi, "Friedrich Engels in seinen deutschen Jugendjahren" (in *Neue Zeit*, Vol. 38, 1920, p. 270 *et seq*); O. Janssen, "Der junge Engels" (in *Sozialist*, Vol. 6, No. 17, 1920); E. Bernstein, "Vom Werden und Wirken des jungen Engels" (in *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, Vol. 42, 1922, p. 212 *et seq*); W. Andreas, "Der junge Engels" (in *Historische Porträts*, 1922, p. 159 *et seq*); R. Sieger, *Friedrich Engels. Die religiöse Entwicklung des Spät pietisten und Frühsozialisten* (1935).
- 2 Franz Mehring, "Friedrich Engels" in *Die Neue Zeit*, Vol. 2, 1904-5, translated in *Reminiscences of Marx and Engels* (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow), pp. 361-4.
- 3 Engels's mother had a difficult labour: see F. Engels (senior) to Karl Wilhelm Moritz Snethlage, December 1, 1820 in *Stadt-Anzeiger-Bergische Wochenpost*, Friday-Saturday, April 18-19, 1969 ("Aus der Geschichte unserer Heimat").
- 4 For Elberfeld and Barmen in the 1840s see Klara Wittgenstein, "Die Entwicklung der sozialen Frage und Bewegung in Wuppertal in den vierziger Jahren des 19en Jahrhunderts und ihre wirtschaftlichen Grundlagen" in *Zeitschrift des Bergischen Geschichtsvereins*, Vol. 54, 1923-4, pp. 118-87.
- 5 It was "managed by some English spinners". See T. C. Banfield, *Industry of the Rhine*, Series II, *Manufacturers* (1848), p. 123. If Banfield's information is correct this is an earlier water mill for spinning cotton yarn than Brügelmann's at Ratingen, near Düsseldorf (1794).
- 6 N. J. G. Pounds, *The Ruhr* (1952), p. 41.

- 7 See F. O. Diltthey, *Geschichte der Baumwollenindustrie im nieder-rheinischen Industriebezirk* (1904).
- 8 See Gustav Kühne, "Das deutsche Manchester" in *Europa*, October 2 and 9, 1847.
- 9 For the Manchester firm, see W. O. Henderson, "The Firm of Ermen and Engels" in *Internationale Wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz*, Heft 11-12, April 1971, pp. 1-10.
- 10 For the German firm of Ermen and Engels see P. Steller, *Führende Männer des rheinisch-westfälischen Wirtschaftslebens* (Berlin 1830) and H. Watzmer, "Die Herkunft der industriellen Bourgeoisie Preussens in den vierziger Jahren des 19en Jahrhunderts" in Hans Motteck (ed), *Studien zur Geschichte der industriellen Revolution in Deutschland* (1960), p. 147. See also *100 Jahre Zinn*, Engels & Co. (Wuppertal).
- 11 See W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner, "Friedrich Engels in Manchester" in *Memoirs and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society*, Session 1956-7, p. 2.
- 12 Edmund Wilson, *To the Finland Station* (Fontana Library, 1960), p. 133.
- 13 Shortly after the enactment of Prussia's first Factory Law in 1839 a foreman in a Barmen spinning mill was sentenced to five years penal servitude for offences against thirteen factory girls aged between 10 and 14. See G. A. Anton, *Geschichte der preussischen Fabrikgesetzgebung bis zu ihrer Aufnahme durch die Reichsgewerbeordnung* (1891; new edition 1953), p. 78. August von der Heydt (the future Minister of Commerce who was then a magistrate in Elberfeld) sent 2,000 letters of admonition and notices of penalty to parents who had failed to send their children to school in 1846. See T. C. Banfield *Industry of the Rhine*, Series II, *Manufactures* (1848), p. 134.
- 14 F. Engels, "Briefe aus dem Wuppertal" in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 23-41.
- 15 F. Engels, "Preussischer Schnaps" in *Volksstaat*, 1876, No. 23-35.
- 16 F. Engels, "Briefe aus dem Wuppertal" in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 37.
- 17 For Engels's religious views in 1837-47 see R. Sieger, *Friedrich Engels, Die religiöse Entwicklung des Spät Pietisten und Frühsozialisten* (Halle an der Saale, 1935). For Pietism see C. Marklin, *Darstellung und Kritik des modernen Pietismus* (Stuttgart, 1839) and L. Hüffel, *Der Pietismus geschichtlich und kirchlich beleuchtet* (Heidelberg, 1846).
- 18 F. Engels to Friedrich Graeber, February 19, 1839 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 500.
- 19 *Ibid.*, April 8, 1839, p. 504.
- 20 i.e. David Friedrich Strauss who in his *Leben Jesu* (1835) had tried to prove that the gospel history was a collection of myths.
- 21 F. Engels to Friedrich Graeber, April 23-May 1, 1839 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 505.
- 22 F. Engels to Wilhelm Graeber, October 8, 1839, in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 538.
- 23 F. Engels to Wilhelm Graeber, December 12, 1839; *ibid.*, p. 554.
- 24 "According to your sort of Christianity nine tenths of humanity are condemned to eternal damnation and one tenth is saved. Come, Fritz, is that really what you call the immeasurable love of God?" (F. Engels to Friedrich Graeber, July 27, 1839 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 531).
- 25 *Ibid.*, April 27-30, 1839, p. 519.

- 26 F. Engels, "Rationalismus und Pietismus" in *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände*, October 17, 1840 and in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 128–30.
- 27 But in an emotional passage in a letter to Friedrich Graeber (July 12, 1839) Engels declared that he felt that he would "find his way to God" (*ibid.*, p. 531).
- 28 For Engels's comments on the political views of the younger generation in Elberfeld and Barmen see his "Briefe aus dem Wuppertal" (April 1839) in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 37.
- 29 F. Engels to Friedrich Graeber, October 29, 1839: *ibid.*, p. 547.
- 30 F. Engels to Friedrich Graeber, December 9, 1839–February 5, 1840: *ibid.*, p. 558. But on another occasion he referred to the king of Hanover as "a lousy old goat".
- 31 After leaving home Engels mentioned in his letters the names of some of his friends at school. They included Peter Jonghans, Friedrich Plümacher, Gustav Wurm, Gustav Heuser, Wilhelm Blank, Friedrich Graeber, Wilhelm Graeber, Hermann Graeber, and Strücher. Several of them were either sons of the manse or candidates for the Protestant ministry or both.
- 32 For Engels's stay in Bremen see his letters to his sister Marie, to Friedrich Graeber and to Wilhelm Graeber and his articles in the *Telegraph für Deutschland* (edited by Carl Gutzkow) and the *Morgenblatt für gebildete Leser* in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2.
- 33 For Treviranus see an article in *Bremer Biographien des 19en Jahrhunderts* (1912) and Tiesmeyer, *Georg Gottfried Treviranus* (1879).
- 34 From Engels's letter of October 29, 1840 to his sister (in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 600–2) it is clear that some of Engels's friends in Bremen – clerks and apprentices who lodged in the homes of their masters – did not have front door keys. Describing a party he wrote: ". . . and then we drank another toast. So it went on until 10 p.m. when those who had no front door keys had to go home but we lucky ones who had keys stayed on and ate oysters. . . ."
- 35 Since Leupold was Consul for the Kingdom of Saxony in Bremen he was addressed as 'Consul Leupold'.
- 36 Engels wrote that Leupold was "ein schrecklich guter Kerl, o so gut, Du kannst Dir gar nicht denken" (F. Engels to Friedrich and Wilhelm Graeber, September 1, 1838 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 486) and "ein köstlicher Kerl" (*ibid.*, p. 490).
- 37 F. Engels to W. Graeber, October 20–21, 1839: "I have had an excessively boring day. The work in the office nearly killed me" (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 542).
- 38 F. Engels to his sister Marie, July 7–9, 1840 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 590).
- 39 F. Engels to his sister Marie, August 20–25, 1840 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 595).
- 40 In a letter of February 22, 1841 to F. Graeber there is a reference to a duel fought by Engels. He boasted that he had given his opponent "a marvellous slash on the forehead – right from top to bottom – a real beauty" (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 564).
- 41 In a letter to his sister, Engels wrote that the Union subscribed to Dutch, English, American, French, Turkish and Japanese newspapers. "I have taken the opportunity to learn Turkish and Japanese and I can understand 25 languages" (September 28, 1839: *ibid.*, p. 588). In

- another letter he offered to teach his sister Danish, Spanish or Portuguese (*ibid.*, p. 595).
- 42 F. Engels, "Eine Fahrt nach Bremerhaven" in *Morgenblatt für gebildete Leser*, August 17, 1841 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 147–8).
- 43 F. Engels to his sister Marie, August 4, 1840 (*ibid.*, p. 592): "It is a sad business. I have hardly a copper in my pocket and I have plenty of debts".
- 44 F. Engels to W. Graeber, November 20, 1840 (*ibid.*, p. 560) "*Tätigkeit, Leben, Jugendmut, das ist der wahre Witz.*"
- 45 Gustav Mayer, "Ein Pseudonym von Friedrich Engels" in *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und Arbeiterbewegung*, Vol. 4, 1914.
- 46 F. Engels to Friedrich Graeber, April 9, 1839 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 504. See R. Sieger, *Friedrich Engels als junger Deutscher* (University of Halle–Wittenberg dissertation, 1935).
- 47 Engels's last article in the *Telegraph* was in the number dated November 1841 and appeared in the middle of December 1841.
- 48 See *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. xxv–xxvi (Rjazanov's introduction).
- 49 July 1840 to August 1841.
- 50 From an article by Wilhelm Liebknecht on Friedrich Engels in the *Illustrierte Neue Welt: Kalender für das Jahr 1897*. See also *Reminiscences of Marx & Engels* (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow), pp. 137–48.
- 51 F. Engels to F. Graeber, April 23, 1839 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 505–6). In this letter Engels declared that the style of the article was shocking (*hundeschlecht*), yet a few months later (July 30, 1839) he wrote to W. Graeber: "I have recently read it again and I am astonished at the style. Since then I have not by any means managed to reach that standard of writing" (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 536).
- 52 "Einige Berichtigungen der Briefe aus dem Wuppertal" in the *Telegraph für Deutschland*, May 1839, No. 8, pp. 635–8 (summarised by D. Rjazanov in the introduction to *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. xxviii).
- 53 *Telegraph für Deutschland*, July 1840, reprinted in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 76–82.
- 54 The excursion was first described in a letter to his sister on July 7–9, 1840 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 589–91). The article appeared a year later in the *Morgenblatt für gebildete Leser*, August 1841 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 147–54).
- 55 F. Engels to W. Graeber, July 30, 1839 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 536).
- 56 F. Engels (F. Oswald), "Karl Beck" in *Telegraph für Deutschland*, November and December 1839 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 57–61).
- 57 F. Engels (F. Oswald), "Retrograde Zeichen der Zeit" in *Telegraph für Deutschland*, February 1840 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 62–6). On February 21, 1840 Engels wrote to Friedrich Graeber: "Through Strauss I have taken the road that leads straight to Hegelianism. Of course I will not become so fanatical a Hegelian as Hinrichs etc. but I must make some important aspects of Hegel's colossal system of philosophy part of my own intellectual heritage" (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 554–5).

- 58 F. Engels's essay on Platen in *Telegraph für Deutschland*, February 1840 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 67–8).
- 59 F. Engels to Friedrich Graeber, January 20, 1840 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 554).
- 60 F. Engels to his sister Marie, March 8, 1840 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 611).
- 61 Engels to his sister Marie on April 5, early May, the end of August, and September 9, 1841 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 613–16.
- 62 "Lombardische Streifzüge" in *Athenäum*, December 4 and 11, 1841 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 159–68.
- 63 Engels to his sister Marie, September 9, 1841 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 615–16.
- 64 The photograph of a small painting of the head and shoulders of a young man in uniform reproduced in Horst Ullrich, *Der junge Engels* (two volumes, 1961), Vol. 1, p. 248 is stated to be a picture of Friedrich Engels in 1842. In fact it is a picture of Engels's father. In his will dated July 29, 1893 Engels left this painting of his father to his brother Hermann.
- 65 Gehard Zirke, *Der General: Friedrich Engels, der erste Militär Theoretiker der Arbeiterklasse* (Leipzig and Jena, 1957).
- 66 Engels to his sister Marie, April 14–16, 1842 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 620.
- 67 *Ibid.*, p. 619.
- 68 *Ibid.*, p. 624.
- 69 *Ibid.*, p. 617.
- 70 The certificate is printed in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 365.
- 71 George Julian Harney in the *Newcastle Weekly Chronicle*, August 17, 1895.
- 72 F. Lessner in *Reminiscences of Marx and Engels* (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow), p. 153.
- 73 F. Engels, "Rheinische Feste" in the *Rheinische Zeitung*, May 14, 1842 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 293–5).
- 74 F. Engels, "Marx und die Neue Rheinische Zeitung" in Karl Marx–Friedrich Engels, *Die Revolution von 1848* (selected articles from the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*: Dietz Verlag, Berlin 1955), p. 32. Engels regarded the shopkeepers and craftsmen of Berlin as "loud-mouthed cowardly toadies".
- 75 Adolf Glassbrenner, *Berliner Volksleben* (1847).
- 76 Michael Bakunin to Alexander Herzen, October 23, 1840 in T. Klein (ed.), *Der Vorkampf deutscher Einheit und Freiheit* (edition of 1925), pp. 67–68.
- 77 R. Sieger, Friedrich Engels. *Die religiöse Entwicklung des Spätpietisten und Frühsozialisten* (Halle a.S., 1935).
- 78 Bruno Bauer (1809–82): Young Hegelian and biblical critic.
- 79 Dr Arnold Ruge (1802–80) edited the *Hallische* (later *Deutsche*) *Jahrbücher* (1841–3) and, with Marx, the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* (one double issue, February 1844). See Paul Nerrlich (ed.), *Arnold Ruges Briefwechsel und Tagebücher aus den Jahren 1825–1880* (two volumes, 1886).
- 80 Edgar Bauer (1809–86).
- 81 Pen name of Kaspar Schmidt (1806–56) whose book *Der Einzige und sein Eigentum* appeared in 1845.
- 82 Karl Friedrich Köppen (1808–63), radical historian and contributor to the *Rheinische Zeitung*.

- 83 Karl Ludwig Theodor Nauwerck was dismissed from his lectureship at the University of Berlin. The King told his Minister Thile in November 1843 that this "well-known revolutionary" should not be allowed to teach in a Prussian university. See Heinrich von Treitschke, *Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, Vol. 5, (edition of 1927), p. 233.
- 84 F. W. von Schelling (1775-1854), P. K. Marheineke (1780-1846) and K. F. Werder (1806-93) lectured on philosophy while L. von Henning (1791-1866) lectured on public finance. On January 5, 1842 Engels wrote to his sister Marie (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 617) that he had attended a lecture given by the poet and orientalist Friedrich Rückert (1788-1866).
- 85 F. Engels, "Tagebuch eines Hospitanten" in the *Rheinische Zeitung*, May 10, 1842 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 290).
- 86 Ludwig Feuerbach, *Das Wesen des Christentums* (Leipzig, 1841).
- 87 See F. Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of German Classical Philosophy* (1888: English translation - Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1950). Engels's pamphlet on Feuerbach first appeared in *Neue Zeit* in 1886 as a review of K. N. Stark, *Ludwig Feuerbach* (1885).
- 88 F. Engels, "Progress of Social Reform on the Continent: II Germany and Switzerland" in *The New Moral World*, November 18, 1843 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 447).
- 89 For Engels's views on the censorship see "Zur Kritik der Preussischen Pressgesetze" in the *Rheinische Zeitung*, July 14, 1842 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 310-17) and "Friedrich Wilhelm IV, König von Preussen" in *Einundzwanzig Bogen aus der Schweiz*, 1843, pp. 189-96 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 339-46).
- 90 Friedrich Oswald (F. Engels), "Schelling über Hegel" in the *Telegraph*, December 1841, pp. 825-7 and pp. 830-2. (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 173-80).
- 91 *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 181-227. The pamphlet was long attributed to Bakunin. A letter from Engels to Ruge, June 15, 1842, proves that Engels was the author (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 631).
- 92 P. K. Marheineke, *Kritik der Schellingschen Offenbarungs-philosophie* (1843) and H. E. G. Paulus, *Die . . . positive Philosophie der Offenbarung . . .* (Darmstadt, 1843). For Marheineke's criticism of Schelling in his course of lectures at the University of Berlin see F. Engels, "Tagebuch eines Hospitanten" in the *Rheinische Zeitung*, May 10, 1842, (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 290-2).
- 93 *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 229-49.
- 94 *Rheinische Zeitung*, May 18, 1842: see D. Rjazanov's introduction to *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 1.
- 95 *Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung*, May 19, 1842: see D. Rjazanov's introduction to *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 1.
- 96 Contemporary references to Friedrich Engels and Edgar Bauer as joint authors of this poem are to be found in W. Koner, *Gelehrtes Berlin im Jahre 1845 . . .* (1846), p. 15 and *Wigands Conversations-Lexikon* (1847), p. 81. See also D. Rjazanov, *op. cit.*, p. liv. The pamphlet was written in June or July 1842 and was published in Zürich in December 1842.
- 97 *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 253-81.
- 98 F. Engels, "Nord-und süddeutscher Liberalismus" in the *Rheinische*

- Zeitung*, April 12, 1842 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 287–9).
- 99 F. Engels, “Alexander Jung, Vorlesungen über die moderne Literatur der Deutschen” in *Deutsche Jahrbücher*, July 7, 8 and 9, 1842 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 323–35).
- 100 F. Engels, “Friedrich Wilhelm IV, König von Preussen” in *Einundzwanzig Bogen aus der Schweiz*, Part I, 1842 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 339–46).
- 101 For Engels’s criticism of the press censorship in Prussia at this time see his article in the *Rheinische Zeitung*, July 14, 1842 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 310–17).
- 102 *Hallische Jahrbücher für deutsche Wissenschaft und Kunst* (edited by Arnold Ruge and Theodor Echtermeyer, January 1838–June 1841) continued as *Deutsche Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Kunst* (July 1841–January 1843).
- 103 F. Engels, “Progress of Social Reform on the Continent: II Germany and Switzerland” in *New Moral World*, November 18, 1843 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 447).
- 104 Engels’s military discharge was dated October 8, 1842 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 635).
- 105 F. Engels, “Progress of Social Reform on the Continent: II Germany and Switzerland” in the *New Moral World*, November 18, 1843 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 448).
- 106 See Moses Hess, *Sozialistische Aufsätze* (1921); Auguste Cornu, *Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels* (1954), Vol. 1, pp. 213–23, 286–9, and 372–8; and H. Förder, *Marx und Engels am Vorabend der Revolution* (1960), pp. 25–6.
- 107 See Moses Hess, *Die europäische Triarchie* (Leipzig, 1841) reprinted in Moses Hess, *Philosophische und Sozialistische Schriften 1837–1850* (ed. by A. Cornu and W. Mönke, 1961), pp. 77–166.
- 108 Moses Hess to B. Auerbach, June 19, 1843 quoted by D. Rjazanov in the introduction to *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. lix. The letter appears in E. Silberner and W. Blumenberg (ed.) *Moses Hess: Briefwechsel* (The Hague, 1959), p. 103.
- 109 F. Engels in the *Rheinische Zeitung*, December 8, 1842 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. 356).
- 110 For Engels’s account of his first meeting with Karl Marx in 1842 see D. Rjazanov’s introduction to *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. lx.
- 111 Engels’s introduction of 1885 to Karl Marx, *Enthüllungen über den Kommunistenprozess zu Köln*, 1853 (edition of 1952), p. 11 and p. 17.
- 112 Marcel Herwegh (ed.), *1848 Briefe von und an Herwegh* (Munich, 1896), p. 88 and D. Rjazanov’s introduction to *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, p. lxxi.
- 113 F. Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (1945: translated by W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner, 1958), p. 30 and pp. 33–4.
- 114 For the Plug Plot riots see A. G. Rose, “The Plug Riots of 1842 in Lancashire and Cheshire” in the *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society*, Vol. 68, 1957, pp. 75–112.
- 115 F. Engels, “Die innern Krisen” (London, November 30, 1842) in the *Rheinische Zeitung*, December 9 and 10, 1842 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 351–5). A third short article by Engels dated December

- 3, 1842 appeared in the *Rheinische Zeitung* on December 8, 1842 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 456–7).
- 116 Moses Hess, “Über eine in England bevorstehende Katastrophe” in the *Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 177, June 26, 1842 (reprinted in Moses Hess, *Philosophische und Sozialistische Schriften 1837–1850* (1961), pp. 183–5). Hess argued that the fundamental causes of distress in England were of a social – not political – nature. He wrote: “Industry has passed from the hands of the people to the machines of the capitalists. Commerce – formerly operated on a modest scale by many small merchants – is now concentrated more and more in the hands of capitalists and adventurers (i.e. swindlers). The land has fallen into the grasp of a few aristocratic families owing to the working of the laws of inheritance. In fact a few great families expand and control ever greater amounts of capital.”
- 117 Brief accounts of the firm appear in H. E. Blyth, *Through the Eye of a Needle. The Story of the English Sewing Cotton Company* (1947), p. 11 and 100 Jahre Zinn, Engels & Co. (Wuppertal). Peter Ermen, the founder, was of Dutch origin and came to England in 1825. He was listed as a merchant in Pigot’s *Manchester and Salford Directory for 1832* (p. 96). In 1834 he took his brother Anthony into partnership. By 1837 another brother named Gottfried (Godfrey) and the elder Friedrich Engels had joined the firm. The local directory for 1838 (p. 26 and p. 118) described Peter Ermen as a “sewing and knitting manufacturer”. In an advertisement in the *Manchester Guardian* on August 27, 1842 Ermen and Engels thanked the police for protecting their property during the Plug Plot riots. Slater’s *Directory of Manchester and Salford* for 1845 listed Ermen & Engels as “cotton spinners and manufacturers of knitting and sewing cotton” (p. 112) with an office at 2 South Gate, St Mary’s (off Deansgate), Manchester. The firm operated the Victoria Mills, Eccles New Road, Pendleton.
- 118 Dedication (in English) “to the working class of Great Britain” which appeared in F. Engels, *Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England* (1845): English translation by W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner (1958), p. 7.
- 119 See E. Aveling, “George Julian Harney . . .” in *The Social Democrat*, No. 1, January 1897 reprinted in *Reminiscences of Marx and Engels* (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, pp. 192–3); G. D. H. Cole, *Chartist Portraits* (second edition, 1965); A. R. Schoyen, *The Chartist Challenge: a Portrait of George Julian Harney* (1958); P. Cadogan, “Harney and Engels” in the *International Review of Social History*, Vol. 10, 1964). For Engels’s view of Harney see F. Engels, “Das Fest der Nationen in London” in the *Rheinische Jahrbücher zur gesellschaftlichen Reform*, Vol. 2, 1846, pp. 1–19 reprinted in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 4, pp. 457–71.
- 120 Harney edited the *Northern Star* in Leeds in 1843–4. The place of publication was changed to London in November 1844. See E. L. H. Glasgow, “The Establishment of the *Northern Star* newspaper” in *History*, February–June 1954, pp. 61–2 and p. 66.
- 121 See *Reminiscences of Marx and Engels* (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow), pp. 175 and pp. 192–3.
- 122 James Leach, a factory worker who became a printer, was a leading Manchester Chartist. He helped to set up the National Charter Association in Manchester (1841) and he was vice-chairman of the

- Chartist National Convention in London (1842). He was an ardent protectionist and a vigorous opponent of the Anti-Corn Law League.
- 123 Engels refers to Leach as his "good friend" in an article in *Das Westfälische Dampfboot* in 1846 reprinted as Appendix I (p. 342) of F. Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (translated and edited by W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner, 1958).
124. For John Watts (1818–87) see the *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. 20, pp. 982–3. Watts played a leading part in the public life of Manchester and was associated with the establishment of the public library and Owens College. He was the author of *The Facts of the Cotton Famine* (1866).
- 125 Engels refers to Watts as "an important person" in his "Briefe aus London", No. 3 in the *Schweizerischer Republikaner*, June 9, 1843 (*Gesamtausgabe*), Part I, Vol. 2, p. 371.
- 126 For Georg Weerth see an article by Friedrich Engels in *Der Sozialdemokrat*, July 7, 1883 reprinted in F. Engels, *Biographische Skizzen* (1967), pp. 107–14 and Georg Weerth, *Sämtliche Werke*, Vol. 1 (1956), pp. 11–15. Engels wrote: "When I stayed in Manchester in 1843 Weerth came to Bradford as a clerk in his German firm and we spent many happy Sundays together." (In fact Weerth worked in Bradford for the Manchester firm of S. Passavant & Co.) In a letter to his mother, dated July 6, 1844 Weerth mentioned that he had been in Manchester over Whitsun and had been in Engels's company for much of his visit. (Georg Weerth, *Sämtliche Werke*, Vol. 5, p. 128).
- 127 F. Engels, "Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England" in the *Rheinische Zeitung*, December 25, 1842 (dated December 20 "from Lancashire") and December 27, 1842 (dated December 22 "from Lancashire") (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 361–4).
- 128 Sir James Graham's Factory Bill of 1843 was withdrawn because of the opposition of Nonconformists and Roman Catholics to the clauses concerning religious education.
- 129 F. Engels, "Briefe aus London" in the *Schweizerischer Republikaner*, May 16 and 23 and June 9 and 27, 1843 (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 465–76).
- 130 F. Engels, "The Progress of Social Reform on the Continent" in the *New Moral World*, November 4 and 18, 1843 and "Continental Movements" (*ibid.*, February 3, 1844): reprinted in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 435–55. See also *Northern Star* November 11 and 25, 1843.
- 131 The journal was banned in Prussia and 300 copies were seized at the frontier. See Franz Mehring, *Karl Marx* (edition of 1967), p. 72.
- 132 F. Engels "Umriss zu einer Kritik der Nationalökonomie" in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* 1844, reprinted in *Karl Marx-Friedrich Engels Werke*, Vol. 1 (1964), pp. 499–524. English translation in W. O. Henderson (ed.), *Engels: Selected Writings* (Penguin Books, 1967), pp. 148–77. The *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* also published a review by Engels of Thomas Carlyle, *Past and Present*, 1843. See *Karl Marx-Friedrich Engels Werke*, Vol. 1 (1964), pp. 525–49.
- 133 Karl Marx's introduction to his *Zur Kritik der politischen Ökonomie* (1859). Karl Marx also mentioned Engels's essay in the first volume of *Das Kapital*, 1867: see Karl Marx, *Capital* (Everyman edition, 1930), Vol. 1, p. 49.

- 134 The New York fire of December 1835 destroyed nearly 700 buildings and caused damage estimated at about twenty million dollars.
- 135 F. Engels, "Die Lage Englands", I "Das achtzehnte Jahrhundert", II "Die englische Konstitution" in *Vorwärts* between August 31 and October 19, 1844, reprinted in *Werke*, Vol. 1, pp. 550–92.
- 136 F. Engels's introduction of 1885 to Karl Marx, *Enthüllungen über den Kommunistenprozess zu Köln* (edition of 1952), pp. 15–16.
- 137 J. Waldeck to Johann Jacoby, May 9, 1844 in Gustav Mayer, *Friedrich Engels*, Vol. 1 (second edition, 1934), p. 171.
- 138 Heinrich Heine, *Sämtliche Werke* (edited by O. J. Lachmann, four volumes, Leipzig 1887), Vol. 4, p. 296.
- 139 Michael Bakunin (1814–76) was the Russian revolutionary who later became the leader of the anarchist movement.
- 140 Karl Ludwig Bernays (1815–79) was at this time a member of the editorial board of *Vorwärts* to which Engels had contributed.
- 141 Dr August Hermann Ewerbeck (1816–80) was the leader of the Paris branch of the League of the Just, a secret revolutionary society of German emigrants. Engels had met the leaders of the London branch of the league.
- 142 Auguste Cornu, *Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels* (two volumes, 1954 and 1962), Vol. 2, pp. 270–1.
- 143 Friedrich Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach und der Ausgang der klassischen deutschen Philosophie* (Stuttgart, 1888): English translation *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy* (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1950).
- 144 Ludwig von Westphalen was the son of Philipp Westphalen, secretary of Duke Ferdinand of Brunswick. During the Seven Years' War Philipp Westphalen acted in fact (though not in name) as chief of staff of the Duke's army and was ennobled for his services. Ludwig von Westphalen's son, Ferdinand Otto Wilhelm, (by his first wife) was Minister of the Interior in Prussia between 1850 and 1858 (Manteuffel ministry).
- 145 Friedrich Engels and Edgar Bauer (Bruno Bauer's brother) collaborated to write a satirical poem criticising Bruno Bauer's dismissal.
- 146 Karl Marx, *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844* (second impression, Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1961). The first German edition of these manuscripts appeared in 1932. See also H. P. Adams, *Karl Marx in his earlier Writings* (1940; new edition, 1965).



## 2

### THE CONDITION OF THE WORKING CLASS IN ENGLAND IN 1844

#### I. The Genesis of Engels's Book

Engels returned to Barmen in September 1844 and lived with his family until April 1845 when he joined Marx in Brussels.<sup>1</sup> It was during this period that he wrote his book on *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. A letter to Marx, written early in October 1844, began a correspondence which lasted for thirty-eight years. In this correspondence – as Lenin observed – the two friends applied materialist dialectics “to the reshaping of all political economy from its foundations up – to history, natural science, philosophy and to the policy and tactics of the working class”.<sup>2</sup> In his letter of October 8–10 Engels was unable to report any progress on his book and explained that he could not get down to work as the entire household was in a state of turmoil over the engagement of his sister Marie to Emil Blank.

Engels also told Marx that he had recently been in touch with communist groups in Cologne, Düsseldorf, Elberfeld and Barmen.<sup>3</sup> He declared that in his absence “the Wupper valley has made more progress than in the last 50 years. The social tone of the district has become more civilised. Everyone is interested in politics and in resisting authority. Industry has made spectacular advances. New suburbs have sprung up and entire woodlands have been cut down. It can now be said that – as a civilised district – Elberfeld and Barmen are above, rather than below, the average in Germany”. Engels hoped that the workers of the Wupper valley – “our wild hot-blooded dyers and bleachers” – would be converted to communism.<sup>4</sup>

In November 1844 Engels visited communist sympathisers in Cologne and Bonn and called upon Otto Lüning in Rheda.<sup>5</sup> Dr Lüning edited first *Das Weser-Dampfboot* and then *Das Westphälische Dampfboot*<sup>6</sup> and Engels hoped that communist articles might be placed in the latter periodical. Despite these activities and despite the distraction of a love affair Engels was able to assure Marx on November 19 that he was buried in English newspapers

and books and that he was writing his account of the condition of the English workers. He indicated clearly the spirit in which the book was being written when he declared: "I shall present the English with a fine bill of indictment. At the bar of world opinion I charge the English middle classes with mass murder, wholesale robbery, and all the other crimes in the calendar. I am writing a preface in English which I shall have printed separately for distribution to the leaders of the English political parties, to men of letters, and to Members of Parliament." Engels assured Marx that he was attacking the German as well as the English middle classes. He would tell the German bourgeoisie plainly that "they are just as bad as the English middle classes – only more cowardly, more flabby and more stupid in their cruel oppression of the workers." Engels added that in writing his book he had escaped from the study of abstract philosophical problems and he was glad to be "actively concerned with real live issues – with historical developments and their consequences."<sup>7</sup>

In January 1845 Engels wrote that his parents had raised the question of his business career. Since his training in Bremen and Manchester had been completed they naturally expected him to take his place in the family firm. "In view of the glum faces of my parents I took the advice of my brother-in-law and had another shot at a business career by working for a few weeks in the office. Circumstances connected with my love affair have also influenced my decision. But I disliked the prospect from the start. Petty trade is too horrible, Barmen is too horrible, and the waste of time is too horrible. Above all it is too horrible to belong to the middle classes and actually to be associated with factory owners. It is too horrible to play the part of a member of the bourgeoisie and to be actively engaged in opposing the interests of the workers. A few days in my old man's factory were enough to remind me forcibly of the horrors that I have been in danger of forgetting." "I suppose that it is possible for a communist to behave like a bourgeois and to engage in petty trade so long as he is not actually writing. But it is quite impossible to be actively engaged in communist agitation and at the same time to be involved in the world of business."<sup>8</sup>

Engels also mentioned in this letter that Moses Hess, whom he had first met in 1842, was in Barmen. Engels and Hess planned to edit a new monthly socialist journal to be called the *Gesellschafts-spiegel*.<sup>9</sup> Engels hoped that this periodical would reveal the condition of the working class in Germany just as his own book would expose the sufferings of the working class in England. A month later Engels reported to Marx that the first number of the new journal was ready for publication.<sup>10</sup> When Engels joined Marx in

Brussels Hess became the sole editor of the *Gesellschaftsspiegel* until his own departure from Germany.<sup>11</sup>

At this time Engels acknowledged the receipt of a brochure announcing the publication of Marx's *The Holy Family* which was an attack upon Bruno Bauer and other Young Hegelians. Engels's name appeared before that of Marx on the title page although he had contributed only a few pages to the book. He had written a criticism of Faucher's views on English affairs. He told Marx that "the new title *The Holy Family* will only lead to family upsets with my pious father, who is now highly annoyed with me, but of course you could not be expected to know this." When the book was published Engels complained of its inordinate length but praised the brilliance of Marx's writing.<sup>12</sup>

In February 1845 Engels wrote enthusiastically to Marx about the success of three communist meetings recently held in Elberfeld. "At the first we had an attendance of 40, at the second 130, and at the third at least 200. All Elberfeld and Barmen were there from the wealthy aristocrats to the grocers – but no workers turned up."<sup>13</sup> Engels described the meetings in an article in the *New Moral World*<sup>14</sup> and printed his own speeches in the *Rheinische Jahrbücher*.<sup>15</sup>

The first meeting, held on February 15, was attended by "representatives of almost all the leading commercial and manufacturing firms" in the town as well as "the attorney-general of the district and other members of the courts of law". Moses Hess opened the proceedings by demanding the abolition of "the old system of competition which he called a system of downright robbery".<sup>16</sup>

Engels, who spoke next, was careful to present the middle classes of Elberfeld and Barmen with a moderate statement of his views. He summarised some of the arguments which he had put forward in the previous year in his article on "Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy" in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*.<sup>17</sup> He suggested that an economic system which allowed unfettered competition was bound to cause grave social distress. The "small middle class", once the backbone of society, was being ruined by the "great capitalists". "There are universal complaints that wealth is being concentrated in fewer and fewer hands while the vast majority of the nation sinks into ever greater poverty." Engels denounced the capitalist system for its inefficiency. Manufacturers were continually misjudging the requirements of the market. Over-production led to regular slumps during which factories were closed and workers were unemployed. In a communist society this would not happen because by state planning of the economy, industrial

output would be accurately geared to meet a demand that had been previously ascertained.

Engels denounced the wastefulness of the capitalist system. He criticised the rich for spending too much on the employment of far more servants than they really needed. He attacked the activities of middlemen and speculators whose profits raised the price of goods to the public. He asserted that capitalism fostered crime. Offences against the person were declining while offences against property were increasing. Engels believed that in a communist society poverty would be abolished and crime would disappear. In his utopia "the police, the law courts and public administration" would be largely superfluous. No standing army would be needed since no communist state would dream of attacking its neighbours. A well-trained popular militia would be adequate to defend the country against attack. Engels also described the socialist communities advocated by Robert Owen and praised them for their efficiency. He argued, for example, that the central heating of several houses had great advantages over a multiplicity of small fires. And he recommended communal feeding in a canteen in place of the cooking of individual meals by housewives in their own kitchens. Engels had himself, however, no experience of life in such a community.<sup>18</sup>

A week later, on February 22, 1845, Engels spoke at a second meeting in Elberfeld. He endeavoured to answer the criticism that in his first address he had illustrated his arguments from the experiences of foreign countries, particularly England, and that he had failed to show that the establishment of a communist society was an inevitable and necessary development in Germany. He drew attention to the widespread distress in various parts of Germany both in rural districts – the Eifel, the Senne, the Mosel valley, the Erzgebirge, Silesia and Bohemia – and in manufacturing regions. In his view the continued growth of the proletariat was bound to lead to the collapse of the existing social order and the establishment of a communist society. Engels then discussed the controversy concerning the fiscal policy of the German customs union and argued that neither free trade nor protection would save the capitalist system from collapse. He finally assured his audience that – if preventive action to solve the social question were taken in time – a violent revolution could be avoided.

A third meeting was held in the following week when Moses Hess gave a lecture. The authorities became alarmed at the situation in Elberfeld and they forbade the holding of further communist assemblies. When another meeting was held the police turned up in force. Engels wrote: "Of course, under such circum-

stances, no public addresses were delivered; the meeting occupied themselves with beef-steaks and wine, and gave the police no handle for interference."<sup>19</sup> On May 18, 1845 Count von Arnim, the Prussian Minister of the Interior, congratulated Freiherr von Spiegel, President of the Rhineland province, on the measures that he had taken to suppress communist assemblies in Elberfeld.<sup>20</sup>

On March 17 Engels told Marx that he had finished writing his book and that the manuscript had been sent to the publisher. Engels promised to let Marx have the 100 thalers due to him when the manuscript was delivered.<sup>21</sup> He had already raised a subscription of 150 francs from German sympathisers to help Marx when he had settled in Brussels in the previous month after being expelled from France. Even at this early stage of their collaboration Engels was already helping Marx financially and this was to become a permanent feature of their relationship.

In the same letter Engels complained bitterly of his situation at home. "I am indeed living a dog's life here. All the religious fanaticism of my old man has been aroused by the communist meetings and by the 'dissolute character' of several of our local communists with whom I am of course in close contact. And the old man's wrath has been increased by my firm refusal to go into petty trading. Finally my appearance in public as an avowed communist has aroused in him a truly middle-class fury. Now try to put yourself in my place. Since I want to leave in a fortnight or so, I cannot afford to have a row. So I simply ignore all the criticisms of the family. They are not used to that and so they get even angrier." "You can have no notion of the sheer malice that lies behind this wild Christian hunt after my 'soul.'" "I have a great affection for my mother who has a fine and noble character. It is only in relation to my father that she has no spirit of independence at all. Were it not for my mother I would not hesitate for one moment to refuse to make even the most trifling concession to my fanatical and despotic old man."<sup>22</sup>

The circumstances under which Engels wrote his account of the English workers were not favourable to literary work. He had other things on his mind besides his book. And, as he explained in his preface, he had hoped to write "a more comprehensive work on English social history". Two years later Engels was reported to be still engaged upon this larger work but it was never completed.<sup>23</sup> While he was writing his book Engels was also contributing articles to the *New Moral World* and the *Deutsches Bürgerbuch*. He was deeply involved, with Moses Hess, in political agitation in the Rhineland and Westphalia and also in founding a new socialist

journal. Engels's activities had attracted the attention of the police and he feared that at any time he might be expelled from Prussia. Moreover, despite the success of the Elberfeld meetings, Engels was disappointed at the divisions among the German communists. He could not persuade Hess to give up his support of Christian Socialism in favour of materialism and he could not convince Georg Jung that Karl Marx held very different views from those of Arnold Ruge.

Engels was also working under a considerable emotional strain. He was extricating himself from a love affair. It is safe to assume that he looked forward to resuming his association with Mary Burns and was not prepared to allow any other friendship to stand in his way. At the same time his relations with his family were rapidly deteriorating. Engels's father had every reason to be displeased. Although Engels was now twenty-four years of age and had completed his commercial training he refused to enter the family business. Instead he persisted in engaging in communist propaganda. The whole family would be disgraced if his behaviour led to his arrest or his expulsion from the country. The rift between father and son widened. Mounting tension at home made the completion of Engels's book no easy task. Despite all difficulties, however, the work was finished in March 1845 and was published in Leipzig by Otto Wigand in the following May.<sup>24</sup> By this time Engels had left Barmen and was living in Brussels.<sup>25</sup>

## II. Engels on the English Workers<sup>26</sup>

In an address to the British workers, written in English, which appeared as a preface to *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, Engels explained that he had studied their way of life by personal observation and by reading the relevant literature on the subject. "I wanted to see you in your own homes, to observe you in your everyday life, to chat with you on your condition and grievances, to witness your struggles against the social and political power of your oppressors." Engels had seen how the middle classes "enrich themselves by your labour while they can sell its produce" only to "abandon you to starvation as soon as they cannot make a profit by this indirect trade in human flesh". Engels was surprised that there was no "readable book from which everybody might easily get some information on the condition of the great majority of 'free born Britons' ". It had been left "to a foreigner to inform the civilised world of the degrading situation you have to live in". Engels made it clear that he was no impartial observer but that he had assembled evidence with the intention of condemning the

English middle classes at the bar of world public opinion for the way in which they had treated the workers.<sup>27</sup>

In his first chapter Engels examined the organisation of the English textile industries in the eighteenth century. He suggested that in those days the workers had led an idyllic existence. They were fully employed since a gradual growth of population provided them with a steadily expanding market. They were generally smallholders as well as textile workers and therefore had two sources of income. They lived far from cities in healthy surroundings and could arrange their hours of work as they pleased. Engels considered that these workers had "enjoyed a comfortable and peaceful existence", their standard of living being higher than that of the urban factory proletariat of the 1840s. This situation had been dramatically changed by the inventions of the eighteenth century – the new textile machines and the steam engine – and by the development of the factory system and the growth of great manufacturing towns. Rural textile workers became factory operatives in urban areas. "The industrial workers no longer owned any of the means of production and they lost all security of employment. This led to the demoralisation of the workers and to political unrest." Engels described the course of the industrial and agrarian revolutions which had "no parallel in the annals of mankind". Echoing the views of Moses Hess he declared: "The industrial revolution has been as important for England as the political revolution for France and the philosophical revolution for Germany." Engels considered that since the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832 English politics had been dominated by the social problems created by the industrial revolution – problems which, unless they were solved, would threaten the very existence of society. The middle classes, now dominant in parliament, were sitting on a powder keg which might explode at any moment.

As in his "Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy" Engels asserted that the intensification of competition between different classes and between individuals in the same social group had been major factors determining the character of the new industrial age. He argued that "competition is the most extreme expression of that war of all against all which dominates modern middle class society". "Everybody competes in some way against everybody else and consequently each individual tries to push aside anyone whose existence is a barrier to his own advancement." The middle classes competed among themselves for the profits of industry. When trade was booming the competition for labour would benefit some workers who could demand higher wages. But wage increases would be checked by competition among the workers themselves for the

available jobs. "This explains the rise of trade unions which represent an attempt to eliminate such fratricidal conflict between the workers themselves." Engels thought that competition was the basic cause of the trade cycle – the rhythmic movement of trade from slump to boom and from boom to slump which was such a characteristic feature of the industrial age. He argued that only planned industrial output and the planned sharing out of manufactured products would eliminate the trade cycle and the need for a reserve of unemployed labour.

His description of the great manufacturing towns created by the industrial revolution was one of the finest pieces that Engels ever wrote. As an author Engels was at his best when describing his own experiences – in a merchant's office or on a military campaign – and when he was recalling his travels, whether they were in the wine growing districts of France or the urban industrial regions in England. He had not only acute powers of observation but the ability to convey his impressions in compelling prose. Engels observed that in the English industrial towns the poor were segregated from the rich and lived in "unplanned wildernesses of one or two storied houses, built of brick". "Wherever possible these have cellars which are also used as dwellings." "The streets themselves are usually unpaved and full of holes. They are filthy and strewn with animal and vegetable refuse. Since they have neither gutters nor drains the refuse accumulates in stagnant, stinking puddles."

Engels described some of the London slums – St Giles, Whitechapel and Bethnal Green – and drew attention to the tragic fate of the destitute homeless. His account of the working class districts of the manufacturing towns of Lancashire and the West Riding was based upon personal observation. He had lived in Manchester which was within easy reach of numerous cotton towns; he had visited Leeds to see Julian Harney, and Bradford to see Georg Weerth. He contrasted the pleasant greystone villages of the Pennine valleys with the sordid brick cottages of the nearby factory towns which were black with soot. In Bradford he shared Weerth's disgust at what he saw. He found that "the workers' houses at the bottom of the valley are packed between high factory buildings and are among the worst-built and filthiest in the whole city". He observed that the factory towns around Manchester were virtually "huge working class communities", consisting of factories and operatives' cottages with few shops or amenities of any kind. He described Bolton as "a gloomy unattractive hole" while Stockport, on the Cheshire side of the River Mersey, presented "a truly revolting picture" when viewed from the great viaduct which carried the

Manchester and Birmingham railway across the ravine in which the town was situated. Stockport had an unusually high proportion of inhabited cellars in relation to the total number of houses.

Ashton under Lyne, on the other hand, having been built within the last fifty years, struck Engels as being "comparatively well planned". The factories had been built on the banks of the River Tame, while the workers' dwellings were situated on the slopes above. "Owing to the way in which it has been built, Ashton has a much more agreeable appearance than most of the other manufacturing towns." Yet even in Ashton there were streets in which "the cottages are becoming old and dilapidated". From Ashton Engels climbed a hill from which he could see the fine villas of the factory owners. On the other side of the hill lay Stalybridge where the streets ran "in wild confusion up, down and across the hill-sides". Here Engels saw "congested rows of old grimy and dilapidated cottages". He condemned the "wholly unplanned method of building" which had produced "a vast number of courts, back passages, and blind alleys".

Manchester, "the most important factory town in the world" and the English city that Engels knew best, was described in greater detail. Engels observed that the Manchester-Salford conurbation had three quite distinct regions—a central district of offices, warehouses and shops; an inner ring of factories, workshops and overcrowded slums; and a pleasant outer ring of middle and upper class suburban residences. "To such an extent has the convenience of the rich been considered in the planning of Manchester that these plutocrats can travel from their homes to their places of business in the centre of the town by the shortest routes, which run entirely through working class districts, without ever realising how close they are to the misery and filth which lie on both sides of the roads". Engels considered that "Manchester is unique in the systematic way in which the working classes have been barred from the main streets. Nowhere else has such care been taken to avoid offending the tender susceptibilities of the eyes and nerves of the middle classes. Yet Manchester is the very town in which building has taken place in a haphazard manner with little or no planning or interference from the authorities."

Next Engels gave an account of various working class districts which he had visited in Manchester and Salford. The first was the Old Town lying between the commercial centre and the River Irk. The district near the river was a slum of the most depressing character. "The worst courts are those leading down to the Irk, which contain unquestionably the most dreadful dwellings I have ever seen." The dilapidated cottages were packed closely together,

the alleys were full of refuse and the river was simply an open sewer. In the maze of courts off Long Millgate conditions were no better. Between St Michael's Church and Withy Grove the houses were rather newer and there was some evidence of planning in the layout of the built-up area. Engels summed up his description of the Old Town by condemning the whole district as being "quite unfit for human habitation". "The shameful lay-out of the Old Town has made it impossible for the wretched inhabitants to enjoy cleanliness, fresh air or good health. And such a district of at least twenty to thirty thousand inhabitants lies in the very centre of the second city in England."

The New Town – or Irish Town – lying between the River Irk and St George's Road was no better than the Old Town. The wretched inhabitants were tightly packed in a small area which lacked drainage or facilities for the disposal of refuse. To make matters worse the district was "infested with small herds of pigs". Little Ireland – in a bend of the River Medlock south west of Oxford Road – was a dreadful district inhabited by some 4,000 people, mostly Irish immigrants. "This horrid little slum affords as hateful and repulsive a spectacle as the worst courts to be found on the banks of the Irk. The inhabitants live in dilapidated cottages, the windows of which are broken and patched with oilskin. The doors and the door posts are broken and rotten. The creatures who inhabit these dwellings and even their dark wet cellars, and who live confined amidst all this filth and foul air . . . must surely have sunk to the lowest level of humanity." The slum dwellings of Little Ireland consisted of two rooms, a cellar and an attic. Each was inhabited by about 20 people and a single privy was shared by 120 people. Small wonder that cholera had raged in Little Ireland in 1831. Yet the condition of the district had changed very little since that date. Engels added that the working class districts of Hulme and Salford were little better than those which he had already described.

Engels argued that speculative builders were largely responsible for the scandalous condition of the workers' houses in Manchester and Salford. They were determined to make a quick profit in a short time and so they put up as many cottages as could possibly be squeezed onto each site. Since the land upon which they built was normally leased, there was a strong incentive to erect jerry-built houses which would be unlikely to outlive the period of the lease. Not only were workers' cottages built as cheaply as possible but very little was spent by the landlords upon the maintenance of their property.

If the condition of those who lived in the working class quarters

of Manchester and Salford was one of utter wretchedness that of the inhabitants of cellars was even worse. Engels estimated that between 40,000 and 50,000 workers lived in cellars in the built-up area of Manchester and Salford. For the homeless – those who could not afford a cottage or even a cellar – there remained the common lodging house. Engels stated that each of these houses accommodated between 20 and 30 persons. “In every room five or seven beds are made up on the floor and human beings of both sexes are packed into them indiscriminately.” “Every one of these houses is a breeding ground of crime and also the scene of much conduct of an unnatural and revolting character.”

Having described the housing of the workers Engels discussed their general standard of living. The Manchester operatives wore clothes of the poorest quality and subsisted upon a very inadequate diet. Although the better paid factory workers enjoyed good food when they had a job, the lower paid workers had to manage on a diet of bread and potatoes. To make matters worse the poor were cheated by unscrupulous shopkeepers who sold unwholesome and adulterated food and gave short weight. “The potatoes purchased by the workers are generally bad, the vegetables shrivelled, the cheese stale and of poor quality, the bacon rancid.”

Engels concluded his chapter on the great towns by summing up his views on the condition of the workers. They had no security of employment and if they lost their jobs they suffered great hardships. They lived in jerry-built, damp, unhealthy and overcrowded cottages. They wore shabby clothes and ate poor food. “In favourable circumstances some of them enjoy, at least temporarily, a modest prosperity.” “In bad times, however, the unlucky worker may sink into the deepest poverty, actually culminating in homelessness and death from starvation.”

The health and morals of the workers – which Engels discussed in his chapter on the results of industrialisation – suffered as a result of the conditions under which they lived and worked. In London Engels had seen many consumptives – “pale, emaciated, narrow-chested and hollow-eyed ghosts”. In the manufacturing districts fever was endemic in overcrowded insanitary slums and typhus regularly took its toll of the workers. Digestive complaints, skin infections and bone diseases were rife in the factory towns and were caused by the poor quality of the workers’ diet. Other factors contributing to the poor health of the factory population were lack of suitable winter clothing, reliance upon quack medicines, and excessive consumption of beer and spirits. The factory districts had a high death rate owing largely to the heavy mortality among babies and young children. In Manchester over half of the workers’

children died before they were five years old. Engels considered that this was due not only to bad housing and poor food but also to the neglect of children by their parents. When husband and wife both worked in a factory their children were "locked in the house or handed over to someone else's care" and consequently there were numerous fatal accidents among babies and young children.

Engels stated that the level of culture and education attained by the workers was as low as their physical condition. In the elementary schools "a narrow sectarianism and a fanatical bigotry are awakened in the children . . . to the serious neglect of any reasonable instruction in religion and morals." This was because education was controlled by rival churches. Engels added that many factory children were illiterate.

The English workers had their failings—which were due to poor housing, inadequate food, bad health, and lack of education. Engels considered that their most serious failings were addiction to spirits, sexual immorality, and lawlessness. "It is particularly on Saturday evenings that intoxication can be seen in all its bestiality, for it is then that the workers have just received their wages and go out for enjoyment at rather earlier hours than on other days of the week." "On such an evening in Manchester I have seldom gone home without seeing many drunkards staggering in the road or lying helpless in the gutter." Engels considered that gross immorality—like excessive drinking—was inevitable owing to the conditions under which the workers lived. "All the failings of the workers may be traced to the same sort of origin—an unbridled thirst for pleasure, to lack of foresight, inability to adjust themselves to the disciplines of the social order, and above all, the inability to sacrifice immediate pleasure to a future advantage." Moreover the English workers had little respect for the law. Engels declared that "the incidence of crime has increased with the growth of the working class population and there is more crime in Britain than in any other country in the world". He considered the situation to be so serious that "already we see society in the process of dissolution". Social strife was developing into open class warfare between the bourgeois capitalists and the oppressed proletariat. Engels was puzzled at what appeared to him to be a great complacency on the part of the middle classes when faced with a grave threat to their security. "Meanwhile national affairs take their course, whether the middle classes realise what is happening or not, and one fine day the property-holding class will be overwhelmed by events far beyond their comprehension and quite outside their expectations."

Having given an account of the homes and living conditions of the working classes Engels proceeded to describe the factories and mines in which they worked. He argued that in the textile industries the introduction of new and more efficient machines enabled employers to reduce their labour force and to replace men by women and young people. As more men became redundant, and as more married women went to work, the wife became the breadwinner while the husband stayed at home to look after the children. The conditions under which women and children worked in the factories were an incentive to immorality. "The factory owner wields complete power over the persons and charms of the girls working for him." Operatives suffered from numerous occupational diseases and physical deformities. Whenever Engels went for a walk in Manchester he saw people who suffered from spinal injuries. He quoted a remark of a Manchester millowner that the local operatives would soon degenerate into a race of pigmies. Workers in the mills were often unfit for work at forty years of age. Certain tasks in textile mills were particularly unhealthy. Those engaged in carding and combing as well as the flax wet-spinners suffered from chest and bronchial complaints. Accidents at work were common, particularly when machinery was being cleaned. "In Manchester one sees not only numerous cripples, but also plenty of workers who have lost the whole or part of an arm, leg or foot." Moreover since mill operatives were often engaged upon purely routine repetitive tasks they tended to suffer from excessive boredom.

Engels condemned the tyranny exercised by the millowners over their workers. The operatives had to obey their masters without question and they were fined for any breach of factory regulations. They were punished for unpunctuality, for talking or whistling, for bad work, or for leaving a machine without the foreman's consent. The workers were subject to harsh discipline. "Their slavery is more abject than that of the negroes in America because they are more strictly supervised." The power of the millowners over their operatives was strengthened by the truck system and by the tied cottage system. The payment of wages in kind – in goods purchased at inflated prices at the employer's 'tommy shop' – was illegal but the practice survived in some rural and colliery districts. The system whereby certain workers rented cottages from their employer was open to serious abuses. "The injustices of the tied cottage system become infamous when the manufacturer . . . forces his operatives, on pain of dismissal, to occupy one of his houses, to pay a higher rent than is normal, or even to rent houses which they do not occupy."

The description which Engels gave of the textile mills was based

upon his own observations – he was working in the offices of a cotton firm – and upon talks with people like James Leach and his girl friend Mary Burns who had personal experience of life in the cotton mills. But when Engels discussed working conditions in other branches of industry or in farming he relied upon pamphlets, newspapers and parliamentary reports. Engels declared that the framework knitters and lace workers of the east Midlands were exceptionally badly paid and suffered from eyestrain, digestive troubles, scrofula and spinal defects. Calico printing was an industry which was changing from hand work to machine production. Engels wrote:

“There was a calico printworks not far from my lodgings in Manchester, where work sometimes went on far into the night. When I got home the building was still lit up and I have been told that the children working in this establishment sometimes had to work such long hours that they snatched a few minutes of rest and slept on the stone steps of the factory and in corners of the outbuildings.”

In the metal industries of Sheffield and the Black Country small workshops survived side by side with large factories. In both of them the condition of the workers was deplorable. The apprentice was exploited by the master craftsman in much the same way as the factory worker was exploited by the factory owner. Engels condemned the conditions that existed in the small metal workshops of the Black Country where apprentices and children were overworked, badly treated, and inadequately fed. The nail makers in the Sedgeley smithies lived and worked in wretched hovels. “In this industrial district the standard of education is incredibly low.” In Sheffield, on the other hand, the cutlers enjoyed rather higher living standards, though some of them – such as the filers and grinders – suffered from asthma. In the Staffordshire potteries the factory children were “thin, pale, small and stunted”. Any worker unlucky enough to have to handle chinaware which had been dipped in lead-arsenic glaze was certain to suffer from poisoning.

In London the dressmakers, milliners and needlewomen – whether they worked at home or on their employer’s premises – were grossly exploited. At the height of the social season they worked long hours for low wages.

“Poverty stricken needlewomen usually live in little attics, where as many herd together as space will permit. . . . Their health is ruined in a few years and they sink into an early grave, without having been able to earn the barest necessities of life. In the streets below, the gleaming carriages of the wealthy middle classes rattle

past, and close at hand some wretched dandy is gambling away at faro in a single evening as much money as a needlewoman could hope to earn in a year."

Engels's description of the English miners was based upon reports issued by the Children's Employment Commission in 1842-3. Miners suffered from many occupational diseases. In Cornwall the lives of tin and copper miners were shortened by galloping consumption and by physical deformities caused by climbing long ladders in mine shafts. At Alston Moor the lead miners had "a stunted physique and nearly all of them suffer from diseases of the chest." In coal mines and iron ore mines women and children were exhausted after a day's work and often stayed in bed on Sundays to recover from the exertions of the previous week's work. Since miners generally worked in a cramped position they suffered from spinal deformities, lung diseases and digestive complaints. Coal hewers and loaders were ready for retirement at the age of forty. In mines with thin seams of coal conditions were even worse as "the miner had to lie on his side, use his elbow as a lever and hack away at the coal with his pick." Fatal accidents were common. In 1844 over 90 miners were killed in an explosion at Haswell colliery in County Durham. Engels declared that in mining districts the illegal truck system was "the rule and not the exception" while the tied cottage system was universal. Moreover miners were paid by the weight of coal which they produced and Engels alleged that the owners repeatedly defrauded their workers of money that they had earned. He also criticised the annual contract which bound the miner to a particular colliery but often failed to guarantee him a year's work. Engels was able to record some improvement in the condition of the miners in 1844 as a result of a great strike in the Northumberland and Durham coalfield and of legal actions brought against colliery owners by the solicitor W. P. Roberts. But the Durham miners were eventually defeated. Roberts then agreed to represent the Lancashire miners. Engels wrote that before long "the gap between the factory workers and the miners - the former being more intelligent and energetic than the latter - will be closed. In the future they will stand shoulder to shoulder with the factory workers on a basis of complete equality. Thus one stone after another of the fortress of the middle classes is being knocked away."

Farm labourers, too, had their grievances. It is true that they worked in the open under relatively healthy conditions and did not suffer from the sort of occupational diseases that affected many industrial workers but they were exploited by the landed gentry and the farmers as much as factory operatives were exploited by the

manufacturers. Engels summarised the gloomy accounts of their condition which had recently appeared in the *Morning Chronicle*<sup>28</sup> and *The Times*.<sup>29</sup> "Their food is meagre and poor in quality. Their clothes are in rags and their dwellings are small and poorly furnished. They inhabit wretched little cottages which have no home comforts." "If they are out of work even for a few days in a month the farm workers are in a desperate situation. . . . If one of their number refuses to work for the very low wages that are offered them there are dozens of unemployed farm labourers – or paupers from the workhouse – who would be happy to work for any wage, however miserable it might be." Farm workers were so poor that they were strongly tempted to indulge in poaching for which harsh penalties were inflicted. "It is the severity of the punishment that accounts for the frequency of bloody encounters with gamekeepers." Still more serious were the recurrent outbreaks of incendiarism in the rural districts. There had been widespread fire-raising in the winter of 1830–1 and when Engels was in Manchester numerous cases were reported in the columns of the *Northern Star*.

In Wales the decline of the small tenant farmers – owing to competition from more efficient English farms – had led to grave rural unrest which found expression early in 1843 in the Rebecca riots. In Ireland the peasants who leased tiny plots of land had sunk into a condition of abject poverty. They lived in "miserable mud huts which are hardly fit for animals". "They are as poor as church mice; they go about in rags; their educational attainments are negligible." And over a quarter of the Irish population received some form of public or private relief. In the circumstances it was hardly surprising that crime was endemic in rural Ireland. "Not a day passes without the perpetration of some serious breach of the law." "Nor do the Irish hesitate to kill their oppressors – the agents and other faithful henchmen of the landlords, the Protestant intruders, and the substantial tenants whose farms have been established by evicting hundreds of Irish peasants from their tiny potato patches."

Engels discussed the reaction of the workers to harsh discipline, long hours and low wages. So long as the Combination Laws had been in force the workers had resorted to violence to resist oppression. Domestic craftsmen, like the Luddites, had destroyed machines which threatened to deprive them of work. But the repeal of the Combination Laws had been followed by the establishment of new trade unions. They, too, had sometimes adopted violent methods when faced with recalcitrant employers and with fellow workers who had refused to support a strike. A notorious trial in Glasgow

in 1838 had revealed the existence in that city of a union of cotton spinners which had resorted to murder and incendiarism to intimidate millowners and blacklegs. In 1843 a strike at Pauling and Henfrey's brickworks in Manchester had culminated in violence. The strikers first demolished the brickyard and then "broke into the house of the manager, beat up his wife, and destroyed the furniture". In February 1844 the Soho Grinding Works in Sheffield had been set on fire and completely gutted. But trade unions generally tried to achieve their aims by strikes rather than by violent action. Engels commented upon "the incredible frequency of strikes" in England in the early 1840s. "Not a week passes – indeed hardly a day passes – without a strike occurring somewhere." "They may be only minor engagements but they prove conclusively that the decisive battle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is approaching." "These stoppages of work are a training ground for the industrial proletariat and a preparation for the next campaign which draws inevitably nearer."

Through the trade union movement the workers fought their employers for better conditions and higher pay. Through the Chartist movement they tried to gain political power by reforming parliament. A House of Commons dominated by a workers' party could secure reforms that neither Whigs nor Tories would be prepared to grant. Engels described the fortunes of the Chartists since their programme – including the demand for manhood suffrage – had been adopted in 1838. At that time Chartism had been a radical movement supported both by workers and by the lower middle classes. Engels suggested that the northern manufacturers – interested in securing the repeal of the Corn Laws – had used social discontent in the early 1840s for their own ends. The factory owners had picked a quarrel with their workers in 1842 by threatening wage reductions so that when the men resisted they could be locked out. And then the unemployed "would leave the towns and swarm into the countryside over the estates of the landed aristocracy". Social unrest would force the Tory majority in parliament to abolish the Corn Laws. But the Plug Plot riots of 1842 were put down by the police and the military. The Chartists – who had played a relatively minor role in the affair – were discredited. "Chartism became a purely working class movement and was free from the trammels of bourgeois influence." Engels concluded by observing that "it is the factory workers, particularly in the Lancashire cotton districts, who form the solid core of the working class movement. Manchester is the headquarters of the most powerful trade unions, the focal point of Chartism, and the stronghold of the Socialist movement."

Finally Engels discussed the character of the English middle classes and their behaviour towards the workers. He considered the middle classes to be utterly demoralised. "They are so degraded by selfishness and moral depravity as to be quite incapable of salvation." Engels praised the vivid picture of the "revolting greed for money" of the middle classes given by Thomas Carlyle in *Past and Present*.<sup>30</sup> The middle classes were not only greedy but hypocritical as well. They claimed that, far from neglecting the poor, they had "subscribed to the erection of more institutions for the relief of poverty than are to be found anywhere in the world." Engels argued that "the vampire middle classes first suck the wretched workers dry so that afterwards they can, with consummate hypocrisy, throw a few miserable crumbs at their feet". "It never occurs to these pharisees that they are only returning a hundredth part of that which they have previously taken away from the broken-down workers whom they have ruthlessly exploited."

The attitude of the middle classes towards the Corn Laws was, in Engels's view, another example of their hypocrisy. The middle classes poured their subscriptions into the coffers of the Anti-Corn Law League in the hope of securing the abolition of the import duties upon cereals. They claimed that they were acting in an altruistic manner to secure cheap bread for the workers. In fact – according to Engels – the factory owners wanted cheap bread simply to be able to reduce wages. The way in which the law was administered was – according to Engels – another example of middle class hypocrisy. In theory all citizens were equal before the law but in practice the English legal system was used by the middle classes as a means to oppress the workers. "At the root of all laws lies the idea that the proletariat is an enemy which must be defeated." The police and the justices of the peace were hostile and prejudiced in their dealings with the workers. Offences against property – such as theft or poaching – were punished with the utmost severity.

Engels attacked the Poor Law as a glaring example of the inhumanity of the middle classes. They accepted Malthus's view that if a man could not find work and provide for his family then "at nature's mighty feast there is no vacant cover for him." If the middle classes were not prepared to let the poor starve to death they were prepared to treat the poor as if they were criminals. The workhouses – the hated bastilles – were no better than prisons and the paupers in them were treated with revolting cruelty. Engels quoted from the press numerous cases of brutality in workhouses. Moreover "in death as in life the poor in England are treated in an utterly shameless manner. Their corpses have no better fate

than the carcases of animals." In the circumstances it was not surprising that there was strong resistance to the administration of the Poor Law by the workers. "No other Act passed by the capitalists has so incensed the workers as this."

Engels concluded his book with a declaration of faith in communism as the only possible solution to the social problems of the industrial age. He believed that the existing industrial society of England would soon collapse and that it would be replaced by a communist society. Under communism competition would vanish and the rivalry between the capitalists and the proletariat would disappear.

An examination of Engels's account of the condition of the English workers shows that in 1845 Engels was in close agreement with Marx's philosophical views. Engels, like Marx, had come to the conclusion that "the course of world history was determined by definite laws and that—in any society—the social and political structure of the state was determined by economic factors—by the way in which goods were produced."<sup>31</sup>

### III. Engels's Book in Germany<sup>32</sup>

The weavers' rising in Silesia in 1844<sup>33</sup> alarmed the authorities and the middle classes in Germany who realised that the country was on the threshold of an industrial revolution and that new social problems must now be faced. Newspapers and periodicals were suddenly full of articles on the distress of the workers and the problem of pauperism and societies were founded to ameliorate the condition of the poor. Engels's book was published at a time when the effects of industrialisation upon the workers were a live issue in the press and in public discussions. It was the most important socialist work to be published in Germany between the weavers' rising and the appearance of the Communist Manifesto. It was widely reviewed, widely read, and widely quoted. The first edition of 1845 was reprinted three years later. The book made a greater impact upon the public than any other work on social conditions in England that appeared at this time.<sup>34</sup>

Engels's work soon attracted the attention of German governments and their ministers and civil servants. Some official commentators argued that Engels was concerned only with English affairs and not with conditions in Germany. Circumstances in the two countries were entirely different and the problems which Engels discussed were of no practical concern to the German reader. Other official commentators took a more realistic view and admitted that one day the German workers might—unless some-

thing were done about it – find themselves in the same unhappy position as the English workers of 1844. They suggested that Engels's book was a timely warning to the German authorities to take action in time to prevent German factory workers from being exploited as the English factory workers had been oppressed by their employers. They were confident that the monarchical régimes in Germany would have the will and the strength to protect industrial workers in the future. In Prussia official commentators used Engels's book as ammunition in their resistance to the demands of the liberals for constitutional reforms and parliamentary government. In the Rhineland and Westphalia some leading manufacturers were behind the liberal movement. Supporters of the monarchy argued that Engels's book was a warning of the fate that would overtake the factory workers if the manufacturers should weaken the traditional authority of the monarchy and gain political power in Germany.

In Prussia reports on Engels's book were prepared in the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and of the Interior. The distinguished statistician Dr Freiherr von Reden of the Foreign Office wrote a memorandum on the book for his Minister.<sup>35</sup> He praised the accuracy of Engels's description of the condition of the English workers and declared that the author had presented "an obviously truthful picture of the attitude of the middle classes to the proletariat". "I am glad that a German author should have been the first to make a thorough comprehensive investigation into the condition of the English workers." Von Reden hoped that a similar book on the German workers would soon be written. A report by an official named Seebode to the Minister of the Interior also praised Engels's book.<sup>36</sup> Seebode argued that the work dealt only with English affairs and that Engels's criticisms could not be applied to conditions in Germany. But Alfred, Freiherr von Bibra, an official in the little Duchy of Meiningen in Thuringia took a different point of view. In a report on the book he suggested that social conditions in England should be carefully examined so that the authorities could take action in time to prevent a situation arising in Germany similar to that described by Engels.<sup>37</sup>

The Prussian authorities feared that some readers of Engels's book might think that Engels's criticism of the treatment meted out to the workers by the middle classes applied to Germany as well as to England. To counteract such a possibility the newspapers which were subsidised by the Prussian government argued that the condition of the English workers, as described by Engels, was due to defects in the British constitution and political system. A similar

situation could not exist under the authoritarian but benevolent rule of the Prussian kings.

This point of view was adopted by the *Allgemeine Preussische Staats-Zeitung*.<sup>38</sup> The reviewer of Engels's book was confident that the welfare services of the German states would shield the workers from the evils from which the English factory operatives suffered. He hoped that Prussia would develop into an industrialised country but that the monarchy would be strong enough to prevent the middle classes from dominating society as they did in England. The Prussian crown would defend the factory workers from exploitation by the capitalists. It would not allow the doctrine of *laissez faire* to triumph but would insist that industrialists should subordinate their own interests to the welfare of the whole community. By such arguments the writer hoped to show that the social evils described by Engels would not spread to Germany. A somewhat similar point of view was taken by Victor Aimé Huber in the journal *Janus* which was subsidised by the Prussian government.<sup>39</sup> Huber confirmed Engels's description of the condition of the industrial proletariat in England from his own observations but criticised Engels for lack of impartiality and for giving a biased view of the relations between workers and their employers.

The conservative press in Prussia generally adopted a point of view similar to that taken by official commentators. On the great estates east of the river Elbe the landowners encouraged the King to resist the demands of the manufacturers of the Rhine and Westphalia for liberal reforms. Political antagonism between the junkers and the industrialists was intensified by a clash of economic interests. The junkers favoured Free Trade while many manufacturers were protectionists. Friedrich von Farenheid, a conservative landowner in the eastern provinces, reviewed Engels's book in a Königsberg journal.<sup>40</sup> He did not doubt the existence of the social evils described by Engels but he did doubt whether they were caused entirely by industrialisation. He asserted that a number of these evils existed in rural societies which had few if any factories. For example, child labour was a social problem on the great estates of East Prussia just as it was a problem in the English industrial districts. Farenheid stated that he knew of three Prussian parishes in which 72 children were habitually absent from school, 33 attended irregularly, while 235 attended only during the winter. Farenheid thought that overpopulation was the root cause of social distress and pauperism.

The journals which represented the views of the business world were strongly opposed to Engels's political aims. They saw that Engels's criticisms of English capitalists could be applied with

equal force to German industrialists. If German millowners, like Engels's father, read *The Condition of the Working Class in England* they realised that they had been pilloried as severely as the Manchester manufacturers. That Engels advocated the destruction of capitalism and the establishment of a communist society made it inevitable that middle class liberals in Germany would reject his views. Mönke observes that they instinctively recognised the threat to their own class if Engels's propaganda achieved any success. "The proletariat could change from an oppressed class to an aggressive revolutionary class and could become the most dangerous enemy of the middle classes."<sup>41</sup>

It doubtless caused Engels no surprise that a newspaper in his home town—the *Barmer Zeitung* which was subsidised by the Prussian government—should have given him an unfavourable review.<sup>42</sup> Again, a reviewer in the literary supplement of the influential *Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung*<sup>43</sup> criticised Engels for assuming that there was already open warfare in England between the workers and the middle classes, and rebuked him for insisting that "the present sufferings of the proletariat are caused entirely by the greed of the bourgeoisie whom he loathes with a burning hatred." The reviewer thought that "every educated impartial reader must be shocked a hundred times by the wrong-headed views expressed by the author, whose lack of all moral sense can be seen in his foolish and unjustifiable hatred of the middle classes."<sup>44</sup>

One of the longest and severest contemporary criticisms of Engels's book came from the pen of Professor Bruno Hildebrand of Marburg.<sup>45</sup> In a work on the principles of economics the professor devoted over 70 pages to Engels's book. Hildebrand conceded that Engels was "the most gifted and knowledgeable German writer on social problems" and that his book was based upon independent research and personal observation. But he argued at some length that although his facts might be right, Engels's interpretations of the facts were wrong and his comments were extremely biased. Hildebrand endeavoured to show, for example, that Engels had failed to understand English criminal statistics correctly and had been wrong in his assertion that English factory workers were worse off in the 1840s than the domestic craftsmen had been in the eighteenth century. Although Hildebrand was one of the leading German academic economists of his day his detailed criticisms of Engels's book seem to have been hardly noticed and not answered.

Writers in radical journals did not share Engels's political opinions but found in his book ample material to use in their attacks upon German manufacturers. Professor Karl Biedermann—who was later Vice President of the National Assembly at Frank-

furt—was no communist but he played an important part in bringing Engels's book to public notice. In the periodical *Unsere Gegenwart und Zukunft*<sup>46</sup> and in popular lectures held in Dresden and Leipzig<sup>47</sup> Biedermann discussed the rise of socialism in Germany and frequently referred to Engels's account of the condition of the English workers. M. Fleischer, another radical reviewer, declared that Engels's horrifying description of the miseries of the English factory workers was a warning of the gravity of the social evils that followed industrialisation if the State failed to curb the avarice of the capitalists.<sup>48</sup> Professor Weinlig of Erlangen, a radical publicist, reviewed Engels's book at some length in 1846. He was particularly interested in Engels's analysis of the economic and social factors which had brought about an industrial revolution in England. He praised Engels for explaining clearly how the social evils of a highly industrialised society had been brought about by "the tendency of the factory system to bring about great concentrations of capital, to promote a clash of interests between the factory owners and their workers and to reduce the industrial proletariat to a position of subjection to the employers".<sup>49</sup>

The socialist press and left wing journals which opened their columns to socialist writers were loud in their praises of Engels's book. They not only gave the book very favourable reviews but they often printed long extracts from it.<sup>50</sup> Moses Hess in the *Gesellschaftsspiegel*,<sup>51</sup> Dr Otto Lüning in the *Deutsches Bürgerbuch*,<sup>52</sup> Rudolph Matthi in the *Bote aus dem Katzenbachthal*,<sup>53</sup> Josef Weydemeyer in *Dies Buch gehört dem Volk*,<sup>54</sup> Hermann Semming in the *Constitutionelle Staatsbürger-Zeitung*,<sup>55</sup> and Dr Hermann Ewerbeck in the *Blätter der Zukunft*,<sup>56</sup> were among the socialists, of various shades of opinion, who wrote about Engels's account of the condition of the English workers. The *Westphälisches Dampfboot*,<sup>57</sup> the *Breslauer Volkspiegel*, and the *Trier'sche Zeitung*<sup>58</sup> also reviewed the book. Although some of these newspapers and journals had small sales and a short life—and were harassed by censorship regulations—they helped to establish Engels's reputation as a leading German socialist thinker.

#### IV. Engels's Book in England

Although Engels's book on the condition of the English workers made a considerable stir in Germany when it first appeared it was soon forgotten except by Karl Marx and his disciples. After the failures of the revolutions in 1848–9 reactionary governments in Germany and Austria suppressed workers' associations and drove the socialist movement underground until it was revived by Fer-

Ferdinand Lassalle in the early 1860s. Marx regarded Engels's book as a brilliant survey of the way in which modern capitalism had developed and a classic description of the social consequences of an industrial revolution. In 1862 he wrote to Engels:

"I have read your book again and I have realised that I am not getting any younger. What power, what incisiveness and what passion drove you to work in those days. That was a time when you were never worried by academic scholarly reservations! Those were the days when you made the reader feel that your theories would become hard facts if not tomorrow then at any rate on the day after. Yet that very illusion gave the whole work a human warmth and a touch of humour that makes our later writings – where 'black and white' have become 'grey and grey' – seem positively distasteful."<sup>59</sup>

In 1867 in the first volume of *Das Kapital* Karl Marx observed that "the fulness of Engels's insight into the nature of the capitalist method of production has been shown by the factory reports, the reports on mines etc., that have appeared since the publication of his book."<sup>60</sup> A few years later Marx could give no higher praise to a book on the Russian workers by N. Flerowski<sup>61</sup> than to say that it was the best book on the proletariat since Engels's *The Condition of the Working Class in England*.<sup>62</sup> By this time Engels's work had long been out of print.

It was not until the 1880s that interest in Engels's early book revived. The rise and fall of the First International, the establishment of socialist parties on the Continent and the growth of trade unions in Britain and the United States fostered an interest in early socialist works and there were now demands for a new German edition and for an English translation. In 1885 Engels wrote: "My friends in Germany say that the book is important to them just now because it describes a state of things which is almost exactly reproduced at the present moment in Germany."<sup>63</sup> At this time Mrs Florence Kelley Wischnewetzky undertook the translation of the book into English for an American edition. Engels revised the text, and the book appeared in New York in 1887. Engels complained that Mrs Wischnewetzky "translates like a factory, leaving the real work to me".<sup>64</sup> He was exasperated by her inefficiency. Instead of approaching a publisher herself she left this to Miss Rachel Foster-Avery (the secretary of the National Women's Suffrage Association)<sup>65</sup> who turned the manuscript over to the executive of the Socialist Labour Party in New York. Engels objected to this arrangement and strongly criticised Mrs Wischnewetzky for having "bungled everything that she has handled; I shall never give her anything again."<sup>66</sup>

Mrs Wischnewetzky's translation appeared in England in 1892. In a new preface<sup>67</sup> Engels, now aged seventy-two, asked for the indulgence of his readers for a book that had been written when he was only twenty-four. "His production bears the stamp of his youth with its good and faulty features, of neither of which he feels ashamed." Engels observed that in certain respects the book was now out of date. In some ways England had changed for the better since 1844. "The petty devices of swindling and pilfering", characteristic of early capitalism, were no longer practised in 1892. Since Engels had written his book England's output of manufactured goods had grown by leaps and bounds and the progress that had been achieved by 1844 "now appears to us as comparatively primitive and insignificant". Consequently "the competition of manufacturer against manufacturer by means of petty thefts upon the workpeople no longer pays." The truck system had been abolished, the Ten Hours Act had long been the law of the land, while the existence of trade unions had been accepted by many of the great industrialists. Indeed "the largest manufacturers . . . were now the foremost to preach peace and harmony" between employers and workers. Engels argued that the reason for this was the desire of powerful industrialists to crush their smaller competitors and so "to accelerate the concentration of capital in the hands of the few". Nevertheless Engels considered that capitalism was just as evil a system in 1892 as it had been in 1844. The growth of capitalism had divided society "into a few Rothschilds and Vanderbilts, the owners of all the means of production and subsistence, on the one hand, and an immense number of wage earners, the owners of nothing but their labour force, on the other".

Engels admitted that the environment of the workers had improved somewhat since 1844. The middle classes had been forced, in their own interests, to clean up the manufacturing towns. Alarmed by serious epidemics, they had improved public sanitation and had cleared away some of the worst slums such as Manchester's Little Ireland. "Accordingly, the most crying abuses described in this book have either disappeared or have been made less conspicuous." But as recently as 1885 the report of a Royal Commission had shown that the problem of providing adequate housing for the workers was still far from being solved. Another change that had occurred since Engels wrote his book was that while in 1844 Britain had been the workshop of the world her industrial monopoly was now being successfully challenged by the United States and Germany.

Engels blamed his "youthful ardour" for the erroneous pro-

phesies which he had made in 1845. "The wonder is, not that a good many of them proved wrong, but that so many of them have proved right." He had correctly foretold that Britain's competitive position, as a manufacturing country, would be undermined by the growth of great industries in America and on the Continent. To show in greater detail how this prophecy had come true Engels reprinted an article which he had written a few years previously on "England in 1845 and 1885".<sup>68</sup>

Engels concluded his preface of 1892 with a caustic reference to a "momentary fashion among bourgeois circles of affecting a mild dilution of socialism" and with a comment upon changes that had taken place in the East End of London since his article of 1885 had been written. "That immense haunt of misery is no longer the stagnant pool it was six years ago. It has shaken off its torpid despair, has returned to life, and has become the home of what is called the 'New Unionism', that is to say, of the organisation of the great mass of unskilled workers." "And for all the faults committed in past, present and future, the revival of the East End of London remains one of the greatest and most fruitful facts of this *fin de siècle*, and glad and proud I am to have lived to see it."

The English translation of Engels's book received a warm welcome not only from socialists – who accepted it as a classic account of the evils brought about by an industrial revolution – but from historians who regarded it as a valuable source of information concerning social conditions in the English manufacturing towns in 1844.<sup>69</sup> Early accounts of the industrial workers and their environment had long been out of print. Not only was Engels's book available but it was written in a vigorous style which kept the attention of the reader. Many discussions of social problems written in the 1840s had been limited to particular industries or to special regions whereas Engels had attempted to give a fairly comprehensive survey of the condition of all types of workers in 1844. Economic historians – Archdeacon Cunningham,<sup>70</sup> Professor Brentano<sup>71</sup> and others – accepted Engels's book as an accurate account of industrial England in an age which had seen the country nearing a peak of manufacturing activity. Engels was an eye-witness who had described what he had seen and heard. His references to contemporary official reports and private investigations gave readers the impression that he was not only an acute observer but also one who had mastered the literature of the subject. The English translation of 1892 was reprinted in 1920<sup>72</sup> and a new translation appeared in 1958.

V. The Significance of Engels's Book<sup>73</sup>

Engels's *The Condition of the Working Class in England* has had a curious fate since its purpose has to some extent been misunderstood and it has been praised for the wrong reasons. The claims of the socialists on behalf of the book merit further examination. Socialists considered that Engels's account of the condition of the English workers had two unique features. First, by using a new intellectual tool—the doctrine of dialectical materialism—Engels was able to show how the state of the English workers in the 1840s was an inevitable consequence of a struggle between social classes. Secondly, he was in a position to forecast the doom of the existing capitalist system and the forthcoming triumph of the proletariat over its bourgeois oppressors. His sociological approach to the problem revealed that industrial capitalism carried within it the seeds of its own decay.

It may be doubted whether either of these propositions can be substantiated. Engels's historical introduction, far from having any claim to originality, was little more than a summary of Peter Gaskell's book on *The Manufacturing Population of England* (1833).<sup>74</sup> Gaskell had thought that in the eighteenth century the yeomen, the peasants and the craftsmen had led a happy idyllic existence and that the degradation of the workers in the manufacturing districts had been brought about entirely by the introduction of the factory system. No modern economic historian would repeat this myth. Many of the evils of the factory system—low earnings, long hours, unhealthy working conditions and the exploitation of the labour of women and children—were to be found in the domestic system of the eighteenth century. The small size and the scattered nature of the units of production at that time tended to hide social evils which came to light later when many workers were gathered together in large factories and mines. Even in Engels's day some of the worst conditions were to be found not in the great cotton mills, the ironworks or the mines but in such occupations as dressmaking in the East End of London and nail-making in the Black Country which were still largely organised on a domestic basis.

Engels's earliest attempt to forecast the future of a capitalist society was as unsuccessful as his first attempt to explain existing conditions by studying their history. He believed that his examination of the origins of the factory system, coupled with his analysis of the structure of English economic and social conditions in 1844 had enabled him to identify certain trends of historical develop-

ment. If these trends were projected into the future the collapse of the capitalist system, the downfall of the middle classes and the future triumph of the proletariat could be predicted with certainty. But Engels was not a very successful tipster. His assertion that the Chartists were on the verge of success in 1844 was soon proved to be wrong since the Chartist movement collapsed in 1848. His confident belief that the cotton lords whom he detested would be swept away by a great rising of the oppressed workers was equally mistaken. All his life Engels waited patiently for the English revolution that he had so confidently predicted but it never occurred.<sup>75</sup> He was wrong in supposing that socialism would first triumph in highly industrialised societies. In fact it was established in the twentieth century in backward underdeveloped countries. Engels was mistaken in thinking that in an industrial society the labour force would be increasingly composed of women and children.<sup>76</sup> His assertion that under the capitalist system the gulf between rich and poor would widen as time went on was also erroneous.<sup>77</sup> To those who drew attention to his blunders Engels replied either by claiming that a faulty prediction was due to the appearance of some new – and unforeseen – factor or by asserting that the prediction was correct and would still come true at some future date.

Nor can it be claimed that Engels gave a well-balanced and entirely accurate account of social conditions in England in 1844. It is true that many of the facts reported by Engels can be readily confirmed from the writings of other observers – such as Léon Faucher – who visited the northern industrial towns in the 1840s. It is in the selection and interpretation of the facts that Engels was at fault. He never made a secret of the fact that his book had been written not to give an objective account of the manufacturing districts, but to attack social evils and to pillory the class which he considered to be responsible for their existence. He saw himself as an advocate prosecuting a criminal, not a judge giving an impartial summing-up. Engels's knowledge of England in the 1840s was less extensive than is sometimes supposed. In twenty months he became well acquainted with Lancashire and the West Riding but his visits to London were brief and there were many manufacturing regions – the Black Country, South Wales, Tyneside, Clydeside – of which he had little if any first hand knowledge. His reading was highly selective since he relied to a great extent upon a small number of books, pamphlets and parliamentary papers. He made considerable use of the Chartist newspaper, the *Northern Star*, which was an extremely biased left-wing journal.

Another criticism concerns the way in which Engels used the

material at his disposal. He sometimes exercised little judgement in evaluating evidence since evidence taken on oath appeared cheek by jowl with extracts from newspapers. Any statements, whatever their origin, were grist to Engels's mill so long as they could be used to attack the millowners. For example, Sir Archibald Alison estimated in 1840 that there were between 30,000 and 40,000 prostitutes in London. Engels naturally took the higher rather than the lower figure and then left his readers with the impression that the existence of 40,000 prostitutes in London was a known fact. Actually Alison had made it clear that he was only guessing and there are of course no accurate statistics of prostitution in England in the 1840s. Again, Engels claimed to describe social conditions in the 1840s, yet some of his evidence came from an earlier date. Thus he made use of an article by John Hennen on the insanitary state of Edinburgh, which had been written as early as 1818. He quoted from Kay's pamphlet of 1832 on the Manchester cotton operatives and from the official Factories Enquiry Commission of 1833-4 as if nothing had changed in the last ten years.

Engels's interpretation of evidence and his attribution of motives to the factory owners were often unsatisfactory. He confidently asserted – as if no other explanation were possible – that the Plug Plot riots in the northern industrial districts had been deliberately fomented by the factory owners who cut wages in the hope that the workers would strike and so force the government to repeal the Corn Laws. This view of the origin of the industrial unrest in 1842 was shared by such strange bedfellows as the Tory J. W. Croker and the Chartist Feargus O'Connor, but was hotly denied by the Anti-Corn Law League. Engels gave one side of the story without even suggesting that any other explanation was worthy of consideration.<sup>78</sup>

Engels also asserted that under the capitalist system the condition of the workers continually declined. He believed that when he was in England in the 1840s the sufferings of the proletariat were greater than they had ever been before. Socialist historians subsequently agreed with him. But other – no less competent – scholars have argued that during the so-called 'Hungry Forties' the workers as a whole were probably no worse off – and some of them may have been better off – than they had been in the 1830s or the 1820s.<sup>79</sup> Engels, however, put forward his point of view as an accepted fact which could not be contradicted.

Engels persisted in portraying the English capitalists as men dedicated to making money at whatever cost in suffering to their workers. So he argued that if hours of work in factories or mines were long and if heavy physical labour were involved, the entre-

preneur was ruining the health of the workers to make large profits for himself. But if improved machines were installed which enabled hours to be reduced and lighter work to be undertaken the factory owner was still at fault. This time he was forcing his employees to work faster to keep pace with new machinery or he was making men redundant and replacing them by women. The capitalist who ignored the social problems of his day was condemned as a heartless monster. Yet the enlightened employer who built model cottages for his workers and provided them with a canteen and a reading room was still criticised and was supposed to have acted from the lowest motives. The model dwellings were tied cottages which meant that the loss of a job also meant the loss of a home while the reading rooms contained only periodicals approved by the employer. Engels's attitude towards the employers made it impossible for him to write a really impartial account of social conditions in England in 1844.

The merits of Engels's book were different from those sometimes attributed to it. Engels had not written an impartial survey of the social scene in industrial England. What he had done was to write a brilliant hard-hitting political tract. The forceful language with which social evils were denounced eventually gave the book a place in German political literature comparable with Thomas Carlyle's pamphlet on Chartism in England. Engels had denounced the social evils of an industrial society in the middle of the nineteenth century more effectively than they had ever been attacked before by a German writer. His book had a powerful impact upon public opinion in Germany between 1845 and 1848 and it helped to generate a feeling of responsibility towards the victims of industrial changes.

Moreover Engels went to the heart of various economic and social problems which were still being treated somewhat superficially by many of his contemporaries. While orthodox economists were discussing problems of rent, prices and the rational use of scarce resources, Engels drew attention to the fundamental problems of economic growth. He was one of the first to discuss the trade cycle and the existence of a pool of unemployed workers and to offer explanations for these phenomena. He saw the significance of the growth of big business at the expense of small undertakings. These topics were later discussed more thoroughly by Karl Marx, but to deal with them at all in 1845 was no mean achievement. Engels's chapter on the great towns – one of the best in the book – showed an insight into problems of urban geography and urban growth which was far ahead of his time.<sup>80</sup> And his discussion of the significance of class antagonism – based upon a clash of economic

interests – in an industrial society anticipated much that Karl Marx and other later writers had to say on the subject. It is because Engels appreciated better than so many of his contemporaries the real significance of the factors which were changing the industrial society of his day that his book went on being read while the writings of so many authors who were at work at the same time have fallen into oblivion.

Engels's book was of vital significance in Marx's intellectual development. In the preface to his first major work on economics – the *Critique of Political Economy* (1859) – Marx explained that as a young man he had studied jurisprudence, philosophy and history but he had eventually realised that to get to the heart of legal forms and political institutions one had to examine the material conditions of life. "The method of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life." Engels's early essay on economic theory in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* and his book on *The Condition of the Working Class in England* played an important part in turning Marx's attention from law and philosophy to economics. A comparison between Engels's book and certain sections of the first volume of *Das Kapital* – for example Marx's discussion of 'the working day' – shows how much Marx owed to his friend's book. It was from Engels that Marx learned how to make effective use of evidence collected by parliamentary commissions, by the Registrar General, and by factory inspectors to gain a real insight into the workings of the industrial economy. In later years Engels influenced the writing of *Das Kapital* at every stage of its production but the initial impulse which attracted Marx to a study of economics came largely from Engels and was one of his important contributions to the development of a theory of 'scientific socialism'.

## NOTES

- 1 See Horst Ullrich, *Der junge Engels* (1966), Vol. 2, Ch. 6.
- 2 W. O. Henderson (ed.), *Engels: Selected Writings* (1967), p. 387.
- 3 Engels wrote in the *New Moral World* (December 13, 1844): "I am just returning from a trip to some neighbouring towns, and there was not a single place where I did not find at least half a dozen or a dozen of out-and-out socialists. . . . We have partisans among all sorts of men – commercial men, manufacturers, lawyers, officers of the government and of the army, physicians, editors of newspapers, farmers etc.; a great many of our publications are in the press, though hardly three or four have as yet appeared; and if we make as much progress during the next four or five years as we have done in the past twelvemonth, we shall be able to erect forthwith a Com-

- munity. You see, we German theorists are getting practical men of business. . . ." (*Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 4, p. 341).
- 4 F. Engels to K. Marx, October 8–10, 1844 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part III, Vol. 1, pp. 1–4.
  - 5 Rheda is in Westphalia and lies between Münster and Bielefeld.
  - 6 The *Weser-Dampfboot* survived for only one year (1844). In 1845 Dr Lüning brought out another periodical called *Das Westphälische Dampfboot*.
  - 7 F. Engels to K. Marx, November 19, 1844 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part III, Vol. 1, pp. 4–8.
  - 8 F. Engels to K. Marx, January 20, 1845 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part III, Vol. 1, pp. 9–13.
  - 9 *Ibid.*, p. 9.
  - 10 F. Engels to K. Marx, February 22–March 7, 1845 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part III, Vol. 1, p. 16. The journal was published in Elberfeld.
  - 11 For the *Gesellschaftsspiegel* see the introduction by Auguste Cornu and Wolfgang Mönke to Moses Hess, *Philosophische und Sozialistische Schriften* (1961).
  - 12 F. Engels to K. Marx, January 20, 1845; February 22–March 7, 1845 and March 17, 1845 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part III, Vol. 1, pp. 11, 16 and 19.
  - 13 F. Engels to K. Marx, February 22–March 7, 1845 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part III, Vol. 1, pp. 14–15.
  - 14 *New Moral World*, third series, May 10, 1845, pp. 371–2 and *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 4, pp. 344–8.
  - 15 *Rheinische Zeitung*, Vol. I, 1845, pp. 45–62 and pp. 71–81 and *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 4, pp. 369–90.
  - 16 *New Moral World*, third series, May 10, 1845, pp. 371–2 and *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 4, pp. 344–8. For Hess's speeches at the communist meetings in Elberfeld see Moses Hess, *Philosophische und sozialistische Schriften 1837–1850* (1961), pp. 348–59.
  - 17 W. O. Henderson (ed.), *Engels; Selected Writings* (1967), pp. 148–71.
  - 18 Engels discussed communist settlements at greater length in an article entitled "Beschreibung der in neuerer Zeit entstanden und noch bestehenden kommunistischen Ansiedlungen" which appeared anonymously in the *Deutsches Bürgerbuch für 1845* (Darmstadt, 1845), pp. 326–40. The article has been reprinted in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 4, pp. 351–66.
  - 19 F. Engels in the *New Moral World*, third series, Vol. 6, May 10, 1845 and in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 4, p. 346.
  - 20 H. Hirsch, *Friedrich Engels* (1968), p. 53.
  - 21 F. Engels to K. Marx, March 7, 1845 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part III, Vol. 1, p. 17.
  - 22 *Gesamtausgabe*, Part III, Vol. 1, pp. 19–20 and W. O. Henderson (ed.), *Engels: Selected Writings* (1967), p. 388.
  - 23 The *Deutsche-Brüsseler Zeitung*, No. 91, November 14, 1847 reported that "F. Engels, who is living in Paris at present, is writing a comprehensive work in several volumes on the history of the English middle class." In 1845 the radical Darmstadt publisher C. W. Leske twice asked Karl Marx to approach Engels concerning his projected history. Leske wished to publish the book. See Wolfgang Mönke, *Das literarische Echo in Deutschland auf Friedrich Engels' Werk "Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England"* (1965), p. 94.
  - 24 For the relations between the radical Leipzig publisher Otto Wigand

- and Marx and Engels see K. Wiegel, "Otto Wigand. Ein fortschrittlicher Drucker und Verleger des 19en Jahrhunderts" in *Marginalien Blätter der Pirckheimer-Gesellschaft*, March 1963, Heft 13, pp. 33-44.
- 25 In July 1845 Georg Weerth wrote to his mother: "My very dear friend Friedrich Engels of Barmen . . . has written a book in defence of the English workers and has fearfully but justly scourged the manufacturers. His own father has factories in England and Germany. He is now at terrible variance with his family; he is considered godless and impious, and the rich father will not give his son another penny for his keep". (Georg Weerth, *Sämtliche Werke*, Vol. 5, p. 172).
- 26 F. Engels, *Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England. Nach eigener Anschauung und authentischen Quellen* (first German edition, Otto Wigand, Leipzig, 1845; second German edition, J. H. W. Dietz, Stuttgart with new introduction by the author, 1892; new German edition with introduction by W. O. Henderson, J. H. W. Dietz Nachfolger, 1965). The first German edition was reprinted in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 4, 1932. The first English translation by Mrs Florence Kelley Wischnewetzky appeared in the United States in 1887 and in England in 1892. Engels wrote new introductions for these editions. A second English translation by W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner was published by Basil Blackwell in 1958 and by the Stanford University Press in 1968. This edition includes a translation of Engels's article on "The Postscript of 1846. An English Strike" which appeared in *Das Westphälische Dampfboot*, January and February 1846 and was reprinted in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 4, pp. 393-405.
- 27 F. Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (translated and edited by W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner, 1958), pp. 7-8. All references are to this edition.
- 28 *Morning Chronicle*, July 6, 1843, p. 3, col. 2-4 (article by Alexander Somerville).
- 29 *The Times*, June 7, 1844, p. 6, col. 1-2; June 10, 1844, p. 7, col. 1-2; and June 21, 1844, p. 5, col. 1 and p. 6, col. 1.
- 30 See also Engels's review of Thomas Carlyle, *Past and Present* in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, 1844 (in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 2, pp. 379-404. English translation in appendix to Karl Marx, *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1961).
- 31 Auguste Cornu, *Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels*, Vol. 2 (1962), p. 269.
- 32 Wolfgang Mönke, *Das literarische Echo in Deutschland auf Friedrich Engels's Werk "Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England"* (1965), pp. 23-60: an excellent monograph on the reception of Engels's book in Germany.
- 33 For socialist views on the rising of the Silesian weavers in 1844 see F. W. Wolff, "Das Elend und der Aufruhr in Schlesien" in *Deutsches Bürgerbuch* (edited by H. Püttmann, 1845 and reprinted in C. Jantke and D. Hilger, *Die Eigentumlosen*, 1965, pp. 157-78) and Karl Marx, "Kritische Randglossen zu dem Artikel 'Der König von Preussen und die Sozialreform, von einem Preussen'" in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part I, Vol. 3 (1932).
- 34 See Eugène Buret, *De la misère des classes laborieuses en Angleterre et en France* (two volumes, 1844); Gustav Mevissen, "Englische Zustände" (*Rheinische Zeitung*, September 13, 18, and 20, 1842); Léon Faucher, *Manchester in 1844; its Present Condition and Future Pros-*

- pects* (translated anonymously with additional notes by J. P. Culverwell: new edition 1969) and *Etudes sur l'Angleterre* (two volumes, 1845; new edition 1969; German translation, 1846); C. G. Carus, *England und Schottland im Jahre 1844* (1845); C. T. Kleinschrod, *Der Pauperismus in England* (1845); J. Venedy, *England* (three volumes, 1845); G. Höfken, *Englands Zustände, Politik und Machtenwicklung mit Beziehung auf Deutschland* (two volumes, 1846).
- 35 H. Welsch, "Ein Urteil des preussischen Statistikers Friedrich Wilhelm Otto Ludwig von Reden über das Werk von Friedrich Engels, 'Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England' aus dem Jahre 1845" (*Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 1958, Vol. 6, Heft 4, pp. 821-4). The report has been reprinted in J. Kuczynski, *Die Geschichte der Lage der Arbeiter unter dem Kapitalismus*, Vol. 8 (1960), p. 168 *et seq.* Dr. Freiherr von Reden (1804-57) subsequently edited the *Zeitschrift des Vereins für deutsche Statistik*, the first volume of which appeared in 1847.
- 36 K. Obermann, "Urteile über das Werk von Friedrich Engels 'Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England' aus den Jahren 1845-1846" (*Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 1959, Vol. 7, Heft 5, p. 1065 *et seq.*).
- 37 Freiherr Bibra's report is printed in J. Kuczynski, *Die Geschichte der Lage der Arbeiter unter dem Kapitalismus*, Vol. 8, 1960, pp. 165-7.
- 38 *Allgemeine Preussische Zeitung*, October 31, November 1 and 7, 1845; reprinted in J. Kuczynski, *op. cit.*, Vol. 8, pp. 170-85 and in Carl Jantke and Dietrich Hilger, *Die Eigentumlosen* (1965), pp. 406-25.
- 39 V. A. Huber, "Zur neuesten Literatur" in *Janus*, 1845, pp. 387-9. For Huber see the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, Vol. 8, pp. 249-58.
- 40 Friedrich H. J. von Farenheid in the *Neue Preussische Provinzial-Blätter*, Vol. 3, Königsber 1847. The review is not mentioned in W. Mönke's monograph on the reception of Engels's book in Germany. See Kurt Forstreuter, "Eine Stimme zu der Schrift von Friedrich Engels über 'Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England'" (*Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Vol. 53, 1966, pp. 366-9).
- 41 W. Mönke, *op. cit.*, p. 59.
- 42 *Barmer Zeitung*, 1845, No. 291. A long criticism of this review appeared in the socialist journal *Gesellschaftsspiegel*, 1845, Heft 6, pp. 86-9.
- 43 Article on "Einige neueste Schriften auf dem Gebiete des Pauperismus, Socialismus und Communismus" in the *Monatsblätter zur Ergänzung der Allgemeinen Zeitung*, February 1846. Engels's book was also discussed in a later article entitled "Acht Monate der deutschen Litteratur" (*Monatsblätter . . .*, March 1846, p. 142).
- 44 Quoted by W. Mönke, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
- 45 Bruno Hildebrand, *Nationalökonomie der Gegenwart und Zukunft* (1848), Vol. I, pp. 155-241; a new edition edited by Hans Gehrig was published in 1922; extracts in J. Kuczynski, *op. cit.*, Vol. 8, pp. 186-9.
- 46 K. Biedermann, "Sozialistische Brestrebungen in Deutschland" in *Unsre Gegenwart und Zukunft*, 1846, Vol. 1 and 4: see also W. Mönke, *op. cit.*, pp. 33-5.
- 47 K. Biedermann, *Vorlesungen über Sozialismus und soziale Fragen* (1847).
- 48 M. Fleischer in the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, December 1846.

- A similar point of view was expressed by an anonymous reviewer in the *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, 1846, Vol. 1.
- 49 Weinlig in *Archiv der politischen Ökonomie und Polizeiwissenschaft* new series, Vol. 4, 1846, pp. 74–98: extracts in W. Mönke, *op cit.*, pp. 116–18.
- 50 See W. Mönke, *op cit.*, pp. 43–58.
- 51 *Gesellschaftsspiegel* (Elberfeld and Iserlohn), Vol. 1 (1846) and Vol. 2 (1847). This journal was founded by Friedrich Engels and Moses Hess. It was edited by Moses Hess.
- 52 *Deutsches Bürgerbuch* (Mannheim), Vol. 2, 1846, pp. 222–45. Dr Otto Lüning was the editor of this publication.
- 55 *Constitutionelle Staatsbürger-Zeitung* (Grimma), October 1845, pp. 513–15 and November 1845, pp. 521–4.
- 56 W. Mönke, *op cit.*, p. 57, states that Dr Hermann Ewerbeck was probably the author of the review of Engels's book that appeared in *Blätter der Zukunft* (Paris), 1845–6, pp. 97–128.
- 57 Dr Otto Lüning did not himself review Engels's book in *Das Westphälische Dampfboot*, which he edited – probably because of difficulties with the censor. But he did reprint a review by R. Rempel which had appeared in the *Öffentliche Anzeigen der Grafschaft Ravensberg*. See *Das Westphälische Dampfboot*, 1845, Heft 11, 12, pp. 552–67.
- 58 For discussions of reviews of Engels's book in the *Trier'sche Zeitung* see articles by K. Obermann and B. Andreas in *Annali* (Milan), Vol. 6, 1963.
- 59 Karl Marx to F. Engels, April 9, 1863 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part III, Vol. 3, p. 138.
- 60 Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1 (Everyman edition, 1930), pp. 240–1(n).
- 61 Pen name of Vasily Vasiljevitch Bervy, 1829–1918.
- 62 Karl Marx to F. Engels, February 10, 1870 in *Gesamtausgabe*, Part III, Vol. 4, p. 275.
- 63 F. Engels to Mrs Florence Kelley Wischnewetzky, February 10, 1885 in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Letters to Americans 1848–1895* (1963), p. 145.
- 64 F. Engels to F. A. Sorge, April 9, 1887, *ibid.*, p. 182.
- 65 The inscription in Engels's own copy of the English translation of *The Condition of the Working Class in England* published in New York in 1887 was "Frederick Engels with the compliments of the publisher, R. G. Foster, Phila. June 7th, 1887" (*Ex Libris Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels*, 1967, p. 63).
- 66 F. Engels to F. A. Sorge, May 4, 1887 in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Letters to Americans 1848–1895* (1963), p. 185. Laura Lafargue wrote to Engels on July 22, 1887: "I have read the preface and appendix of your book with the greatest interest and the sight of the book itself has been an infinite delight . . . I was about 15, I think, when, a self-imposed task, I did the whole or part of your book . . . into English. . . ." (*F. Engels – Paul and Laura Lafargue Correspondence*, Vol. 2, p. 53).
- 67 F. Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (translated and edited by W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner, 1958), pp. 360–71. The preface was dated January 11, 1892. A few days previously Engels had written to Laura Lafargue that he was working on the "proof sheets and new preface of (the) new English edition of (*Die*) *Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England*". (F. Engels to Laura