

ПРОИЗВЕДЕНИЯ
К. МАРКСА
И
Ф. ЭНГЕЛЬСА
НАПИСАННЫЕ
НА АНГЛИЙСКОМ
ЯЗЫКЕ

ХРЕСТОМАТИЯ
ДЛЯ ИЗУЧАЮЩИХ
АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК



ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО
МОСКОВСКОГО УНИВЕРСИТЕТА
1 · 9 · 3 · 9

**ПРОИЗВЕДЕНИЯ
К. МАРКСА и Ф. ЭНГЕЛЬСА
НА АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ**

**ХРЕСТОМАТИЯ
ДЛЯ ИЗУЧАЮЩИХ АНГЛИЙСКИЙ
ЯЗЫК**

Составитель
кандидат филологических
Т. Е. КРУПНИК

**ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО
МОСКОВСКОГО УНИВЕРСИТЕТА
1959**

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>F. Engels</i> , The Expulsion of Marx from Brussels | 5 |
| <i>F. Engels</i> , Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany | 9 |
| Germany at the Outbreak of the Revolution. | 9 |
| The Prussian State | 16 |
| The Other German States | 24 |
| Austria | 27 |
| The Vienna Insurrection | 32 |
| The Berlin Insurrection | 35 |
| The Frankfort National Assembly | 38 |
| The Paris Rising — the Frankfort Assembly | 42 |
| The Vienna Insurrection | 45 |
| The Storming of Vienna — the Betrayal of Vienna | 49 |
| The Prussian Assembly — the National Assembly | 55 |
| The Triumph of Prussia | 58 |
| The Assembly and the Governments | 61 |
| Insurrection | 64 |
| Petty Traders | 67 |
| The Close of the Insurrection | 70 |
| The Late Trial at Cologne | 74 |
| <i>K. Marx</i> , Speech at the Anniversary of the People's Paper | 80 |
| <i>K. Marx</i> , Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association | 82 |
| <i>K. Marx</i> , Preface to the First Edition of the First Volume of Capital | 89 |
| Preface to the Second Edition of the First Volume of Capital | 92 |
| <i>F. Engels</i> , Editor's Preface to the English Edition of Capital | 99 |
| <i>F. Engels</i> , Socialism: Utopian and Scientific | 103 |
| Special Introduction to the English Editions of 1892 | 103 |
| Socialism: Utopian and Scientific | 121 |
| I | 121 |
| II | 132 |
| III | 138 |
| <i>F. Engels</i> , Speech at the Graveside of Karl Marx | 156 |
| <i>F. Engels</i> , Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844. | 158 |
| Preface to the English Edition | 158 |

Letters

| | |
|--|-----|
| Marx to Danielson. London, april 10, 1879 | 169 |
| Marx to Danielson, 19 February, 1881 | 171 |
| Engels to Florence Kelly Wischnewetsky. London, June 3, 1886 | 173 |
| Engels to Danielson (Nicolai-on). London, September 22, 1892 | 174 |
| Engels to Danielson (Nicolai-on). London, October 17, 1893 | 176 |
| Engels to Danielson (Nicolai-on). London, 24 February, 1893 | 178 |

ОТ СОСТАВИТЕЛЯ

В учебно-методической литературе по преподаванию иностранных языков все еще не хватает специализированных хрестоматий для аудиторного и внеаудиторного чтения студентов и аспирантов, т. е. таких хрестоматий, которые, во-первых, учитывали бы специальность, по которой подготавливаются учащиеся, во-вторых, давали бы полноценный лингвистический материал, содействующий вместе с тем политическому и общекультурному росту и воспитанию студенчества.

При составлении данной хрестоматии учитывалось, что все студенты и аспиранты университетов и педагогических вузов изучают основные источники марксизма. Знания их будут более глубокими и полными, если они ознакомятся с этими произведениями на английском языке.

В хрестоматию включены произведения К. Маркса и Ф. Энгельса, написанные ими на английском языке и авторизованные. Они охватывают широкий круг политических и теоретических вопросов. В них дается изложение теории научного социализма, рассматриваются важные общественно-политические проблемы, содержится анализ и оценка ряда исторических событий XIX в. (например, революции 1848 г. и др.).

Кроме того, данные работы Маркса и Энгельса представляют собой не только гениальные теоретические и исторические произведения, но и непревзойденные по своей образности, ясности, выразительности и силе образцы языка английской политической литературы.

Произведения, включенные в хрестоматию, отражают также работу К. Маркса и Ф. Энгельса в области разработки научной общественно-политической терминологии, необходимость кото-

рой была связана с теми новыми философскими, экономическими проблемами и проблемами научного коммунизма, которые были поставлены и разрешены основоположниками марксизма.

Изучение классических трудов К. Маркса и Ф. Энгельса, включенных в настоящую хрестоматию, поможет студентам и аспирантам глубже овладеть общественно-политической и экономической марксистской научной терминологией английского языка.

Вдумчивая работа над хрестоматией должна подготовить учащихся к свободному переводу специальных текстов без словаря, к конспектированию и реферированию иностранной специальной литературы.

* * *

Работа Энгельса «Революция и контрреволюция в Германии» дана не полностью.

Статья «Недавний процесс в Кёльне» была написана для «New York Daily Tribune» Энгельсом по просьбе Маркса. Впоследствии она была включена в подготовленное Элеонорой Маркс-Эвелинг и вышедшее отдельной книгой в 1896 г. издание серии статей «Революция и контрреволюция в Германии» вместо последней, обещанной Энгельсом, но не появившейся в газете статьи этой серии.

Работа «Развитие социализма от утопии к науке» и предисловие к этой работе со всеми подстрочными пояснениями, сохранены полностью по изданию 1950 г. «Marx — Engels — Selected Works Volume II».

Материалы данной хрестоматии распределены в хронологическом порядке.

F. ENGELS

THE EXPULSION OF MARX FROM BRUSSELS

(THE NORTHERN STAR, VOL. XI, 25 MARCH 1848 № 544, p. 2).

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NORTHERN STAR

Dear Sir,

After the important events accomplished in France, the position taken by the Belgian people and government, is of a greater interest than in ordinary times. I hasten, therefore to inform your readers of what has happened since Friday, 25th of February.

The excitement and inquietude was universal in this town in the evening of that day. All sorts of rumours were spread, but nothing was really believed. The railway station was full of a crowd of people of all classes, anxious for the arrival of news. The French Ambassador, ex-Marquis de Rumigny, himself was there. At half-past twelve at night, the train arrived, with the glorious news of Thursday's revolution and the whole mass of people shouted in one sudden outburst of enthusiasm: *Vive la République!* The news spread rapidly all over the town. On Saturday all was quiet. On Sunday, however, the streets were crowded with people, and every one was curious to see what steps would be taken by two societies—the Association Démocratique and the Alliance. Both bodies assembled in the evening. The Alliance, a set of middle-class Radicals, resolved to wait, and thus retired from the movement. The Association Démocratique, however, took a series of most important resolutions, by which this body placed itself at the head of the movement. They resolved to meet daily, instead of weekly; to send a petition to the town-council, reclaiming the arming, not only of the middle-class Civic Guard, but of all citizens in districts. In the evening some rioting took place in the streets. The people cried, *Vive la République*, and assembled in masses around the Town Hall. Several arrests took place, but nothing of any consequence occurred.

Among the individuals arrested, there were two Germans — a poli-

tical refugee, M. Wolff, and a working man. Now, you must know that there existed here, in Brussels, a German working men's society in which political and social questions were discussed, and a German democratic newspaper. The Germans, resident in Brussels, were known for being generally very active and uncompromising Democrats. They were almost all members of the Democratic Association, and the vice-president of the German society. Dr. Marx, was also vice-president of the Democratic Association.

The government, perfectly aware of the narrow sentiment of nationalism prevalent among a certain class of the population of a small country like Belgium, immediately profited by these circumstances, in order to spread the rumour that the whole agitation for the Republic had been got up by the Germans — men who had nothing to lose, who had been expelled from three or four countries for their turpitudes, and who intended to place themselves at the head of intended Belgian Republic. This precious piece of news was reported on Monday through the whole town, and in less than a day the whole mass of the shopocracy, who form the body of the Civic Guard, raised one unanimous outcry against the German rebels, who wanted to revolutionise their happy Belgian fatherland.

The Germans had fixed a place of meeting in a coffee-house, where every one of them was to bring the latest news from Paris. But the outcry of the shopocrats was so great, and the rumours of government measures against the Germans were so manyfold, that they were obliged to give up even this innocent means of communicating with each other.

On Sunday evening, already the police had succeeded in prevailing upon the publican, proprietor of the German society's room, to refuse them the room for any future meeting.

The Germans behaved perfectly well during these times. Exposed to the most petty persecutions of the police, they yet rested at their post. They assisted every evening at the meeting of the Democratic Association. They abstained from all tumultuous crowding in the streets, but they showed, though personally exposing themselves, that in the hour of danger they would not abandon their Belgian brethren.

When, after a few days, the extraordinary agitation of Sunday and Monday has ceased, when the people had returned to their work, when the government had recovered from their first terror, then commenced another series of persecutions against the Germans. The government published orders, according to which all foreign working men, from the moment they had no work, were to be expelled from the country; and all foreigners indiscriminately, whose passports were out of order, were to be treated in the same way. Thus, while they took these measures; they excited, by the rumours they spread the masters against all foreign working men and made it impossible to any German to find work. Even those who had work lost it, and were, from that moment, exposed to an order of expulsion.

Not only against working men out of work, but also against women, they commenced their persecution. A young German Democrat, who lives, according to the French and Belgian custom, with a French lady, just as married people live — and whose presence at Brussels appears to have importuned the police—was suddenly exposed to a series of persecutions, directed against his mistress. She having no passports — and who ever before thought in Belgium of asking passports from a woman? — was threatened with immediate expulsion! and the police declared that it was not for her sake, but for the individual with whom she lived. Seven times in three days, the Commissary of Police was at her house; she had to pass at his office several times, and was sent to the central police office, escorted by an agent — and if an influential Belgian Democrat had not interposed, she would certainly have been obliged to leave.

But all this is nothing. The persecutions against working men,—the spreading of rumours about such and such an individual be arrested, or about a general chase after the Germans to be made in all public houses of the town on Tuesday evening, all this is nothing compared with what I have now to report.

On Saturday evening Dr. Marx, amongst others, reached a royal ordinance, ordering him to quit the country within twenty-four hours. He was engaged in arranging his trunks for the journey, when, at one o'clock in the morning, and in spite of the law which forbids the violation of the dwelling of a citizen from sunset to sunrise, ten police agents, armed, headed by a commissary of police, broke into his house, seized upon him and led him to the Town Hall prison. No reason was given but that his passport was not in order, though he presented them at least three passports, and though he had resided in Brussels for three years! He was led off. His wife, seized with terror, instantly ran to see a Belgian lawyer, who always offered his services to persecuted foreigners—the same whose friendly interposition has been mentioned above, — M. Jottrand, president of the Democratic Association. On her return, she met with a friend, a Belgian, M. Gigot. He accompanied her home. At the door of Dr. Marx's house, they found two of the policemen who had arrested her husband. "Where have you taken my husband?" asked she. "Why, if you follow us we will show you where he is." They led her, along with M. Gigot, to the Town Hall, but instead of fulfilling their promise, they delivered up both of them to the police, and they were put into prison. Mrs. Marx, who had left her three little children at home, with a servant only, was led into a room where she found a set of prostitutes of the lowest order, with whom she had to pass the night. Next morning she was led into a room where she had to stay three hours without fire, shivering with cold. M. Gigot was also retained. Mr. Marx had been put into a room with a raving madman, whom he was obliged to fight every moment. The

most brutal treatment on the part of the jailors was joined to this infamous conduct.

At three o'clock in the afternoon, at last, they were conducted before the judge, who very soon ordered their liberation. And of what had Mrs. Marx and M. Gigot been indicted? Of vagabondage, because neither of them had a passport of their pockets!

Mr. Marx was equally liberated, and ordered to leave the country the same evening. Thus, after having been wantonly imprisoned during eighteen of the twenty-four hours left to settle his affairs; after having had not only himself, but also his wife, separated for all that time from his three children, the eldest of whom has not attained her fourth year, he was sent away without a minute to put his affairs in order.

M. Gigot, on his arrest, had only left the prison the day before. He had been seized, along with three democrats from Liege, at six o'clock on Monday morning, in a hotel, and was arrested for vagabondage, because they had no passports. They were ordered to be liberated on Tuesday, but yet retained till Thursday against all law. One of them, M. Tedesco, is yet in prison, accused of nobody knows what. Both he and M. Wolff will be either liberated or placed before the tribunal in the course of this week.

I must say, however, that the Belgian working men and several other democrats of that nation, particularly M. Jottrand, have behaved exceedingly well towards the persecuted Germans. They have shown themselves quite above all petty sentiments of nationality. They saw in us not foreigners but democrats.

I hear that there is an order of arrest out against a Belgian working man and brave democrat, M. de Guasco. Another, M. Dassy, arrested on Sunday last, for rebellion, was before the tribunal yesterday; his judgement is not yet pronounced.

I am daily and hourly expecting my order of expulsion, if not worse, for nobody can foretell what this Belgio-Russian government is about to dare. I hold myself ready to leave at a moment's notice. Such is the position of a German democrat in this free country, which, as the papers say, has nothing to envy in the French republic.

Salutation and Fraternity,
Your old Friend.

Brussels, March 5th.

F. ENGELS

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN GERMANY

GERMANY AT THE OUTBREAK OF THE REVOLUTION.

The first act of the revolutionary drama on the continent of Europe has closed. The "powers that were" before the hurricane of 1848 are again the "powers that be", and the more or less popular rulers of a day, provisional governors, triumvirs, dictators, with their tail of representatives, civil commissioners, military commissioners, prefects, judges, generals, officers, and soldiers, are thrown upon foreign shores, and "transported beyond the seas" to England, or America, there to form new governments in partibus infidelium¹ European committees, central committees, national committees, and to announce their advent with proclamations quite as solemn as those of any less imaginary potentates.

A more signal defeat than that undergone by the continental revolutionary party—or rather parties—upon all points of the line of battle, cannot be imagined. But what of that? Has not the struggle of the British middle classes for their social and political supremacy embraced forty-eight, that of the French middle classes forty, years of unexampled struggles? And was their triumph ever nearer than at the very moment when restored monarchy thought itself more firmly settled than ever? The times of that superstition which attributed revolutions to the ill-will of a few agitators have long passed away. Everyone knows nowadays that wherever there is a revolutionary convulsion, there must be some social want in the background, which is prevented, by outworn institutions, from satisfying itself. The want may not yet be felt as strongly, as generally, as might ensure imme-

¹) вне реальной действительности, за границей (буквально: «в стране неверных» — добавление к титулу католических епископов, называвшихся на чисто номинальные должности епископов нехристианских стран).

ciate success; but every attempt at forcible repression will only bring it forth stronger and stronger, until it bursts its fetters. If, then we have been beaten, we have nothing else to do but to begin again from the beginning. And, fortunately, the probably very short interval of rest which is allowed us between the close of the first and the beginning of the second act of the movement, gives us time for a very necessary piece of work: the study of the causes that necessitated both the late outbreak and its defeat; causes that are not to be sought for in the accidental efforts, talents, faults, errors, or treacheries of some of the leaders, but in the general social state and conditions of existence of each of the convulsed nations. That the sudden movements of February and March, 1848, were not the work of single individuals, but spontaneous, irresistible manifestations of national wants and necessities, more or less clearly understood, but very distinctly felt by numerous classes in every country, is a fact recognised everywhere; but when you inquire into the causes of the counter-revolutionary successes, there you are met on every hand with the ready reply that it was Mr. This or Citizen That who "betrayed" the people. Which reply may be very true or not, according to circumstances, but under no circumstances does it explain anything—not even show how it came to pass that the "people" allowed themselves to be thus betrayed. And what a poor chance stands a political party whose entire stock-in-trade consists in a knowledge of the solitary fact, that Citizen So-and-so is not to be trusted.

The inquiry into, and the exposition of the causes, both of the revolutionary convulsion and its suppression, are, besides, of paramount importance from a historical point of view. All these petty, personal quarrels and recriminations—all these contradictory assertions that it was Marrast, or Ledru Rollin, or Louis Blanc, or any other member of the Provisional Government, or the whole of them, that steered the Revolution amidst the rocks upon which it foundered—of what interest can they be, what light can they afford, to the American or Englishman who observed all these various movements from a distance too great to allow of his distinguishing any of the details of operations? No man in his senses will ever believe that eleven men¹, mostly of very indifferent capacity either for good or evil, were able in three months to ruin a nation of thirty-six millions, unless those thirty-six millions saw as little of their way before them as the eleven did. But how it came to pass that thirty-six millions were at once called upon to decide for themselves which way to go, although partly groping in dim twilight, and how then they got lost and their old leaders were for a moment allowed to return to their leadership, that is just the question.

¹) Члены французского временного правительства.

If, then, we try to lay before the readers of *The Tribune* the causes which, while they necessitated the German Revolution of 1848, led quite as inevitably to its momentary repression in 1849 and 1850, we shall not be expected to give a complete history of events as they passed in that country. Later events, and the judgment of coming generations, will decide what portion of that confused mass of seemingly accidental, incoherent, and incongruous facts is to form a part of the world's history. The time for such a task has not yet arrived; we must confine ourselves to the limits of the possible, and be satisfied, if we can find rational causes, based upon undeniable facts, to explain the chief events, the principal vicissitudes of that movement, and to give us a clue as to the direction which the next, and perhaps not very distant, outbreak will impart to the German people.

And firstly, what was the state of Germany at the outbreak of the Revolution?

The composition of the different classes of the people which form the groundwork of every political organization was in Germany, more complicated than in any other country. While in England and France feudalism was entirely destroyed, or, at least, reduced, as in the former country, to a few insignificant forms, by a powerful and wealthy middle class, concentrated in large towns, and particularly in the capital, the feudal nobility in Germany had retained a great portion of their ancient privileges. The feudal system of tenure was prevalent almost everywhere. The lords of the land had even retained the jurisdiction over their tenants. Deprived of their political privileges, of the right to control the princes, they had preserved almost all their Medieval supremacy over the peasantry of their demesnes, as well as their exemption from taxes. Feudalism was more flourishing in some localities than in others, but nowhere except on the left bank of the Rhine was it entirely destroyed. This feudal nobility, then extremely numerous and partly very wealthy, was considered, officially the first "Order" in the country. It furnished the higher Government officials, it almost exclusively officered the army.

The bourgeoisie of Germany was by far not as wealthy and concentrated as that of France or England. The ancient manufactures of Germany had been destroyed by the introduction of steam, and the rapidly extending supremacy of English manufactures; the more modern manufactures, started under the Napoleonic continental system, established in other parts of the country, did not compensate for the loss of the old ones, nor suffice to create a manufacturing interest strong enough to force its wants upon the notice of Governments jealous of every extension of non-noble wealth and power. If France carried her silk manufactures victorious through fifty years of revolutions and wars, Germany, during the same time, all but lost her ancient linen trade. The manufacturing districts, besides, were few and far between; situated far inland, and using, mostly, foreign, Dutch, or Belgian ports

for their imports and exports, they had little or no interest in common with the large seaport towns on the North Sea and the Baltic; they were, above all, unable to create large manufacturing and trading centres, such as Paris and Lyons, London and Manchester. The causes of this backwardness of German manufactures were manifold, but two will suffice to account for it: the unfavourable geographical situation of the country, at a distance from the Atlantic, which had become the great highway for the world's trade, and the continuous wars in which Germany was involved, and which were fought on her soil, from the sixteenth century to the present day. It was this want of numbers, and particularly of anything like concentrated numbers, which prevented the German middle classes from attaining that political supremacy which the English bourgeoisie has enjoyed ever since 1688, and which the French conquered in 1789. And yet, ever since 1815, the wealth, and with the wealth the political importance of the middle class in Germany, was continually growing. Governments were, although reluctantly, compelled to bow, at least to its more immediate material interests. It may even be truly said that from 1815 to 1830, and from 1832 to 1840, every particle of political influence, which, having been allowed to the middle class in the constitutions of the smaller States, was again wrested from them during, the above two periods of political reaction, that every such particle was compensated for by some more practical advantage allowed to them. Every political defeat of the middle class drew after it a victory on the field of commercial legislation. And, certainly, the Prussian Protective Tariff of 1818, and the formation of the Zollverein¹, were worth a good deal more the traders and manufacturers of Germany than the equivocal right of expressing in the chambers of some diminutive dukedom their want of confidence in ministers who laughed at their votes. Thus, with growing wealth and extending trade, the bourgeoisie soon arrived at a stage where it found the development of its most important interests checked by the political constitution of the country; by its random division among thirty-six princes with conflicting tendencies and caprices; but the feudal fetters upon agriculture and the trade connected with it; by the prying superintendence to which an ignorant and presumptuous bureaucracy subjected all its transactions. At the same time the extension and consolidation of the Zollverein, the general introduction of steam communication, the growing competition in the home trade, brought the commercial classes of the different States and Provinces closer together, equalised their interests, centralised their strength. The natural consequence was the passing of the whole mass of them into the camp of the Liberal Opposition, and the gaining of the first serious struggle of the German middle class for political power. This change may be dated from 1840, from the moment when the bourgeoisie of Prussia assumed the lead of

¹) Таможенный Союз

the middle class movement of Germany. We shall hereafter revert to this Liberal Opposition movement of 1840-47.

The great mass of the nation, which neither belonged to the nobility nor to the bourgeoisie, consisted in the towns of the small trading and shopkeeping class and the working people, and in the country of the peasantry.

The small trading and shopkeeping class is exceedingly numerous in Germany, in consequence of the stunted development which the large capitalists and manufacturers as a class have had in that country. In the larger towns it forms almost the majority of the inhabitants; in the smaller ones it entirely predominates, from the absence of wealthier competitors or influence. This class, a most important one in every modern body politic, and in all modern revolutions, is still more important in Germany, where, during the recent struggles, it generally played the decisive part. Its intermediate position between the class of larger capitalists, traders, and manufacturers, the bourgeoisie properly so-called, and the proletarian or industrial class, determines its character. Aspiring to the position of the first, the least adverse turn of fortune hurls the individuals of this class down into the ranks of the second. In monarchical and feudal countries the custom of the court and aristocracy becomes necessary to its existence; the loss of this custom might ruin a great part of it. In the smaller towns a military garrison, a county government, a court of law with its followers, form very often the base of its prosperity; withdraw these, and down go the shopkeepers, the tailors, the shoemakers, the joiners. Thus eternally tossed about between the hope of entering the ranks of the wealthier class, and the fear of being reduced to the state of proletarians or even paupers; between the hope of promoting their interests by conquering a share in the direction of public affairs, and the dread of rousing, by ill-timed opposition, the ire of a Government which disposes of their very existence, because it has the power of removing their best customers; possessed of small means, the insecurity of the possession of which is in the inverse ratio of the amount, — this class is extremely vacillating in its views. Humble and crouchingly submissive under a powerful feudal or monarchical Government, it turns to the side of Liberalism when the middle class is in the ascendant; it becomes seized with violent democratic fits as soon as the middle class has secured its own supremacy, but falls back into the abject despondency of fear as soon as the class below itself, the proletarians, attempts an independent movement. We shall by and by see this class, in Germany, pass alternately from one of these stages to the other.

The working class in Germany is, in its social and political development, as far behind that of England and France as the German bourgeoisie is behind the bourgeoisie of those countries. Like master, like man. The evolution of the conditions of existence for a numerous, strong, concentrated, and intelligent proletarian class goes hand in hand

with the development of the conditions of existence for a numerous, wealthy, concentrated, and powerful middle class. The working class movement itself never is independent, never is of an exclusively proletarian character until all the different factions of the middle class, and particularly its most progressive faction, the large manufacturers, have conquered political power, and remodelled the State according to their wants. It is then that the inevitable conflict between the employer and the employed becomes imminent, and cannot be adjourned any longer; that the working class can no longer be put off with delusive hopes and promises never to be realised; that the great problem of the nineteenth century, the abolition of the proletariat, is at last brought forward fairly and in its proper light. Now, in Germany the mass of the working class were employed, not by those modern manufacturing lords of which Great Britain furnishes such splendid specimens, but by small tradesmen, whose entire manufacturing system is a mere relic of the Middle Ages. And as there is an enormous difference between the great cotton lord and the petty cobbler or master tailor, so there is a corresponding distance from the wide-awake factory operative of modern manufacturing Babylons to the bashful journeyman tailor or cabinetmaker of a small country town, who lives in circumstances and works after a plan very little different from those of the like sort of men some five hundred years ago. This general absence of modern conditions of life, of modern modes of industrial production, of course was accompanied by a pretty equally general absence of modern ideas, and it is, therefore, not to be wondered as if, at the outbreak of the Revolution, a large part of the working classes should cry out for the immediate re-establishment of guilds and Mediaeval privileged trades' corporations. Yet from the manufacturing districts, where the modern system of production predominated, and in consequence of the facilities of inter-communication and mental development afforded by the migratory life of a large number of the working men, a strong nucleus formed itself, whose ideas about the emancipation of their class were far clearer and more in accordance with existing facts and historical necessities; but they were a mere minority. If the active movement of the middle classes may be dated from 1840, that of the working class commences its advent by the insurrections of the Silesian and Bohemian factory operatives in 1844, and we shall soon have occasion to pass in review the different stages through which this movement passed.

Lastly, there was the great class of the small farmers, the peasantry, which, with its appendix of farm labourers, constitutes a considerable majority of the entire nation. But this class again sub-divided itself into different fractions. There were, firstly, the more wealthy farmers, what is called in Germany Gross and Mittel-Bauern¹, Proprietors of more or less extensive farms, and each of them commanding the ser-

¹) крупных и средних крестьян

vices of several agricultural labourers. This class, placed between the large untaxed feudal landowners, and the smaller peasantry and farm labourers, for obvious reasons found in an alliance with the anti-feudal middle class of the towns its most natural political course. Then there were, secondly, the small freeholders, predominating in the Rhine country, where feudalism had succumbed before the mighty strokes of the great French Revolution. Similar independent small freeholders also existed here and there in other provinces, where they had succeeded in buying off the feudal charges formerly due upon their lands. This class, however, was a class of freeholders by name only, their property being generally mortgaged to such an extent, and under such onerous conditions, that not the peasant, but the usurer who had advanced the money, was the real landowner. Thirdly, the feudal tenants, who could not be easily turned out of their holdings, but who had to pay a perpetual rent, or to perform in perpetuity a certain amount of labour in favour of the lord of the manor. Lastly, the agricultural labourers, whose condition, in many large farming concerns, was exactly that of the same class in England, and who in all cases lived and died poor, ill-fed, and the slaves of their employers. These three later classes of the agricultural population, the small freeholders, the feudal tenants, and the agricultural labourers, never troubled their heads much about politics before the Revolution, but it is evident that this event must have opened to them a new career, full of brilliant prospects. To every one of them the Revolution offered advantages, and the movement once fairly engaged in, it was to be expected that each in their turn, would join it. But at the same time it is quite as evident, and equally borne out by the history of all modern countries, that the agricultural population, in consequence of its dispersion over a great space, and of the difficulty of bringing about an agreement among any considerable portion of it, never can attempt a successful independent movement; they require the initiatory impulse of the more concentrated, more enlightened, more easily moved people of the towns.

The preceding short sketch of the most important of the classes, which in their aggregate formed the German nation at the outbreak of the recent movements will already be sufficient to explain a great part of the incoherence, incongruence and apparent contradiction which prevailed in that movement. When interests so varied, so conflicting, so strangely crossing each other, are brought into violent collision; when these contending interests in every district, every province are mixed in different proportions; when, above all, there is no great centre in the country, no London, no Paris, the decisions of which, by their weight, may supersede the necessity of fighting out the same quarrel over and over again in every single locality; what else is to be expected but that the contest will dissolve itself into a mass of unconnected struggles, in which an enormous quantity of blood, energy, and capital is spent, but which for all that remain without any decisive results?

The political dismemberment of Germany into three dozen of more or less important principalities is equally explained by this confusion and multiplicity of the elements which compose the nation, and which again vary in every locality. Where there are no common interests there can be no unity of purpose, much less of action. The German Confederation, it is true, was declared everlastingly indissoluble; yet the Confederation, and its organ, the Diet, never represented German unity. The very highest pitch to which centralisation was ever carried in Germany was the establishment of the Zollverein; by this the States on the North Sea were also forced into a Customs Union of their own, Austria remaining wrapped up in her separate prohibitive tariff. Germany had the satisfaction to be, for all practical purposes divided between three independent powers only, instead of between thirty-six. Of course the paramount supremacy of the Russian Czar, as established in 1814, underwent no change on this account.

Having drawn these preliminary conclusions from our premisses, we shall see, in our next, how the aforesaid various classes of the German people were set into movement one after the other, and what character the movement assumed on the outbreak of the French Revolution of 1848.

THE PRUSSIAN STATE

The political movement of the middle class or bourgeoisie, in Germany, may be dated from 1840. It had been preceded by symptoms showing that the moneyed and industrial class of that country was ripening into a state which would no longer allow it to continue apathetic and passive under the pressure of a half-feudal, half-bureaucratic Monarchism. The smaller princes of Germany, partly to insure to themselves a greater independence against the supremacy of Austria and Prussia, or against the influence of the nobility of their own States, partly in order to consolidate into a whole the disconnected provinces united under their rule by the Congress of Vienna, one after the other granted constitutions of a more or less liberal character. They could do so without any danger to themselves; for if the Diet of the Confederation, this mere puppet of Austria and Prussia, was to encroach upon their independence as sovereigns, they knew that in resisting its dictates they would be backed by public opinion and the Chambers; and if, on the contrary, these Chambers grew too strong, they could readily command the power of the Diet to break down all opposition. The Bavarian, Würtemberg, Baden or Hanoverian Constitutional institutions could not, under such circumstances, give rise to any serious struggle for political power, and, therefore, the great bulk of the German middle class kept very generally aloof from the petty squabbles raised in the Legislatures of the small States, well knowing that without a funda-