MARXISM AND THE DEMOCRATIC TRADITION

Marxism and the Democratic Tradition

BY A. LANDY

International Publishers, New York

72

PRINTED IN U S A.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

The relation between democracy and communism is one of the fundamental questions of our time Yet it is almost as old as capitalism itself In the comparatively early days of capitalist society, at the time of the American and French Revolutions, most men of wealth feared democracy as much as communism In fact, they saw no difference between the two To them communism was the logical outgrowth of democracy, not its antithesis But that was in the heyday of capitalism, when the bourgeoisie was entering upon a new era of ascendance and there was as yet no modern working class capable of waging an independent struggle for its own demands, nor the conditions for such a struggle

Since that time, however, capitalism has reached its old age, and if its spokesmen have not grown any wiser, they have certainly become more cautious and less forthright What their great grandfathers had so brilliantly anticipated in theory, a hundred years of subsequent historical development had demonstrated in practice democracy and communism were the twin offspring of an ascendant working class aspiring for political power and economic emancipation The triumph of socialism in half of Europe and Asia only confirmed their conviction without diminishing their fear.

But if the old fear remained, a new approach was clearly in order It was evident that the less the capitalists tolerated democracy, the more the working people fought for democratic rights To continue to insist, therefore, that there was no difference between democracy and communism, far from weakening the attachment of the working people to democracy, could only facilitate their realization of the necessary connection between the two.

Of course, one way out was to resort to fascist terror, which would destroy the possibility of the development of bourgeois democracy to its logical conclusion by destroying this democracy itself As we know, this is what the most reactionary sections of monopoly capital tried to do But matters did not work out so simply for them For, while fascism, as the unrestricted, terrorist dictatorship of finance capital, meant aggression against the people at home, it also meant aggression and war abroad And when German fascism, built up with the aid of reactionary British and American capital, set out to conquer the world under the pretext of combating communism, it only succeeded in uniting the democratic countries of the world, capitalist and socialist, in a common struggle for survival Instead of burying democracy, world reaction only opened a new era in its development Far from destroying communism, it taught freedom-loving people everywhere that those who sail under the banner of anti-communism are the foes of democracy in any form

The military defeat of fascism, however, has not meant the eradication of fascist ideology Indeed, the World War hardly came to a close before reaction revived the Hitler slogan of anti-communism, only in a form adjusted to the new world conditions The reactionaries strove hard to erase the memory of the self-sacrificing contributions which the communists everywhere made in the struggle for democracy and freedom They were especially anxious to erase the memory of the historic contribution of the Soviet Union to the salvation of democracy and mankind They had to reckon with the fact that at the end of the War there were three types of democracy in existence the capitalist democracy of England and the United States, the Socialist democracy of the Soviet Union, and the popular democracy of such countries as Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia in which private property still prevailed but large landed estates and monopoly capital were eliminated and political power was concentrated in the hands of the people But they sought to meet this by

refusing to recognize any other kind of democracy than bourgeois democracy and by denying the democratic character of communism From the viewpoint of obscuring the truth this approach undoubtedly has an enormous advantage over the frank position of their eighteenth century predecessors But it is hardly a testimonial of insight into the historical realities or the dynamics of contemporary history, it is certainly no contribution to progress or peace

It is true that communism and capitalism are fundamentally opposite social systems That is an undeniable historical fact. But it is not a fact that this makes capitalism synonymous with democracy and communism its mortal foe To establish the relationship of these two systems to democracy, it is necessary to examine each system on its merits, to study the history, social character and deeds of each Needless to say, capitalism can least afford to submit to such an objective test Indeed, the very slogan "democracy versus communism" is a tacit admission that it is easier to rally the masses in support of democracy than of capitalism, but it is at the same time an admission that democracy and capitalism are far from synonymous

In the last analysis, the claim that democracy and communism are mutually exclusive rests on a distortion of both. On the one hand, it restricts the concept of democracy to a formal, circumscribed democracy which excludes the welfare and initiative of labor and the people from the vital interests of the nation On the other hand, it denies the democratic character of the communist movement precisely because it fights for the welfare of labor and the people and regards their interests as synonymous with the interests of the nation. It is therefore not difficult to see how those who exclude the people from the concept of democracy should refuse to recognize the democratic character of such a distinctly people's movement as the communist movement. But the very origin and history of modern democracy and communism testify to the organic relationship between the two

This history has demonstrated that the communists have always been the most consistent champions of democracy. The rise of Marxism a hundred years ago not only gave the communist movement a scientific basis, but thereby enabled it to fight even more consistently for democracy And it did this because it provided a scientific understanding of the nature and basis of the class struggle in modern society, and consequently, of the relation of the various classes to democracy It not only championed the interests of the working class in this struggle, but demonstrated that the working class is the backbone of democracy and the main driving force of democratic development That is why the very first manifesto of the party of Marxism proclaimed the historical mission of the working class to be the winning of the battle for democracy And to this day the communist movement has continued the fight to defend and extend democracy and assure its development to a higher form

This book does not presume to be a rounded study of democracy and Marxism It deals with only one aspect of this vast and many-sided question, the historical origin of Marxism within the general democratic current Written for the general reader who may not have had the opportunity of studying the record for himself, this book is entirely introductory in character It reviews the chief historical milestones in the development of modern democracy beginning with the British Revolution of 1648 and ending with the democratic movement which gave rise to Marxism On the whole, therefore, it is essentially an historical outline The study of the development of the modern democratic current and the origin of Marxism within it is undoubtedly the most elementary step in the examination of the relation of Marxism and democracy But, aside from being a necessary step, it has the merit of breaking the ground for the deeper, theoretical study of this question.

CHAPTER I The Rise of Modern Democracy

I

MODERN democracy had its origin in the historic struggle to overthrow the feudal system in Europe and to establish, instead, the new capitalist system of production which had matured within the old feudal order. Capitalist manufactories had arisen as early as the fourteenth century in the medieval Italian city republics, and as they spread through Europe they stimulated bold and daring efforts to find new markets for their wares By the middle of the fifteenth century, with the construction of canals, locks, ships, mining shafts, pumping and ventilating apparatus for the working of mines, firearms, fortresses and nautical instruments, industry had attained a considerable degree of development and the weight of commerce had begun to shift to the Atlantic The discovery of America and the circumnavigation of Africa were the epic products of these developments which opened up new fields of activity to the rising capitalist class and paved the way for the establishment of the world market [1]

The emergence of the new capitalist economy broke down feudal restraints and limitations a thousand years old The medieval world restricted largely to the Mediterranean Sea gave way to the new, global world of modern history The tempo of life was accelerated In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, encouraged by the growth of industry and the great geographical discoveries, brilliant advances were

registered in the natural sciences, and the printing press, invented in the fifteenth century, assured the wide dissemination of the new knowledge The more industry grew, the more it needed scientific knowledge of the materials of nature, and the more it provided the basis for systematic experimental science, the more thoroughly did it doom the feudal mode of thought which, as Galileo observed, held that truth had to be sought, not in the world, not in nature, but in the collation of texts In alliance with commerce and manufacture, the new science created vast productive forces which provided the foundations for the turbulent advance of modern society

The struggle against feudalism, however, proceeded not only in the economic and scientific realms It was simultaneously a struggle for political power led by the bourgeoisie, since the political structure, the organization of the state, could not remain feudal in form while society became more and more bourgeois Its aim was to destroy all the old differences among the various estates co-existing in a country, all arbitrary privileges and exemptions, all medieval guilds and corporations, and to replace the individual and hereditary privileges of feudalism by the privilege of money [2]

In order to achieve this, the bourgeoisie was obliged to raise political affairs to the rank of popular affairs, it was obliged to make the elective principle the foundation of government—to recognize equality in principle, to free the press from the shackles of monarchic censorship, to introduce the jury in order to get rid of a separate class of judges forming a state within a state In short, it was obliged to adopt a democratic program and to involve the people in the struggle for its realization The revolution against feudalism was thus a bourgeois democratic revolution

But long before the triumph of the bourgeoisie, the struggle for democracy was begun by the people themselves This took the form of a series of peasant and plebeian revolts from the middle of the fourteenth to the first part of the sixteenth

century These were independent democratic movements of the farm and urban poor, beginning with the revolt of Rienzi in Rome between 1347 and 1357, followed by the peasant Jacquerie in France in 1357, the peasant revolt in England led by Wat Tyler and John Ball in 1381, and the peasant wars in Germany in the 1520's. All of these revolts, the memory of which endured down through the American and French Revolutions at the end of the eighteenth century, were brutally suppressed, in almost every case with the assistance of the bourgeoisie of the time

The first bourgeois revolution occurred towards the end of the sixteenth century when the Netherlands revolted from Spain and opened the actual era of capitalist production in Europe Spain, promoter of the great maritime explorations, had emerged as the dominant power of the sixteenth century Governed at this time by Charles V, and later by his son Philip II, it held the imperial crown of the Holy Roman Empire and ruled the Netherlands and Burgundy, Italy, Portugal and the colonies of Spanish America The fabulous achievements of its explorers who had carried the banner of Castile across uncharted ocean wastes to Mexico, Peru and the Pacific encouraged its visions of Iberian domination of the world. In 1527 Spain's troops sacked Rome, and in 1571 its fleet defeated the Moslem enemy which for nearly a thousand years had contested control of the Mediterranean with Christianity. But the anointed ruler of the first absolute monarchy of Europe, who encouraged his explorers to open a new world, effectively discouraged Spain's participation in it as a modern nation by preventing the rise of the Spanish bourgeoisie, crushing the Cortes (Parliament) and the cities rather than yield to their demands As a result, Spain remained backward economically, outstripped by its rival, France, and surpassed even by Venice as the center of commerce [3]

Spanish absolutism, however, could not hold down the energetic bourgeoisie of the Netherlands, which declared its independence in 1581 and continued to wage a struggle for

seventy years until it freed itself completely from Spanish domination This struggle against Spanish absolutism bolstered by the Catholic Inquisition was waged under the banner of Calvinism, the religious doctrine of the Dutch and French bourgeoisie. A major role in this struggle was played by the Calvinist petty-bourgeoisie which, fearing extension of the Catholic Inquisition to the cities of the Netherlands, constituted a holy army of warriors for the faith For aid, the Dutch turned chiefly to Britain, which was itself to experience a civil war that culminated in the establishment of a republic[4] It was not until 1648 that the Dutch Republic was finally recognized By this time, Holland had risen to be the dominant commercial power of the world, aided by the capital of Venice whose commercial supremacy it replaced. The loans from decadent Venice constituted one of the secret bases of the capital wealth of Holland With the aid of these large sums of money, Holland built up its marine, fisheries and manufactures, surpassing those of any other country The total capital of the Dutch Republic was greater than all of Europe's put together[5]

The Dutch example was followed in the middle of the seventeenth century by a number of simultaneous efforts to introduce a republic in Lisbon, Naples, Messina and England, signalizing the rise of the modern democratic current.[6] The British Republican Revolution, while comparatively short-lived, was European in scope and the most important historical forerunner of the democratic revolutions of the eighteenth century. It gave rise to what Macaulay described as "one of the most memorable eras in the history of mankind the great conflict between Oromasdes and Arimanes, liberty and despotism, reason and prejudice."[7]

The British Republic, established in 1649, was the product of a twenty-year struggle between the House of Commons

and the King It had as its aim the abolition of all feudal property relations, such as feudal land ownership, guilds and monopolies, which acted as fetters upon budding capitalist industry Like the Netherlands at this time, England had only part of its old feudal nobility left, the bulk of the established aristocracy having been decimated by the Wars of the Roses in the fifteenth century Out of ninety peers sitting in Parliament in 1621, forty-two had received their peerages from James I, while the lineage of the others went back no further than the sixteenth century. This new landed aristocracy operated its estates predominantly along bourgeois lines and consequently identified its interests more readily with the urban bourgeoisie, which constituted a considerable economic power at this time There was, in addition, a large free yeomanry which comprised the bulk of the population and was part of the camp arrayed against the King

Like its Dutch predecessor, the British Revolution also assumed a religious form, taking its ideological inspiration from the Old Testament But behind the religious denominations stood distinct social classes and parties, the Puritan bourgeoisie, uniting with the new aristocracy and supported by the people, against the Stuart monarchy, the old feudal nobility and the Established Church The chief parties in the Revolution against the King were the Presbyterians, the Independents and the Levellers—similar to the Girondists, the Jacobins and Babeuvists respectively in the Great French Revolution of the eighteenth century.

The struggle between the King and Parliament had flared up as early as 1625 Four years later, Parliament was dissolved and its leaders imprisoned This was followed by eleven years of arbitrary rule, during which illegal taxes were collected, illegal monopolies authorized, and the Puritans, who controlled the House of Commons, were subjected to illegal confiscations and dreadful persecution The rich merchants of London were almost all Puritans, as were also a large number of the lower nobility and bourgeois landowners.

The influence of the Established Church had diminished among the wealthy classes, and even a growing number of the upper aristocracy turned away from the Church

The Puritans confined themselves at first to legal resistance, conducting country-wide agitation with the help of funds contributed generously by the merchants of London But the illegal and repressive measures of the King and the government drove increasing numbers into political and religious opposition, which culminated in civil war in the autumn of 1642.

In the course of the war, the latent antithesis between the Presbyterians and Independents in the Puritan camp, both in Parliament and the army, came more and more into the open The majority of the merchants of London were Presbyterians, and the generals supporting them waged the war in a lukewarm fashion, partly because they still intended to reach a compromise with the King

Nearly all the politically radical elements, however, turned away from the Presbyterians and towards the Independents headed by Oliver Cromwell, who had become assistant head of the army The Presbyterians acknowledged only the freedom of their own religion, regarding the toleration of other sects as heresy Cromwell stood for genuine religious tolerance, declaring that the State in choosing its servants should not inquire into their opinions, if they served the State honestly, that was sufficient John Lilburne, another army officer who had a mass following, also defended the sects and, as a result, was imprisoned repeatedly The Presbyterians waged a struggle against this tolerance of the numerous religious sects, not only because of religious fanaticism, but primarily because of their desire for the monopoly of economic and political power

By the end of 1647 the relations of the various parties in Parliament and to the King and the army had changed. Charles I had fled to Scotland in the spring of 1646, but the Scots, on receiving payment of the expenses of their army on

January 30, 1647, surrendered him to Parliament From here on there developed a series of maneuvers, the Presbyterians trying to out-maneuver the Independents by a private deal with the King, and the Independents, in turn, conducting their own negotiations with him, while the King took full advantage of the differences between them The army, on the other hand, under the influence of John Lilburne and his friends, became impatient with Cromwell and his Independent colleagues for dealing with the King The result was that the party of Independents was split into Levellers headed by Lilburne and Gentlemen headed by Cromwell [8]

The Levellers, who represented the common people, never fully trusted the Gentlemen Independents and pressed them for action Despite the struggle that went on between the Levellers and Cromwell for political influence over the army, Lilburne was ready to co-operate with Cromwell as long as energetic action was taken against the King The Levellers and the Cromwell Independents even signed an agreement for joint action which was never observed by the latter

The Levellers stood for the forcible cleansing of Parliament and the beheading of the King, but they wanted assurances that after this happened, something enduring would come out of it for the people This was the basis of their differences with the Gentlemen Independents The Levellers were the most democratic force in the Revolution of 1648 as shown by the principles for which they fought They declared that men are naturally free and equal, that they have natural rights, that all powers emanate from the people and that government is founded in the consent of the governed The Levellers demanded that the government of England be reformed according to republican principles Their political program was No King, no House of Lords, the House of Commons to be the supreme authority and to be truly representative of the people, periodical parliaments, universal suffrage, equality of all before the law, separation of Church and state, universal toleration to all except Papists, and ex-

clusion of these only on political grounds, no test acts, no imprisonment for debt, conviction in cases involving life, liberty, etc by jury alone, men's lives to be taken only for murder, freedom of trade and labor, self-government, cities, towns and boroughs to elect their officers for a year, abolition of all privileges and exemptions, and every parish to choose its own ministers

Cromwell and other Independents were inclined to republicanism, but in their concern for the protection of property, they were not ready or willing to go as far as this Algernon Sydney, for example, one of the members of the tribunal that was soon to condemn Charles I to death, wrote "As for democracy, I believe it can suit only the convenience of a small town, acompanied with such circumstances as are seldom found But this in no way obliges men to run into the other extreme, inasmuch as the variety of forms, between democracy and absolute monarchy is almost infinite" [9] James Harrington, whose *Oceana* was published in 1656, polemized against Machiavelli for saying that "he who will go about to make a commonwealth where there be many gentlemen (property), unless he first destroys, undertakes an impossibility," and argued that "an army may as well consist of soldiers without officers or of officers without soldiers, as a commonwealth consist of people without a gentry or a gentry without a people" [10]

John Milton, Secretary of Foreign Languages of the future commonwealth, envisaged a republic in which the people exhausted their rights of suffrage in one constitutent act, choosing once and for all time their ablest and wisest men to sit as a grand council for the management of public affairs In his *Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth*, Milton refers to the experience of ancient and medieval republics as proof that popular assemblies "either little availed the people or else brought them to such a licentious and unbridled democracy as in fine ruined themselves with their own excessive power" [11]

Cromwell was ready to work out a compromise with Lilburne and the Levellers, and in the struggle to cleanse Parliament of the Presbyterians, he was only too anxious to collaborate with them, especially in view of their strong influence in the army. But events in relation to the King came to a head quickly, and nothing came of the agreement between the Gentlemen Independents and the Levellers.

In the winter of 1648, Parliament, under the control of a Presbyterian majority, sneaked the King away To meet this challenge, the army headed by the Independents proceeded to clean the Presbyterians out of Parliament on December 6-7, placing 47 of them under arrest This action was known as Colonel Pride's Purge The purged or Rump Parliament proceeded to put an end to the struggle with the King. Charles I was condemned to death on January 27, 1649 and three days later he was executed On February 1, Parliament sanctioned the purge by formally excluding the members Pride drove out On February 6 the House of Lords was declared useless, and on February 7 government by a king or a single person was abolished as "useless, sinful and dangerous"[12] On February 15, a State Council of 41 persons was appointed of which Cromwell, Fairfax and other army chiefs were members, and a month later John Milton, England's great poet, assumed the post of Secretary of Foreign Languages On May 19, by decision of Parliament, England was proclaimed a Republic The Commons published a declaration explaining the ground upon which they had "judged it necessary to change the government of this nation from the former monarchy into a republic, and not have any more a king to tyrannize over them." It was now declared that the people of England "shall be and are hereby constituted, made, established and confirmed to be a Commonwealth and free state."[13]

The Levellers, who had fought most consistently for the establishment of a republic, were not satisfied with these measures. They felt that much had been done for the rights

of Parliament but that little had been done for the people. The Agreement of the People which had been drawn up by Lilburne and the Levellers had been approved by the Council of Officers on January 15, 1649 and had been presented to Parliament. But neither the officers of the army nor Parliament intended to carry out this Agreement which would have meant the establishment of a fully democratic republic [14] Instead, Parliament proceeded to combat the influence of the Levellers in the army by prohibiting correspondence on political matters with civilians and petitions to Parliament or any persons other than their officers and by courtmartialing anyone inciting mutiny in the army.

Throughout the Revolution, it was the Levellers who were the most ardent advocates of a republic But as spokesmen of the common people they wanted more than a victory of bourgeois property over feudal property involved in the victory of Parliament over the King They wanted a democratic republic which would also answer the needs of the people The Leveller movement, therefore, attacked the monarchy, the nobility, the Church and the wealthy classes, reserving its bitterest barbs for the tribe of lawyers who countered every effort at reforming the laws with the cry that it was an attempt to destroy property

The Levellers were thus the first to raise the social question within the revolution One group of Levellers even advanced outright communist ideas, calling themselves True Levellers or Diggers from the fact that they attempted to organize a communist movement to dig up and plant the common land on the basis of communal ownership which they felt could alone end poverty on earth They argued that they supported Parliament in the struggle against the King because they accepted its promise that the land would be free Parliament and the army had declared that they were acting in the interest of the entire nation, the gentry had the right to their land, the common people now wanted the same right to the common land They demanded only the right to work

and enjoy the fruits of their labor, they declared it a shame for religion that land was lying uncultivated while many people died of hunger They were ready to acknowledge the leadership of Parliament and the army provided they were assured of the land and their labor on it was protected Short of this, they felt that they would have gained nothing from having supported Parliament in the struggle with the King [15]

The principles and aims of the True Levellers were clearly set forth by Gerard Winstanley, the intellectual leader of the movement, in his book, *The Law of Freedom in a Platform, or True Magistracy Restored*, published in 1651-52 Even though England had been proclaimed a republic, Winstanley declared, the masses were still oppressed Thus, the clergy, many of whom were enemies of freedom and outright supporters of the monarchy, continued to dominate the people Tithes were still being collected, judges continued to enforce the laws in the old arbitrary way The Lords of the Manor continued to oppress their "brothers" as of old, exacting feudal dues, and driving them off the common land for failure to pay rent The rich land owners, and especially the new gentry who were the most greedy, squeezed out the small farmers and farm laborers The worst injustices were perpetrated in the levying of taxes, the wealthy benefiting at the expense of the poor, and in the towns the people were oppressed by intolerable duties and market tolls The only thing that had changed in England's institutions, Winstanley insisted, had been the name, yet the victory over the King had been achieved not by Cromwell as an individual or by Cromwell and his officers alone, but with the help of the common people, and should therefore have been shared by all Calling on Cromwell to change not only the name but the essence of England's institutions, Winstanley outlined a complete system of a Communist society *

* With the rise and growth of capitalist farming in England in the last third of the fifteenth century, the condition of the British masses began to worsen steadily, a process which was to continue for the next three centuries It is worth noting, however, that it was precisely Crom-

Because the Levellers raised the property question in the Revolution, seeking to drive the Revolution beyond the achievement of mere political equality for the men of property, the term Leveller acquired the same significance attached later to the terms Babeuvist and communist after the eighteenth century French Revolution [16]

Meanwhile, the Presbyterians and Monarchists did not give up the struggle against the "blood-thirsty tigers of the Republic" and conspired in all the courts of Europe against the young Commonwealth Dissatisfaction grew in the army and rebellion broke out in Ireland The struggles between the Levellers and Cromwell sharpened and finally took the form of attempts at assassinating him, especially after 1654

In April 1653, dissatisfied with the Rump Parliament, Cromwell forcibly disbanded it and replaced it by the "Little Parliament," consisting of 139 selected Independent notables, who upheld his military despotism Cromwell died on September 3, 1658, and his son Richard took over the Government, but unable to carry on, he soon abdicated The Rump Parliament thereupon convened once more, but it had little support When General George Monk, commander of the armed forces in Scotland, came to London in February 1660, with the purpose of taking over the Government, the Rump Parliament dissolved itself and provided for a new Parliament of both Houses which proceeded to restore the Stuart monarchy Assembled on April 25, 1660, the new Parliament solemnly resolved that "according to the ancient and fundamental laws of this Kingdom, the government is, and ought to be, by king, lords, and commons" [17] On May 8, 1660, Charles II was proclaimed King

---

well's time which formed an exception to this process of deterioration in the lot of the British masses "So long as the Republic lasted," Marx observed in 1867, "the mass of the English people of all grades rose from the degradation into which they had sunk under the Tudors" (*Capital*, Vol I, p 821 footnote) The relative, even though temporary, improvement of the position of the British yeomen under the Republic was the direct result of the revolutionary, democratic struggle of the masses under the leadership of the Levellers

But those sections of the bourgeoisie which had conspired against the Republic had even less desire to be dominated by the extravagant and dissipated Charles II or other Stuarts secretly plotting to restore the Church of Rome In 1688, therefore, they led a new, Whig revolution, the so-called "Glorious Revolution," embarrassed neither by republican aims nor by a popular democratic movement as had been the case in the "inglorious" Revolution of 1648 They invited William and Mary of Orange to save England "from a Catholic tyranny" by heading a constitutional monarchy, which actually would be the instrument of the bourgeoisie

The Gentlemen Independents of the 1648 Revolution passed over politically into the Whig movement of 1688 which had developed into a great financial power by the end of the seventeenth century In fact, members of the Independents were the founders of the Bank of England, the establishment of which represented the first sanction of the rule of the financial bourgeoisie and which the Tories resisted on the ground that since the banks famous at that time were those of Venice, Genoa, Amsterdam and Hamburg, a bank was a republican institution which it would be dangerous to introduce in a monarchy [18] But it was not only the establishment of the Bank of England almost immediately after the ascension of William III that showed the bourgeoisie to be the real masters of England This was indicated also by the introduction of the national debt, accompanied by a new impetus to the manufacturing middle class through the consistent enforcement of the protective fiscal system [19] Indeed, from 1650 to 1750, England was the scene of a continuous struggle between the landed interest and the money interest, the aristocracy and money capital which, aided by the establishment of the modern credit system and the national debt at the end of the seventeenth century, ended with the victory of capital

By the beginning of the eighteenth century, England outstripped Dutch manufacture and began to supersede Holland

as the leading commercial power of the world It profited from the circumstance that, although Holland had lost its supremacy in commerce and industry, one of its main lines of business from 1701 to 1776 was the lending of enormous amounts of capital, especially to its great rival England, thereby repeating the process that went on between Venice and Holland in the preceding century

The road was now open for the emergence of the Industrial Revolution in 1769, the economic foundation was laid for the ascendance of bourgeois democracy.

CHAPTER II Out of the Wilderness

I

IT WAS in colonial America that the idea of one great democratic republic was first revived It was here, in the eighteenth century, that the first declaration of the rights of man was issued and the democratic trend, which seemed to have been extinguished with the British Republic, was again resumed

The British Revolution exerted a direct influence upon the American conflict To the extent that the Founding Fathers developed republican ideas during their struggle with the British Crown, they drew their intellectual inspiration from the bourgeois republicans of seventeenth century England They read Milton, Harrington, Algernon Sydney and other British republicans, as well as John Locke Harrington, whose *Oceana* also contained ideas similar to those of the Levellers, exerted little influence in his own country but was widely read by the colonists John Adams and Jefferson were familiar with his writings, and Otis confessed himself greatly indebted to the "great and incomparable" Harrington [1] Milton's views, which were so strikingly like those of the Founding Fathers, found their most complete realization in the revolutionary American republic of the eighteenth century.

The American colonists established their new commonwealth in the midst of a world dominated by monarchies that had been striving for a hundred years to obliterate the

very memory of republics By the time of the American Revolution, the foes of democracy had succeeded so well in exploiting the failure of the British Commonwealth and the republican revolts of the seventeenth century that it was generally believed republics were feasible only in tiny states. Montesquieu, Voltaire and other spokesmen of the eighteenth century French Enlightenment proclaimed it as practically an immutable law that republicanism was not convenient for a great state Even the Founding Fathers in America shared these views and regarded the new republic merely as an experiment [2]

The fact is that the American colonies took the path of revolutionary struggle against the English Crown reluctantly. Even when they finally renounced their allegiance to the British King, they did not break their attachment to the British Constitution They used the laws and Constitution of the British realm in the fight against the Crown, and when war with the motherland became the only possible solution to the conflict, they turned, not to the French ideas of popular sovereignty, but rather to the bourgeois republicans of the England of 1648 and its 1688 aftermath Indeed, only when it came to final separation did they fall back on abstract principles of liberty as set forth in the Declaration of Independence [3] The very term "republic" did not gain currency in American official documents until ten years after the War of Independence According to Jefferson's *Anas*, something of the British prejudice against the word "republican" lingered even in Washington's mind Jefferson relates that on May 23, 1793, Washington called his attention to the word "republic" in the draft of a state paper with the remark that it was a word "which he had never before seen in any of our public communications." On November 28, Jefferson records his satisfaction that the expression "our republic" had been introduced by Attorney-General Randolph in his draft of the

President's speech to Congress, and that Washington made no objection to it.[4]

The American Revolution was led by men of wealth. This flowed from the very nature of the forces engaged in the struggle and the conditions which prevailed in the colonies at the time America, on the eve of its war for independence, was in large measure a colonial replica of British society The same caste spirit prevailed, perhaps even more pronounced in the colonies As in aristocratic England, the laws weighed heavily on the poor and served to perpetuate distinctions between patricians and plebeians People were expected to dress according to their rank and keep their proper place Imprisonment for debt was widespread The jails were filthy and centers of depravity, and the whipping-post, the pillory and stocks were the daily instruments of a barbarous penal code. American political practices were likewise taken over from England The suffrage was closely restricted by property qualifications, and for office-holding these were raised to a point at which only men of wealth were eligible,[5] although the democratic struggles dating from the seventeenth century did not fail to exert a political influence in the colonies

But even though it was the democratic activities of the people that drove the revolution forward until independence was achieved, and the petty-bourgeois radicals played a leading role especially in the First Continental Congress, political leadership was essentially in the hands of the rich merchants and gentry Indeed, the constitutional means of popular participation in the conduct of government were so undeveloped at this time that party denoted little more than a connection of interest among the gentry In Boston, for example, we have the word of John Adams that three rich merchants, Thomas Hancock, Charles Althorp and Thomas Green, when united, could carry an election almost unanimously He also tells us that "half a dozen or at most a dozen families had always controlled Connecticut."[6] New York politics were determined by the attitude of the great families—the Livingstons, the

Schuylers and the Clintons In the South, political power depended almost wholly on family connection and social influence

The mass of the people lived outside the centers of political ferment The urban population was small, not one thirtieth of the whole There were no more than four cities in the entire country with more 10,000 inhabitants Boston had a population of 18,000 Philadelphia, with a population of 42,000, was the chief city One fifth of the total population of the country was to be found within the bounds of Virginia where there were no large towns[7] Furthermore, in 1775 there were only 37 newspapers in the entire country, and the only way leading men in different localities could keep one another informed of political movements was by correspondence All in all, conditions were such that only those in social relations with the governing class, that is, the gentry, were even in a position to obtain the information and undertake the organizational measures necessary for political activity That is why the men who bombarded the King and Parliament with constitutional arguments, who organized the Continental Congress, giving a national character to the revolutionary struggle, and who finally declared their independence of the British Crown, were men of wealth and privilege, the Whig bourgeoisie of colonial America

2

The fact that colonial society was dominated by the landed gentry and the urban bourgeoisie determined the fundamental character of the Revolution Nevertheless, as far as its democratic features were concerned, it was the working people of the towns, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the poor farmers of the back country who were the determining force in the struggle In this respect, the war itself proved to be the most decisive factor in the emergence of the new state as a democratic republic For the war drew the masses into the

struggle, and made it possible for them to play a role in determining the military conduct and outcome of the conflict By thus bringing forward the genuinely democratic classes, it opened the way for the operation of democratic influences at the most crucial time in the life of colonial America, the formative period of the new state and nation

Had it been left entirely up to the planter-merchant aristocracy, there would have been neither national independence nor a democratic republic A large section of this opulent gentry opposed and sabotaged the struggle and openly joined the British in the war That part of the planter-merchant aristocracy which took up arms against the Crown, sought to retain exclusive leadership of the struggle, to subordinate the participation of the masses to its own aims in the war and to restrict the democratic initiative of the people Its primary object was to remove British imperial domination and oppression which were stifling American economic life and development It feared revolution and independence as opening the way to republican rule, "the worst of all possible tyrannies" It therefore sought to wage the struggle against Britain from the top, under the slogan "Taxation without representation is tyranny," and tried to keep the people from gaining any share of the leadership It regarded the masses with contempt and was alarmed at the fact that the resistance to the Crown had "brought all the dregs to the top" in every colony United in their own revolutionary organizations, chiefly under the name of Sons of Liberty, in the key towns of the colonies, the city poor, led by such radical merchants and professionals as Sam Adams and John Lamb who realized that it was the patriotism of the masses on which the salvation of the country would finally depend, waged a fight for joint leadership of the struggle They carried on intensive revolutionary agitation and organization, prepared and distributed various types of literature, and finally proved strong enough to defeat the efforts of the rich merchants to bar them from the First Continental Congress, forcing them to hold it on

the basis of equal representation from workers, country poor, rich planters and merchants When the British sent troops to crush the resistance of the colonists, it was the working people of the cities and towns who watched and reported every one of their movements, kept the colonial Tories under surveillance, and, together with the farmers, provided the manpower for the fighting forces [8]

The fact is that in 1775, during the first stage of the armed struggle against Britain, these merchant-planters still had no thought of independence Even as military hostilities commenced, they proclaimed "an accommodation with our mother country" to be the "fondest wish of each American soul," an idea with which George Washington, on his way to assume command of the continental armies, was entirely in accord [9] The British had forced armed resistance upon them, and they were prepared to wage war, but it was for recognition of their constitutional liberties and rights by the Crown, not for the overthrow of British rule They were, consequently, not yet ready to conduct the war by *revolutionary* means, although the logic of the struggle and the intervention of the masses was soon to lead to this To wage the war in a revolutionary way, the war had to have independence as its aim, but in 1775 they had no such aim as yet. Leaving New York for the army in Cambridge, Washington realized that it might be necessary to use forcible measures against the British Governor of New York, but he hesitated to order such measures because "the seizing of a Governor [is] quite a new thing," for which he would have to ask authority from the Continental Congress.[10] Indeed, British officers and soldiers who were killing Americans and treating American prisoners as outlaws, were still regarded as fellow-citizens, while captured British officers were treated as "gentlemen" and allowed to be at large on parole, as in the case of an officer by the name of Prescott who was permitted to live in the best tavern in Philadelphia, "feasting with

gentlemen of the first rank in the province, and keeping a levee for the reception of the grandees" [11]

It was the democratic masses who pressed for the revolutionary conduct of the war, that is, for independence. They were enraged by the barbarous action of the British who devastated and burned American towns, and were alarmed and infuriated by the open treachery of the wealthy Tory aristocrats who conspired with the British against the American cause. The demand of the masses was reflected in the statement of General Greene who declared "O, could the Congress behold the distress and wretched condition of the poor inhabitants, driven from the seaport towns, it must, it would kindle a blaze of indignation against the commissioned pirates and licensed robbers People begin heartily to wish a declaration of independence" [12] The behavior of the British forces was creating a new situation General Charles Lee, who declared that God favored those with the heaviest battalions, also pressed for revolutionary action "I propose to seize every governor, government man, placeman, tory, and enemy to liberty on the continent, and to confiscate their estates," he declared, "or at least lay them under heavy contributions for the public Their persons should be secured in some of the interior towns, as hostages for the treatment of those of our party, whom the fortunes of war shall throw into their hands" [13] But General Washington did not respond to this plea, which was in accord with the desires of the democratic populace

The conservative gentry in the Continental Congress were not in favor of such revolutionary methods or of separation from Britain which these methods involved They hoped that the moderates in Parliament would be able to keep the struggle from developing into a war to the finish Furthermore, they feared the democratic aims of the masses as a threat against their own privileges and property interests The imperial restraints on colonial trade and economy which obstructed exchange among the merchants also cut the prices

of the farmers' products and the wages of the workers, and menaced their ability to become independent producers The people were therefore eager to fight for freedom against the foreign oligarchy But they also suffered from the oppression of the domestic gentry Their aims therefore went beyond those of the planter-merchant aristocracy More and more injecting their own independent organizations and demands into the struggle, they strove for freedom from both the foreign and domestic oligarchy The workers saw clearly that the time for appeals and debate had passed and that the issue could be resolved only by a vigorous resort to arms, outright independence, and the establishment of a popular, democratic government To prevent this outcome, the gentry tried to sidetrack the demand for independence and to avoid any action which would close the door to any other solution [14]

The British also understood the extent to which the masses were the driving force for resistance to the Crown, and especially their role as a military factor They adjusted their strategy accordingly and planned to cut off communication between the Northern and Southern provinces, and shift the war from New England where they were confronted by the stubborn resistance of the farmers and mechanics, to the South where they intended to release the Negro slaves, disrupt the Southern provinces and thus secure speedy victory At the same time, they tried to bribe the people who bore the brunt of the struggle while the wealthy merchants were growing rich from the war, by promising 100 acres of land to each man that enlisted plus 100 acres for his wife and 50 for each child, and demagogically appealed to the workers to escape misery and poverty by deserting the revolutionary army The British also depended on the wealthy colonial tories who entered into an extensive conspiracy with them to betray the revolutionary army and the Revolution

But the people, struggling for their freedom, refused to give in, despite the hardships and military superiority of the enemy They displayed remarkable ingenuity in supplying

arms and organizing the fighting forces for the revolutionary army. Above all, they overwhelmed the British by the revolutionary energy and fighting technique which they displayed on the battlefield The farmers and mechanics, without uniforms or the discipline of a professional army, poorly trained and even more poorly equipped, performed miracles They did more work in one night erecting fortifications than a whole British army, as British General Howe admitted, would have done in a month They developed tactical innovations, most important of which was guerrilla warfare, that dismayed the unchallenged masters of Europe's battlefields Here was a revolutionary army which had a strength all its own, far superior in purpose and quality of fighting men to the essentially mercenary army of the British Crown with its inflexible formations and its tactics of the line "In the American War of Independence," Engels declared in 1877, "these cumbrous lines came up against bands of insurgents, which although not drilled were all the better able to shoot from their rifled carbines, these rebels were fighting for their own special interests, and therefore did not desert like the mercenaries, nor did they do the English the kindness of advancing against them also in line and across the open plain, but in scattered and rapidly moving troops of sharpshooters under cover of the woods In such circumstances the line was powerless and was defeated by its invisible and intangible opponents Fighting in skirmishing order was re-invented—a new method of warfare which was the result of a change in the human material of war" [15]

The war had its own logic The Tory conspiracy and the British maneuvers deprived those sections of the gentry who still hoped for reconciliation with Britain of their last arguments. There was no way out except war to the end The Tory plot was smashed and the Continental Congress was forced to prepare for a long and bloody struggle. By June 1776, the Congress had to consider whether the united colonies should declare themselves free and independent states

The forces that demanded independence carried the day A committee appointed to draft a declaration of independence met in the home of a bricklayer, and the draft, prepared by Thomas Jefferson, was adopted on July 4 When the people heard the news, their joy "amounted almost to frenzy" The workers hurled the statue of George III from its pedestal in Bowling Green and made bullets out of it Washington disapproved of their action because it "too much resembled lawlessness and riot" [16] In some colonies the workers were the only ones to rejoice [17]

Among the first to raise the demand for national independence was Thomas Paine, the most popular and effective spokesman of the masses of people in this struggle Paine was a true and great democrat whose pamphlets and writings exerted a deep influence on the people, especially during the most difficult days of the War Following the tradition of the great humanitarians of the 17th and 18th centuries who were shocked by the extremes of wealth and wretchedness which already then characterized the newly developing capitalist system, Paine's sympathies were with the people But though he sought to protect them against the evil consequences of this system, he condemned any effort to abolish private property Yet Paine's outlook was entirely in accord with the needs of his time and with the tasks which historical development had posed for solution in America in the last quarter of the 18th century An Englishman by birth and a citizen of the world, it was in the American Revolution that Paine made his greatest contribution to freedom and earned his place among the immortals of history.

It was the workers and the common people who assured the final triumph and saved the Revolution They were the most patriotic forces in the Revolution, the most consistent champions of independence, and the most ardent advocates of a democratic republic As common soldiers, they withstood the most terrible suffering, caused as much by the greed of the speculators and stock jobbers supplying the army

as by the British blockade. While the masses sacrificed everything for victory, the merchants and manufacturers profiteered, bled the people through soaring prices in violation of price-control legislation, and grew even richer on government contracts, currency speculation and land jobbing Despite all the hardships and the constant retreats and defeats of the revolutionary army during the war, the workers and masses remained loyal to the cause of the Revolution. And in the long run, this proved decisive.

The revolutionary war for independence made a fundamental contribution towards strengthening the democratic conditions of American development It destroyed the system of indentured servitude by freeing the thousands of indentured servants who enlisted in the revolutionary army and by halting the importation of new servants It gave strength, confidence and prestige to the workers and common people who brought victory over the enemy. It gave them a new economic asset by opening up vast quantities of new land which the imperial proclamation of 1763 had closed to settlement. And it brought them important political gains, embodied in the Bills of Rights of nearly all State Constitutions. Many of these disestablished the churches, guaranteed freedom of worship, prohibited voice voting, and abolished primogeniture and entail [18]

But with all this, the influence of the bourgeoisie remained dominant The speculators were the first to profit from the opening up of the new lands The great estates of the Tory Loyalists fell into the hands of the wealthy few, and the planter-merchant aristocracy retained political power, as was soon to be revealed by the outcome of the struggle over the formation of the new national government.

3

Once independence was achieved, the struggle began for the determination of the character of the new state, lasting

until 1787 when the new federal and state governments were formed This struggle reflected the social distinctions prevailing in the country Though monarchy was excluded in a society in which hereditary titles had been practically nonexistent, many of the "well-born" dreamed of it, and even though these "well-born" were unable to establish a formal aristocracy, they were clearly convinced that government responsibility belonged exclusively to them [19] Most of the members of the Constitutional Convention which set up the new government and which adopted the Constitution making the United States a republic, belonged to the merchant and landed gentry They took it as a matter of course that they, who were in possession of the means and the ability to take care of such matters, would control every branch of the Government and conduct public affairs [20]

John Adams, who condemned hereditary political privilege and insisted that there should be equality before the law, nevertheless contended that differences of birth and wealth exerted "a natural and inevitable influence upon society" After all, did not America have its "laborers, yeomen, gentlemen, esquires, honorable gentlemen and excellent gentlemen?" [21] Alexander Hamilton, who was open in his monarchic leanings and his contempt for the people, declared that "all communities divide themselves into the few and the many The first are rich and well-born, the other the mass of people .. The people are turbulent and changing They seldom judge or determine right Give therefore to the first class a distinct, permanent share in the government They will check the unsteadiness of the second" [22]

What the rich and wealthy really feared about the republic as a state form was that its logical development led beyond the rule of the privileged and wealthy to the rule of the people This fear of democracy was expressed very clearly by Gouverneur Morris, a close friend of George Washington, who proclaimed that property is the basis of all government and described democracy as "that disease of which all repub-

lics have perished, except those which have been overthrown by force" [23] In March 1789, he wrote to the Marquis de la Luzerne "Republicanism is a moral influenza" [24] Shays' rebellion against foreclosures and the persecution of debtors, which occurred in Western Massachusetts in 1786, and the disturbances in New Hampshire and Rhode Island, had greatly frightened the delegates to the Constitutional Convention and only confirmed their conviction that democracy was the hidden disease that constituted the Achilles' heel of every republic They sought to meet this by building up a governmental structure which they hoped would curb and control these democratic tendencies For this purpose they introduced the system of checks and balances into the Constitution of the new republic as a safeguard against "tyranny," the "tyranny" of the many, the masses of people who might use state power against the propertied classes

When this system was criticized by Turgot and Mably, world renowned French statesmen and thinkers, and the latter one of the theoretical forerunners of French communism, John Adams came to its defense In an elaborate review and analysis of the history of republics, he argued that a pure democratic state like that dreamt of by French philosophers was impossible Although Adams accepted the term "republic" as describing the new American government, it was not in the sense implying popular rule In correspondence with Roger Sherman, therefore, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, Adams called it a "monarchical republic," a classification which he had applied to England also and by which he meant that the custody of the executive power was an individual trust and that it was also republican inasmuch as the Constitution provided for the representation of the people [25] This was generally the view taken by the authors of the *Federalist*, who referred to the new Government as republican. But, as Madison argued, it is a republic which should by no means be classed with the democratic republics of antiquity in which the people ruled "Democracies," Madi-

son wrote, "have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention, have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property, and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths . The true distinction between these (ancient republics) and the American governments lies in the total exclusion of the people in their collective capacity from any share in the latter" [26]

4

Despite the fear of democracy, the new Government took the form of a democratic republic All the pains of the Constitutional Convention to fashion a government machine which would control the democratic tendencies they dreaded, proved unable to stem the democratic upsurge. Fisher Ames put his finger on the reason for this when he remarked "Constitutions are but paper, society is but a substratum of government" [27] The social and historical conditions were such that the Constitution could not resist adjustment to the democratic development

Unlike the British gentry who dealt with a settled population trained to habits of deference and unable to escape from landlord control, the American gentry were faced with entirely different conditions The authority which they exercised during the greater part of the colonial period because of the pressure of the French and Indians upon the English settlements lost much of its foundation after the expulsion of the European powers and the driving back of the Indians There was practically no end to the amount of unoccupied land, and coercive social arrangements were not so easy to maintain, as the gentry soon discovered. The need to obtain settlers was paramount and caused democratic inducements which early took the form of political franchises [28] Thus William Grayson of Virginia, who hoped for speedy land sales and lower taxes, observed that "the want of inhabitants"

was "perhaps our only calamity" Tench Coxe sought to attract settlers to Pennsylvania with the argument that it offered civil and religious liberties, land on easy terms, voting citizenship after two years of residence, and freedom from Old World restraints on trade and industry.[29]

The need for making such democratic concessions in order to secure settlers without, at the same time, undermining their political power, presented the gentry with a dilemma, the only escape from which they saw in the presence of a strong enemy on America's borders "We need as all nations do," wrote Fisher Ames to Rufus King in 1802, "the compression on the outside of our circle of a formidable neighbor, whose presence shall at all times excite stronger fears than demagogues can inspire the people with towards their government" [30] In face of the actual conditions and events, this was merely self-delusion on the part of the gentry, who thereby only demonstrated that there was no escape from the "dilemma" of democracy.

The inexorable influence of the presence of an unlimited extent of land for democratization of the country which the Founding Fathers could not escape, was a source of democratic development that had already asserted itself at the very beginning of the colonization of America in the seventeenth century The aristocrats of England had twice attempted to set up in America a landed social order of a feudal character: the first time during the turmoil of Stuart England, when hundreds of entrepreneurs came to America in the hope of establishing ducal and manorial estates like those which had been the models in Europe for five hundred years, the second time between 1660 and 1667, after the defeat of the British Republic and the restoration of Charles II to the throne But both of these efforts failed because of the conditions under which settlers were secured for the colonization of the new country These included prospective homesteads for all who wished them, the right to elect assemblies and freedom of religious beliefs and conduct.

To persuade people to migrate to the colonial wilderness and become workers on the proposed manorial estates, the entrepreneurs and ship captains had to agree to terms which played a vital role in the formation of the early North American character. Most men and women who went to the Chesapeake Bay country between 1620 and 1660 stipulated that they would take the risks and become indentured servants for five or six years only on such specific terms As a result, the entrepreneurs paid six pounds each for the transportation of servants to their destination and signed contracts in which they promised indentured workers, at the expiration of their terms, a tract of land, a new suit of clothes, a heifer, two pigs, firearms and the simpler farm tools.

These were the basic conditions on which the majority of white people became citizens of the North American colonies from Maine to Georgia. And with vast stretches of land not far away, these workers on the lands of the would-be manor lords of Virginia and Maryland were not disposed to become submissive serfs They responded to all efforts at making serfs of them by running away to the Frontier in such great numbers that more laws were enacted on this than any other subject during a period of thirty years, but the laws could not be enforced effectively. The guarantee of lands and freedom to indentured servants defeated the formation of a stratified social order along feudal lines This guarantee was reinforced by the fact that plantations were constantly moving and changing, thereby preventing the permanent attachment of less ambitious workers to the soil [31]

Under these conditions, where feudal institutions were unable to take root, no dependent peasantry developed in America There was no native nobility and no feudal customs Land was held in fee simple Estates were not entailed and the custom of primogeniture did not generally prevail [32]

In a secondary way, religion also proved to be a source of democratic development in America. In the colonies, unlike the mother country, the church was separate from the state.

As in politics, so in religion, the colonists had belonged to the most progressive parties in England In fact, the first republicans in America were Puritan ministers, namely, Roger Williams, Thomas Hooker and John Wise Like other colonists, they were acquainted with the moderate republican principles of government expressed in the works of Milton, Sydney, and others, and were ardent proponents of democratic views The democratic outlook of Thomas Hooker and Roger Williams was embodied in the constitutions of the colonies which they founded [33]

The fact is, however, that for a hundred years after the establishment of the first colonies, religion was essentially a matter of the few The Anglican Church in Virginia was under the management and control of the planter aristocracy. In New England, because of social restrictions, the membership of the churches was made up of a small minority The Presbyterians, the Congregationalists and the Reform bodies fully shared Calvin's low opinion of the common people The Quakers, especially after the adoption of birthright membership, came to be more and more a prosperous upper class group. The early New England Fathers, who considered democracy the "meanest" of all forms of government, regarded it as their principal task to see that "the elect," the chosen of God, controlled in both Church and state

To the extent that religion pentrated to the masses, it took the form of colonial revivalism, spread by colonial preachers who taught that every man was expected to find his own way to God and stressed the doctrine that all men are equal in the sight of God, encouraging the desire of the common people to take part in the management of their own affairs. The revivalist preachers recognized no social distinctions and sought to reach all classes of men, slaves as well as masters, poor as well as rich, ignorant as well as learned. To them, all were sinners and in need of a saviour whose grace alone availed. The revivals were thus a great leveling force in

American colonial society, they sowed the basic seeds of democracy widely and effectively.[34]

5

During the thirteen years between the First Continental Congress of 1774 and the adoption of the Constitution establishing the new American Republic in 1787, the basic democratic forces of the Revolution played a decisive role in the prosecution of the War and in maintaining the unity of the colonies until independence was won The revolutionary petty-bourgeois democrats who dominated the first Continental Congress were responsible for the Declaration of Independence which had been drafted by a committee of the Congress headed by the thirty-two year old Thomas Jefferson Although they had to share leadership with the rich merchants and landed gentry in the Second Continental Congress, they were able to force the adoption of the Articles of Confederation which kept the colonies on the road to the establishment of a single republic The common people, consisting of the poor farmers, artisans, mechanics and sailors, provided the man-power for fighting the war and, as such, bore the brunt of the struggle It was these democratic groups that enforced the revolutionary dictatorship and terror against the Tories which was less violent than in the subsequent French Revolution only because of the absence of feudal conditions in the colonies.

But as the war progressed, political power shifted entirely to the Whig bourgeoisie, the bulk of whom later formed the Federalist Party It was they who dominated the secret Convention which adopted the Constitution of 1787. When Thomas Jefferson, who had been sent to France in 1784 to replace the aged Franklin as American Minister to that country, received a copy of the new Constitution in 1787, he was disturbed to find that neither a Bill of Rights for the people nor rotation in the presidential office had been provided for.

He liked the idea of a central government functioning without recurrence to the States, the separation of the executive and judiciary from the legislature, and the establishment of a Congress composed of two Houses But because the Constitution disregarded the democratic rights of the people, Jefferson declared himself "nearly a neutral" in relation to it.[35]

When he returned to the United States in 1790, he found the nation divided "into a minority enriched, and a majority furnishing the riches" and the new Government in the hands of the wealthy merchants, the landed and professional aristocracy Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, was using the Government to increase the wealth of the propertied groups He sought to attach "certificate men," stock-jobbers, speculators and monied aristocrats to the Government [36] His financial measures, funding the public debt, enriched his wealthy friends at the expense of the farmers and artisans who were burdened with high taxes which paid for the operation of Hamilton's plan The people, who had sought to achieve greater democratic gains, realized that they were in danger of losing the things for which they had sacrificed and fought during the Revolution They were highly dissatisfied with the situation and pressed for a Bill of Rights.

The struggle between the popular masses and the rich and well-born who controlled the Government became so sharp by 1790 that the country was divided into two distinct camps. "The line is now drawn so clearly," Jefferson declared in 1793, "as to show on one side (1) the fashionable circles of Philadelphia, New York, Boston and Charleston (natural aristocrats), (2) Merchants trading on British capital, (3) Paper men (All the old Tories are found in some one of these descriptions) On the other side are (1) Merchants trading on their own capital, (2) Irish merchants, (3) Tradesmen, mechanics, farmers and every other possible description of our citizens." [37]

On his return from France, Jefferson had been appointed Secretary of State Although he had grasped the basic situa-

tion in the country at that time and noted that, in their fear of the masses, the ruling circles were showing "a preference for kingly over republican government," Jefferson did not immediately see the full significance of Hamilton's funding scheme In 1790, therefore, he said of himself "I am neither Federalist nor anti-Federalist, I am of neither party, nor yet a trimmer between parties" [88] By 1791, however, a bitter antagonism developed between Jefferson and Hamilton over the excise and the national bank proposed in Hamilton's treasury report The struggle between the two men was to become the underlying pattern of the national political struggle for the next thirty years

Hamilton advocated the suppression of popular tendencies and democracy with an iron hand Jefferson insisted that the people were the best repository for political power, and sought to give democracy the freest scope Hamilton fought for a strong, centralized national government dedicated to the interests of the bourgeoisie, and, for this purpose, advocated a life-long, even hereditary executive or monarch, with State governors holding their commissions at the national pleasure, and a Congress constructed on the English model of Lords and Commons Jefferson countered with an assertion of States' Rights which he regarded as "a precious reliance" in face of an administration dominated by Hamilton and his friends, and insisted on distributive rather than consolidated functions of the Government Hamilton was pro-British and approved of the corruption then prevalent in the British Parliament Jefferson hated the British and was friendly to revolutionary France

He had left France with an enthusiasm for the bourgeois democratic ideology which had permeated all the anti-feudal classes in that country, and eager to help the new American Republic develop into a strong, progressive nation whose achievement would be a model and an inspiration to all humanity But he was amazed to find that the Federalist leaders in New York were outspoken in their support of British

monarchism and their desire for hereditary government. As he mixed in their circles, he found himself "the only advocate on the republican side of the question" [39] Even John Adams had abated in his resentment against British forms of government and was frankly hostile to the Revolution in France And as Jefferson joined Washington's Cabinet, he became convinced that the President was surrounded by men who had monarchical designs When he came into open conflict with Hamilton in 1791, General Knox, Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris and the Eastern Federalists attacked him as a hypocrite, a flatterer of the people, a philosopher of crude abstractions, a false generalizer, a worshiper of France, and a "semi-maniac" [40] The struggle raged during the fall elections of 1792, and the antagonism between Jefferson and Hamilton grew Hamilton fought to oust Jefferson from the Cabinet. The stage was being set for the emergence of new party formations.

As the financial projects of the Treasury developed, divisions began to take place in the Federalist camp. On the one hand, the orthodox Federalists represented the commercial and banking groups with such spokesmen as Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris and Robert Morris On the other hand, a powerful element in the Middle States, as well as most Southern statesmen, began to draw away from the Federalists. This group, of considerable size, stood midway between the Hamiltonians and the Jeffersonian republicans, the contemporary newspapers often referred to them as "moderates." This group, of which John Adams was the spokesman, represented the middle class in the cities and the middle group of farmers.

At no time was Adams' position on economic issues within the sphere of practical politics acceptable to the commercial group Furthermore, because of the fact that during the Revolution Adams displayed radical tendencies by being among the foremost in pressing the adoption of drastic measures against England, the Federalist conservatives always retained

a lingering suspicion of him It was not until the close of the Revolution, when he produced political writings between 1787 and 1790 which were to their liking, that he won their applause, although these works alienated Adams from the Republicans

As the legislation advocated by the Federalists, under the leadership of Hamilton, became more and more clearly designed in the exclusive interests of the commercial and banking groups, the "moderates" became restive. Thus, Madison and Hamilton, who had been united on the question of the adoption of the Constitution, diverged almost immediately thereafter, leaving Adams as the spokesman of the "moderates" within the Federalist Party and among the more conservative republicans However, Adams' efforts to control the policy of the Federalist Party did not succeed [41]

Soon after Washington's re-election to the Presidency, the struggle which had developed over Hamilton's financial program was still further aggravated and sharpened by the dethronement and execution of Louis XVI in France and the war which Britain organized against the new French Republic The American people were aroused to great enthusiasm by the establishment of the French Republic Hamilton and his supporters, who regarded the rise of democracy in France as a great calamity, rushed to the defense of British interests. Jefferson had been anxious to leave the Cabinet, but at Washington's request held on until the end of 1793 when he retired from office as Secretary of State. The more he had seen of the Administration, the more disgusted he had become He was determined to cease being a counselor to a Federalist administration and to rally the democratic forces for control of the Government. He was immensely popular at the time he withdrew from the Administration, and in 1794 organized the Republican Party which became the political expression of the democratic camp in the country.

The people, aroused by the domestic and foreign policies of the Government, had sought to defend themselves by organ-

izing democratic societies like the Sons of Liberty of the Revolutionary period These popular societies, the first of which appeared in Philadelphia in 1793, grew out of the discontent of the poor settlers and craftsmen, the farmers and sailors, their desire to preserve liberty and the Republic, and their opposition to all aristocratic measures at home and abroad Between 1793 and 1800, 42 such popular societies were organized whose members ranged from rich merchants to sailors and militiamen, with their base made up of those who had waged the struggle for independence as common soldiers and members of revolutionary organizations They were determined to keep the country from being taken over by the foes of liberty, and as in 1776, so after 1790, they united with all democratic elements to save the nation, equality and the Republic [42]

Supported by the people, Jefferson ran for President in the elections of 1796 But John Adams, the candidate of the Federalists, carried the office by a close vote in the Electoral College, and Jefferson was chosen Vice President In 1798 the Federalists enacted a series of repressive measures known as the Alien and Sedition Acts in an effort to crush American democracy. But the people fought back under Jefferson's leadership, and in the elections of 1800 democracy was triumphant, electing Jefferson President of the United States

Thomas Jefferson was a man of encyclopedic stature, whose interests ranged from agriculture to the fine arts He was a student and a thinker whose intellectual curiosity embraced nearly every field of human knowledge including philosophy, natural and applied science, ancient and modern languages, and mathematics A man of broad culture, a true humanitarian, and an astute political leader, he was above all a consistent democrat, cut from the same cloth as the great personalities of the French Enlightenment But, like them, he was essentially a representative of bourgeois-democratic society, the exponent of a great, independent nation, the enlightened spokesman of a progressive democracy whose economic

foundations were still primarily of a freehold agrarian character. When the popular democratic societies, organized on the model of the French Jacobin societies, emerged as a driving force in the struggle against Federalist reaction, and were held responsible for the "Whiskey insurrection" of Western Pennsylvania, he refused to sanction them, although he challenged the epithet of "self-created societies" which Washington directed against them in his message to Congress. Although he hated monarchs, he felt that the French Revolution should have stopped with a constitutional monarchy He greeted the establishment of the French Republic, but he condemned the revolutionary acts which crushed the counter-revolution and saved the republic as "atrocities" of the French "rabble," and contrasted them with the "steady and solid" character of the American people [43] When Monroe returned humiliated from France, where he had glorified the bloody bourgeois counter-revolution, Jefferson had no word of criticism of his position, and took him under his political wing Indeed, in later years, Jefferson agreed fully with Lafayette that the split between the constitutional-monarchist and the republican wings of the bourgeoisie was a misfortune which opened the way for the Jacobin masses and the Terror headed by Robespierre Jefferson, the political and ideological leader of the democratic masses, during the first twenty years of the existence of the new Republic, was unquestionably the man in whose life and thought the humanism and internationalism of the eighteenth century bourgeois democratic revolution found its highest expression in America, but he never went beyond the farthest horizon of that revolution These bourgeois limitations did not diminish the greatness of his contributions to the history of the American people and the world.

CHAPTER III Dawn Breaks In Europe

I

THE American Revolution initiated a new era of the ascendancy of bourgeois democracy on both sides of the Atlantic Men like Thomas Jefferson, who declared that America was "acting for all mankind," [1] realized the world significance of the Revolution The common people, too, who had faith in the future of the new republic for which they had made such great sacrifices, were confident that its example would be followed in other parts of the world

Europe was in such a state of feudal decay and the spirit of defiance and rebellion against the old order was growing so strong that a major democratic upheaval of the caliber of the American Revolution was bound to give a great impetus to the struggle for democracy in such countries as France, England, Germany, Italy, and even far-away Russia America, after all, had long been the object of great commercial struggles among the European powers, and since the Revolution was a struggle against England, the dominant power of Europe, the entire continent was naturally interested in its outcome. As a colonial appendage of Europe, America was really part of the European system of relations, and consequently shared in the mutual influence of events which was a regular feature of the development of the nations of Europe for whom the struggle against feudalism was a common historical task Even in those days of few newspapers and poor

communication, therefore, the news that came thundering in from the Atlantic reached into the farthest corners of the continent and was received with almost universal rejoicing. All anti-feudal classes hailed the great event the constitutional-minded nobles, the upper bourgeoisie that wanted a constitutional monarchy, the moderate bourgeoisie that dreamed of a republic, the revolutionary intelligentsia, as well as the men of the people It was a blaze of light in a world shrouded in feudal darkness, and even those who later found ground for difference greeted the conflagration As the Count of Segur reported in his *Memoirs* "The first shot of the cannon fired in the new hemisphere resounded throughout Europe with the rapidity of lightning . The courageous daring of the Americans electrified all spirits and excited general admiration" [2]

It was in France, where the American cause evoked the widest response, that the bourgeois democratic revolution was to register its next major triumph At the time of the American Revolution, France was an agrarian state with a population of more than 24,000,000 peasants, burghers and workers ruled by no more than 240,000 privileged aristocrats The peasantry, carrying the entire parasitic structure on its back, was plundered by the state, the tax-exempt clergy and the nobility who lived in idleness and luxury at Versailles or on their estates With the serfs degraded and hungry, the countryside was in a state of decay From the end of the reign of Louis XVand throughout the reign of Louis XVI, agriculture was in the grip of a chronic crisis The peasants deserted the estates *en masse* and fled to the cities where they were unable to secure employment As a result the cities were full of beggars Even by the middle of the seventeenth century, the number was so great that a kingdom of vagabonds was established in Paris In 1777, the third year of Louis XVI's reign, the number of beggars in the country was estimated at 1,200,000 The Monarchy tried to meet this enforced transformation of the peasants into urban vagabonds and

paupers by passing the Ordinance of July 13, 1777 according to which every man in good health from sixteen to sixty years of age, if without means of subsistence and not practicing a trade, was to be sent to the galleys[3] Louis XVI was truly the *roi des gueux,* King of the beggars

While the peasants were thus weighed down by feudal burdens, the bourgeoisie of the towns were sufficiently developed by the latter half of the eighteenth century to begin to aspire to political power Ever since the beginning of the seventeenth century, French statesmen had made various attempts to encourage manufactures under strict regulation and police supervision. But it was not until the middle of the eighteenth century that production really began to develop in a sustained fashion and many French cities blossomed into substantial manufacturing centers However, the feudal privileges and the insatiable demands of the Monarchy, which was reduced to financial insolvency by a heritage of debt and extravagant and useless expenditures, were a burden on commerce and industry and only served to sharpen the antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the feudal order. The intellectuals of France gave theoretical expression to these antagonisms between the privileged minority and the overwhelming majority of the peasantry, bourgeoisie and urban masses. Beneath the surface of society, the revolution was maturing.

Under these circumstances, the response to the American Revolution was instantaneous The hearts of Frenchmen, as the Count of Segur reported, "throbbed at the news of the awakening of liberty, striving to throw off the yoke of arbitrary power"[4] Benjamin Franklin personally testified to the intense interest with which American affairs were followed in France and the democratic impact of the American Revolution. "All Europe," Franklin wrote from Paris in May 1777, "is on our side of the question, as far as applause and good wishes to carry them. Those who live under arbitrary power do nevertheless approve of liberty, and wish for it, they al-

most despair of recovering it in Europe, they read the translations of our separate colony Constitutions with rapture.... It is a common observation here, that our cause is the cause of all mankind, and that we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own." [5] Franklin, himself, had published and spread the State Constitutions and the Declaration of Independence throughout France in 1783, which in a few years were to serve as models for the French in their own Revolution

The Whig character of the American Revolution evoked a favorable response among the French bourgeoisie. French thinkers and writers pointed to the United States as showing the road that must be followed, they pointed to its religious toleration, its freedom of the press and the absence of feudal privilege, and the political sovereignty of the people They were of the opinion that the very existence of the American democratic republic would have profound consequences for the whole world

2

The Great French Revolution was directed against the rotten and corrupt feudal system which hampered the growth of trade and capital, impoverished the urban masses and held the peasantry in intolerable bondage The immediate sequence of events which led up to it had begun in the winter of 1783 when France began to suffer from a severe economic crisis affecting all classes This crisis was aggravated by the unfavorable trade treaty with England of 1786 which resulted in closing down factories and a drastic reduction of trade It was further aggravated by two years of harvest failures in 1788 and 1789. The crisis culminated in revolution because of the starvation of the people and the breakdown in the distribution of food supplies for the capital.

At the same time, financial difficulties compelled Louis XVI to convoke the Estates of the Realm for the purpose of se-

curing the assistance of the bourgeoisie The Estates met at Versailles on May 5, 1789, but the bourgeoisie was determined to abolish the special privileges of the nobility and clergy and secure political liberty before granting the financial demands of the King The ensuing struggle between the King and the Third Estate, led by the bourgeoisie, resulted three weeks later in the transformation of the Estates of the Realm into a National Assembly which proceeded to draft a constitution embodying the demands of the bourgeoisie It was the intervention of the famished artisan masses in this struggle against the King which drove it onto the path of revolution The people stormed the Bastille on July 14 and compelled the Assembly to move to Paris The French Revolution was on the way

Two years passed before the Constitution was finally adopted, but, in the meantime, the Assembly proceeded to abolish feudal obstacles to domestic trade, to confiscate Church lands and to dissolve the medieval guilds New paper money, called *assignats*, was issued, profiteers and speculators in currency and the confiscated Church land made their appearance A Declaration of the Rights of Man was adopted proclaiming all men free and equal and the object of society to be the maintenance of the inalienable human rights of freedom, property and security As a result of the intervention of the Parisian masses in support of the Assembly, the King was compelled to sign this Declaration on October 4, 1789

The big bourgeoisie, which dominated the Constituent Assembly, now felt that it had achieved its goal—a limited monarchy and a constitution It was ready to reach a compromise with the Old Order and was prepared to put down any popular movement with the big National Guard, headed by Lafayette, which was at the disposal of the Assembly. Although it abolished some feudal privileges, suffrage was restricted to the bourgeoisie, and it even tried to enforce payment of redemption and feudal dues.

From 1790 to June 1791, the Assembly endeavored to sta-

bilize a constitutional monarchy It finally adopted the draft constitution in 1791 dividing all citizens into two groups (1) active citizens, who were defined as those paying a definite and fairly high direct tax amounting to not less than the wages of three days' work, and who possessed some land or other immovable property, only these had the right to elect deputies or become members of the National Assembly and have a share in the municipal administration, (2) passive citizens, who included the entire working class and petty bourgeoisie [6]

But the King refused to subordinate himself to the bourgeoisie and rule as a constitutional monarch When he attempted to flee from Paris on June 20, 1791, with the object of assuming command of a royalist army backed up by Austrian troops, the people intercepted his flight and brought him back to the capital The Revolution could not stand still now. The Constitutionalists regarded the King as the necessary coping stone to the Constitution The revolutionary masses, however, regarded the King as a hostage held by the French people in face of a hostile reactionary Europe

At this time the idea of a republic was first put forward, and it finally became clear that there were two parties among those who had framed the Constitution, the Constitutional Royalists and the Republicans The Constitutionalists were great admirers of the American Revolution but they had no intention of establishing a republic. The people of Paris were opposed to restoring the King and wanted the Assembly to declare a republic. On July 17, 1791, they held a big popular demonstration on the Field of Mars in behalf of a republic. But the big bourgeoisie was anxious to retain the monarchy at any price and feared popular republican agitation It felt that "one step further in the direction of still greater freedom will mean the destruction of the throne, and one step further in the direction of equality will mean the abolition of property" [7] It therefore sent the National Guard, under Lafayette's personal leadership, to fire on the demonstration

The slaughter of July 17, 1791 was followed by police terror The Assembly, which had curbed the arbitrary powers of the monarchy with the help of the people, now invoked the aid of absolutism in order to attack the people and protect property As a result, the people had to wage a struggle against both the Old Order and the big bourgeoisie which had allied itself with the former against the people and which had no intention of solving the political, social and economic tasks of the Revolution The Constitution of 1791 did not solve the peasant question, and the enrichment of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by the impoverishment of the workers, artisans and large sections of the petty bourgeoisie. The Old Order did not disappear The hunger and distress of the masses, the peasants' hatred of the landlords and the efforts of the absolutist governments of Europe to prevent the establishment of a democratic government in France, drove the Revolution forward

By October 1, 1791, when the new Legislative Assembly convened, the Constitutionalists had lost control to the Girondist Party, the republican wing of the bourgeoisie, which admired the Whig character of the American Revolution. This party, however, composed of the deputies representing the well-to-do bourgeoisie of the Gironde, likewise ignored the demands of the people, refused to adopt measures for the final, legal abolition of the feudal system and feudal dues, and refused to legalize the peasants' right to the land which they had seized from the lords or to fix maximum food prices for the towns The Girondins vacillated between the monarchy and democracy

Meanwhile, counter-revolution at home and abroad, headed by the King, was continuing its conspiracies It was in the name of the King that the coalition of the feudal governments of Austria, Prussia and Russia opened war on France in April 1792 By June it became clear that the weak French armies were defeated and that it would not be long before the invaders would reach Paris and crush the Revolution

The King, who had been compelled to accept a revolutionary ministry headed by a Girondin, now felt that victory was assured and dismissed the ministry on June 13, while royalist risings began to break out all over France. Attacked directly by the King, the Girondins had to agree to the mobilization of the masses for a new rising against the Monarchy which the people called the "Austrian Committee" in recognition of the true nature of the French Court On August 10, the people attacked and captured the Royal palace of the Tuileries Three days later, the King and his family were seized and imprisoned, and the first stage of the Revolution had come to an end.

The rising of August 10, 1792 was organized and headed by a new revolutionary power, the commune of Paris, whose moving spirit was Marat and which represented the Parisian masses Spurred by the defeats at the front and the counter-revolutionary conspiracies at home, the people of Paris were determined to put an end to the counter-revolution before proceeding to the front The feudal coalition was threatening to drown the Revolution in the blood of the French people, one of its armies was within a few days' march of Paris In fact, on September 2, Verdun fell and the Duke of Brunswick boasted that he would soon dine in Paris The republicans in Paris realized the danger from those who did not care what became of France so long as the Monarchy were restored. On September 2 and 3, they therefore seized 1600 counter-revolutionists in the prisons of Paris and executed them. They forced the Legislative Assembly to dissolve and to convene a new revolutionary body which was elected by universal suffrage

The new Assembly, called the Convention, met on September 20, 1792 and proclaimed France a democratic republic September 22 was designated as the first day of the first year of the republic Louis XVI was deposed, the estates of the refugee nobles confiscated, all feudal dues were wiped out and universal suffrage was restored The majority of the

Convention consisted of elements led by the Girondins, the moderate republicans. The revolutionary minority consisted chiefly of the Paris deputies, known as the Jacobins or Mountain Party While the Convention declared as its foundation the sovereignty of the people and the abolition of royalty, it also decreed that landed and other property was sacred forever.

The Convention could maintain its position only with the support of the proletarian masses, which was given solely on the condition that the material conditions of the workers be improved by the new regime, which it did not do The Girondins thought that the Revolution should have ended August 10 Measures necessary for the welfare of the people they regarded as anarchy to be severely repressed Disputes quickly arose between the Girondins and Jacobins in the Convention over fundamental questions

In January 1793 the chief question before the Convention was the Monarchy. The trial of the King began Proof of his negotiations with the representatives of the European Alliance sealed his fate The bulk of the Girondins voted for his death, but only out of compulsion On January 21 the King was beheaded, and immediately England and Spain declared war on France Tory England would not tolerate a democratic republic across the channel

The truce between the parties which had been effected over the execution of the King came to an end. The Girondins and the Jacobins fought over the question of the peasantry, food supplies and fiscal policies—over whether all feudal burdens should be abolished without compensation, whether communal property should be left in the hands of the village community, whether war should be declared on speculators and those who hoarded supplies waiting for a rise in prices, whether a law should be passed fixing a minimum contribution of grain and other articles of necessity, whether especially high contributions should be demanded of the rich and whether political terrorism should be adopted at the moment.

The Girondins opposed every attack on property They protested against special capital taxation, opposed the introduction of a grain tax and defended the principle of free trade But the Jacobins, who pressed for land settlement and maximum food prices, for a strong executive to crush the counter-revolution and for the "Republic, one and indivisible," were able to overcome the Girondins They answered the Girondin attempt to suppress the Paris Sections by surrounding the Convention with troops and securing a decree which drove the Girondins from the Convention on May 31, 1793 The latter hurried to the Provinces, raising the standard of revolt among the peasants of the Vendée Two-thirds of the Departments of France rose against Paris and the Convention But the city poor and small peasantry saved the Revolution Twenty-nine Girondin leaders were arrested on June 2, 1793.

From this time on, until the victory of the counter-revolution on July 27, 1794, the Revolution was led by the party of the proletarian masses With the bulk of the Girondins out, the Jacobins proceeded to a vigorous defense and development of the Revolution They adopted a new democratic constitution, the Constitution of 1793, raised new armies, instituted revolutionary terror to crush the internal counter-revolution, executed the traitors and saved Paris and France from the foreign invaders.

The new Constitution of 1793 provided for universal suffrage and the plebiscite and declared that it was the duty of society to protect equality, liberty, security and property. But unlike the Constitution of 1791, the new Constitution declared that "society owes support to the needy citizens, it provides them with work or secures to those incapable of work the means of existence" [8] Since the country was still torn by struggle, the Convention decided to postpone the date when the Constitution would be put into effect until more peaceful times. France was now ruled by a dictatorship of the revolutionary government, pursuing a broad social and

economic policy and supported by the workers in town and country

The Jacobin camp, however, was far from being a homogeneous group, and once it became clear that the Revolution was saved and a program of positive construction had to be undertaken, acute factional struggles developed within the Convention in the winter of 1793 and the spring of 1794 On the Right in the Convention were Danton, Desmoulins and others, representing bourgeois property interests This group included not a few who had grown rich from the Revolution Danton, himself, was involved in speculations and negotiations with Pitt and previously with agents of the French King In the center were Robespierre, Saint-Just and Couthon, representing the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie On the left were the adherents of Marat, Hebert and Chaumette, representing the ruined sections of the petty bourgeoisie, the artisans and shopkeepers On the extreme left were the "Levellers," led by the Abbé Jacques Roux, Varlet and Leclerc, representing the impoverished working and petty bourgeois masses of Paris.

The Levellers, who laid great stress on economic demands, were still striving in the summer of 1793 for the inclusion in the Constitution of a reference to the struggle against the rich The Convention, having disposed of the Girondins, thereupon hastened to dispose of the Levellers and their leader, the Priest Jacques Roux, in the autumn of 1793 Roux and his colleagues had refused to support Robespierre and criticized the Constitution on the ground that it did not affect the war profiteers, the land and exchange speculators and the forestallers "Freedom," Roux had declared, "is only a delusion if one class is able to starve another, if the rich man, through his monopoly, has powers of life and death over the poor The Republic is nothing more than a phantom if the counter-revolution manifests itself in the continuously rising prices of foodstuffs, which three-quarters of the citizens are unable to procure without shedding tears. The support of

the *Sansculottes* for the Revolution and the Constitution will never be gained so long as the handiwork of the forestallers is not destroyed The war which the rich wage against the poor at home is more terrible than the war which the foreigner wages against France It is the bourgeoisie who have enriched themselves out of the Revolution for four years, worse than the landed nobility is the new nobility of commerce, which oppresses us and then forces up prices higher and higher, and no one can see any end to the process. Is the property of a swindler more sacred than the life of a man?"[9]

In April 1794 Robespierre proceeded to carry out the government's program of social and economic measures. He wanted a "society of equal property holders"—the abolition of poverty and the division of the land among the needy, a "realm of virtue" where agriculture was to be the main occupation of the people

Robespierre, it is true, fought successfully against agrarian communism, at the same time, he wanted to destroy the France of the bourgeoisie and transform it into an agrarian republic of equal proprietors, which brought down on him the hatred of the bourgeoisie Curtois, a bourgeois speculator, for instance, in a speech to the Convention on the 9th Thermidor (July 27, 1794), accused Robespierre of wishing to limit the accumulation of capital "You dull-witted and bloodthirsty equalitarians," he declared, "you will reach your goal only when you have sapped the foundations of all trading relations, when you have buried wealth and trade under your ruins, when, with your fantastic agrarian schemes you have changed 25 million Frenchmen into 25 million men living on 40 ecus"[10]

In May and June 1794, in order to put through his program, Robespierre tried to exclude from the Convention all the corrupt and morally discredited deputies, at the same time, he stopped all those who demanded an intensification of the Terror, so that he met the whole resistance of the Right and Left wing groups in the Convention, the remainder

of the Gironde, the former Hebertists and the Levellers from the suburbs of Paris, and finally the "Marsh," the center group of the Convention, afraid of the new tasks of the Revolution and encouraged by the resistance of Robespierre's enemies The bourgeois counter-revolution felt strong enough to assert itself and take power away from the masses.

3

Robespierre was arrested on the 9th of Thermidor The Paris municipality rallied to his defense but it was too late because, anxious not to violate the "constitutional liberties" of the Assembly, he had hesitated to take the road of insurrection On the 10th of Thermidor (July 28), he was executed The Convention was dissolved

The arrest of Robespierre marked the triumph of the new aristocracy of wealth, the new class of rich bourgeois, wealthy manufacturers, army contractors, land speculators and profiteers, which began to form immediately after the outbreak of the Revolution Their representatives in the Convention, the Thermidorians, were willing to preserve the Republic, but they represented different social interests from those of the Mountain Party, or Jacobins, and they wanted a different kind of republic from what the masses of the people, suffering from famine, wanted.

Francois Noel Babeuf, who was soon to emerge as the leader of Parisian democracy, described the situation accurately in his *Tribun du Peuple* (*Tribune of the People*) of December 21, 1794 "I see two parties in the Convention diametrically opposed to one another," he wrote, "I believe that both of them want the Republic but each wants his own kind One wants it bourgeois and aristocratic, the republic of 'the million' who had always been the enemy, the exploiter and 'the bloodsucker of the 24 other million,' of the million 'who for centuries have been enjoying their laziness at the expense of our sweat and toil,' who want a small number of

privileged masters gorged with superfluities and pleasures and the large mass reduced to the low state of Helots and slaves, the other understands it as having been made and wants it to remain democratic, a republic of 'equal rights and comfort' The one party sees in the Republic the patricians and plebeians, the second party wants for everyone not only equality before the law, equality on paper, but also in practice, with 'sufficiency' legally guaranteed for all physical needs, with all the social advantages, with just and adequate returns for the part of labor which each contributes to the common task" [11]

The Thermidorians did not stop with the execution of Robespierre They proceeded to purge the Convention of his supporters, arresting the leaders of the Mountain Party and putting them on trial In this way, the Thermidorians sought to consolidate their power and nullify the democratic gains of the Republic legally embodied in the Constitution of 1793. All France watched the trial of the Mountain leaders closely in the winter of 1794 In Paris, as a result of the scarcity of bread, the masses were suffering intensely from famine Instead of putting into effect the democratic Constitution of 1793 and coming to the aid of the hungry people, the Thermidorians were putting the champions of that Constitution on trial By March 1795, the economic situation had grown worse As a result, the Parisian masses began to press on the Convention, protesting against the famine and the arrest of the Mountain Party members, demanding bread and the Constitution of 1793.

On April 1, 1795 the resentment of the Parisian populace had reached insurrectionary proportions. Interrupting the proceedings of the Convention with cries of "For bread," "For liberty to the Patriots," they declared they were "upon the point of regretting the sacrifices they had made to the Revolution." [12]

But the movement of April 1 did not mark the end of the action of the Parisian masses. The workers and the people

of Paris began to fear that the Republic for which they had fought was being abandoned The Constitution of 1793 had declared that it was the duty of society to provide for the poor and unfortunate The Republic of 1793 protected the needy, taxed the rich, tried to keep prices from rising In fact, it was only after the Republic was established in 1792 that measures were taken to improve the lot of the masses, it had therefore aroused great hopes in their hearts The Republic, to them, meant the solution of their economic needs The Terror hit the rich and the traitors but it alleviated the sufferings of the poor [13]

Now everything that the masses had fought for in the Revolution was being swept away by the Thermidorians The decrees which had made it easy for the poorest peasants to buy nationalized lands or communal lands were revoked Republican ideals were disintegrating and the Royalists were raising their heads When the masses demanded bread, they were answered with more arrests and trials of the Mountain Party representatives in the Convention The people could see that the Thermidorian champions of the Republic were championing only their own self-interest.

On May 20, therefore, less than two months after the April outbreak, the masses broke into the Convention again, repeating their demands James Monroe, American Minister to France, reported to the Secretary of State describing this event The movement, he said, called for the Constitution of 1793, bread and the removal of Barrère, "in other words, the revival of the reign of terror" [14] Monroe himself, who sympathized with the Thermidorians as the "moderate party," characterized this movement as "anti-monarchical" and made up of artisans who were afraid that the "preponderating party was royalist since it worked in harmony with the royalists" Describing these uprisings of April 1 and May 20 in a letter to Thomas Jefferson of June 23, 1795, Monroe added that "the distress of the people is beyond what was ever seen on our side of the Atlantic." [15] This was confirmed in a report

received by Oliver Wolcott, Secretary of the Treasury, on June 29, 1795 that "in France the want of bread is extreme, and the public resources exhausting rapidly if not exhausted" On July 16, 1795, he wrote to Jedediah Morse "In France the people are wasting with famine" [16] John Trumbull who also had been in France at the time registered the same fact. In a letter from London on July 24, 1795, he said "I have seen the City of Paris exhibit an example of patient fortitude which I did not expect from such a mass of ignorant and profligate people I have seen them week after week receive the miserable pittance of two ounces of bad bread to a person a day, and support this privation with fewer instances of riot, impatience or murmur than you would have expected from a race of philosophers" [17]

By September 1795 the fears of the masses were confirmed. The Thermidorians crowned their work by adopting a new constitution embodying the principles of their order, which Monroe, in his report of September 10 to the Acting Secretary of State, characterized as "infinitely preferable to the one it was to supersede," that is, to that of 1793, which, he said, "forms, of course, in case it be adopted, a new bulwark in favor of republican government" [18] This new constitution, the Constitution of 1795, actually nullified with a stroke of the pen the democratic principles which were embodied in the Constitution of 1793 It kept the republic but abolished universal suffrage, re-introduced the old distinctions of active and passive citizens, reimposing high property qualifications and indirect elections, created two chambers, a lower house called the Council of 500 and an upper house called the Council of the Ancients composed of 250 members The two chambers were to nominate a directory of five who were to constitute the executive government A so-called Rights of Man prefaced the Constitution, limiting freedom of the press and practically the right to assemble

This Constitution of 1795 tricked the people out of all political rights won during the Revolution As Babeuf wrote

from prison "According to this constitution, all those who have no territorial property, all those who are unable to write, that is to say the greater part of the French nation, will no longer have the right to vote in public assemblies, the rich and the clever will alone be the nation" [19] Monroe, in his report of September 10, which discussed the new constitution adopted by the Convention and submitted to the primary assemblies, admitted that the people of Paris generally rejected the Constitution [20]

The Royalists attempted to take advantage of the Constitution to stage a comeback On October 5 they organized an armed insurrection, surrounded the Convention with nearly 25,000 men, thinking that little or no opposition would be offered, and besieged it until ten o'clock in the evening However, the Convention appealed to the masses in the workers' districts for support, and they, together with the troops headed by General Bonaparte, surrounded the Royalist troops, forcing them to surrender. As a reward for this help, the Convention amnestied the imprisoned Left Jacobins that same month, but disbanded the newly organized republican battalions which had come to its aid.

In a letter to Thomas Jefferson of November 18, 1795, Monroe pointed out that the foreign powers had been connected with this Royalist insurrection as evidenced by the fact that there was knowledge of the revolt in England, Hamburg and Basle before it happened Aside from this fact, other events led him to conclude they had a finger in the pie.

With the workers' revolts crushed and the Royalist insurrection dispersed, the Thermidorians were free to proceed with their new government, the Directory Upon the adoption of the new Constitution, the Convention came to an end on October 27, 1795, on October 31 the members of the Directory, or executive, were chosen and the new government was installed Monroe, in his letter of November 5, hailed the new Constitution as "an event of great importance, not only to France, but perhaps to mankind in general." [21]

The establishment of the new government of the Directory actually opened the dikes to a flood of bourgeois development In Karl Marx's words, bourgeois society under this government burst forth like a mighty torrent, a rush for wealth began and a wild surge to set up commercial enterprises, in the first fever-heat, many new landlords subjected the land to all-sided cultivation, a rapid development of the land took place and the new bourgeois life surged forward [22]

The members of the Directory themselves, who prior to the overthrow of Robespierre had no means or only slight fortunes, grew wealthy in this process Barras, one of the members, acquired five estates Merlin de Thionville owned two chateaus and immense landed property Swindling set in wholesale The *nouveau riche* were clearly the real power in the country and the five Directors were their mandatories The Directory and all the prominent politicians were hand in glove with the clique of financial speculators whose sole aim was to enrich themselves.

Thus, while the misery of the masses was growing steadily, the social inequalities stood out sharp and challenging The Constitution of 1795 became the symbol of the rule of the bourgeoisie The Constitution of 1793, on the other hand, which the Thermidorians had prevented from coming into force, became the rallying center and cry of the democratic forces.

4

In face of the Thermidorian reaction, the democratic forces of all shadings attempted to form an alliance Despite persecution and the loss of their leading personalities, however, they tried almost immediately to reconstitute their old Jacobin clubs In the organization of such clubs, Babeuf and his friends played a leading role Babeuf had come to Paris on February 24, 1794, having fled from a sentence of twenty years penal servitude on a false charge of forgery and of sub-

stituting one name for another in an Act of Sale of one of the nationalized lands in connection with the repartition and sale of the nationalized property of the Church on which he was employed In Paris, Babeuf appealed the case, in an effort to save his honor and, finally vindicated, he returned to his native town

When Babeuf heard of the execution of Robespierre on July 27, 1794, he immediately rushed back to Paris There he started a paper, *Journal de la Liberté de la Presse* (*Journal of Liberty of the Press*). At this time, Babeuf did not fully grasp the nature of the Thermidorians, vehemently attacking the fallen government of Robespierre and the system of terror generally But it was not long before he realized that the Directory was only the instrument of the *nouveau riche*, while the masses were left to starve, and he began to attack it just as vehemently as he formerly had assailed the government of Robespierre In line with this, he changed the name of his paper to *Tribun du Peuple;* he began to improve his understanding of the old revolutionary leaders and their policies, and no longer attacked them indiscriminately in his paper

He took the lead in the fight to preserve the democratic gains of the Revolution and to defend the needs of the poor masses He criticized the Convention for its utter indifference to the plight of the people and its uncertain and vacillating policy. "I see in the present state of the public administration the complete overturn of the democratic system.. the government of an oligarchy in place of a republican regime" [23] After the publication of No. 27 of his paper, Babeuf was arrested for the fifth time only to be released after a few days He resumed his agitation in the *Tribun* which reappeared on December 18, 1794 and henceforth was published irregularly. But now he threw off all restraint and declared in the December 21st issue that there were two classes struggling in the Convention for diametrically opposed ends the privileged exploiters and bloodsuckers, and the masses who

want a democratic republic, a republic of equal rights which would meet the needs of the masses No 33 of the *Tribun* carried a particularly violent attack on the Thermidorians. Babeuf proposed that the French people resort to a peaceful insurrection by submitting a petition to its representatives, describing the terrible plight of the nation and the reforms it had a right to expect As a result, Babeuf had to go into hiding, but the police found and arrested him on February 12, 1795 and sent him to the prison in Arras.

It was here that he first began to formulate his ideas about communism. As an archivist of landed estates prior to his residence in Paris, he had learned of the feudal extortions and discovered, as he himself wrote later, "the horrible secrets of the usurpations of the nobility" [24] He learned that feudal property constituted the source of power of the feudal nobility, a source which they owed to favors or to usurpation And then, in Paris, he had come face to face with the new power, bourgeois power, which had its source in bourgeois property, a power which came from the exploitation of the masses On the basis of this practical experience, his wide reading in Mably, Morelly, Rousseau, Brissot and Linguet, who wrote about the property question and at least two of whom, Mably and Morelly, taught that communism alone could solve the problems of society, Babeuf was led to the conclusion that only property in common could break all chains

From the prison in Arras, Babeuf was transferred to Paris where he was released eight months later in the amnesty proclaimed by the National Convention at its last sitting in October 1795 He immediately resumed No 34 of his *Tribun* and proceeded to organize a political society which soon amalgamated with a similar club to form the Society of the Pantheon, named after its meeting place Babeuf boldly proclaimed in his paper the doctrine of full equality, castigated the Directory and continued to denounce private property as the chief source of all the evils of society.

During the course of 1795 Babeuf finally gave up hope that peaceful pressure could preserve the democratic gains of the Revolution The workers' actions of April 1 and May 20, 1795 had brought no change He became convinced that nothing could be achieved with the Thermidorians who held power, they were concerned only with self-enrichment, the accumulation of private property, and the only way the masses could satisfy their needs was by abolishing private property, the only way they could establish real democracy, which meant real equality, was to abolish private property and the classes associated with its existence, and the only way this could be done would be by the seizure of power by force Meanwhile, he intended to begin by establishing a small communist center, a sort of phalanx, which would serve as an example and as a center of communist propaganda for the rest of France, gaining the whole country for communism by slow stages Later Babeuf abandoned this idea of isolated communities for the struggle on a nation-wide scale [25]

After Babeuf came out of prison in the autumn of 1795, he boldly called on "the plebeians" to unite against the "handful of usurping rulers" He castigated the "so-called patriots," who, having formerly opposed the Thermidorians had now rallied to the Directory on the pretext that they would be better able to introduce reforms and who now were proclaiming that all was well [26] But Babeuf pointed to the soaring prices, and declared that the poor were dying of hunger. He warned that the people, deceived by the politicians and seeing no end to their long suffering, were losing faith in the Republic As matters stood now, the majority of the people could be rallied more easily for restoration of the Bourbons than for consolidation of the Republic. The governing bodies and the deputies had discredited themselves, they had turned liberty and equality into hollow phrases, they had forced a constitution for the rich on a suffering nation. There could be no further confidence in the men and government responsible for this. The only thing to do was to turn to the

revolutionary principles before the 9th of Thermidor, to the Constitution of 1793. This must be done by direct mass action, for nothing great could be achieved without the masses. The masses, Babeuf declared, "must be told everything, shown constantly what remains to be done." The French Revolution, he said, is "an open war between the patricians and plebeians," between the rich and the poor, "a war which has been going on continuously and which begins as soon as the established order permits some to take everything, leaving nothing for the others." [27]

The Thermidorians accused Babeuf of undermining the Republic and playing into the hands of the royalists But Babeuf was not intimidated by their abuse To those who charged him with undermining the Republic, he replied· "You appear to gather around you only republicans, a trite title of very doubtful character. Therefore you advocate merely a republic. But we assemble all the democrats and plebeians, a name which unquestionably has a more positive meaning Our principles are pure democracy and unqualified equality" [28] By democracy, Babeuf explained, he did not mean merely the substitution of the Constitution of 1793 for that of 1795 If he agitated for the re-establishment of the former Constitution, it was only because "it prepared the way" for the democratic institutions which would lead to equality. Nor did democracy mean the agrarian law, that is, the equal partition of the land, for, as he later said, "the essence of the agrarian law was to transform France into a chessboard" Democracy, he said, was social and economic equality in the absence of private property and the existence of institutions which would prevent some from becoming the masters of others Each person would exercise the economic function for which he was best fitted, each would turn over the product of his labor to the common storehouse and in turn would receive an equal share of everything. Peaceful methods, Babeuf contended, were ineffective for attaining democracy, for its advocates were being menaced from all

sides It was dangerous to wait longer The time for combat was ripe, and the question resolved itself into "Conquer or die" [29]

In December 1795 a group of consistent republicans met secretly and formed a committee to prepare an insurrection, but the Directory was prepared and ordered Babeuf's arrest Early in February 1796, it also decided to suppress the *Tribun;* but Babeuf escaped On February 27, the Directory ordered the closing of the meeting place of the Pantheonists and the dissolution of their society, and the order was carried out by General Bonaparte in person The closing of the Pantheon was followed by the suppression of popular societies and public meetings throughout Paris. On March 30, 1796 Babeuf organized a new Secret Directory of seven members for the overthrow of the government of the Directory. Babeuf was chosen the leader of this "Party of Equality," or Communist Party, which launched upon energetic organizational activities, distributing pamphlets, songs and posters in the workers' district and issuing appeals to the soldiers. The privilege of wealth, it declared, had replaced the privilege of aristocracy, the undemocratic Constitution of 1795 had been imposed on the nation by a small minority. It was the duty of all Frenchmen to restore the democratic Constitution of 1793, the soldiers were the instruments of the rich minority to keep the poor majority in subjection, but both soldiers and people were exploited, they should fraternize to end this rule of the usurpers of the people's rights and to set up a communist society where the organized labor of all able-bodied citizens would redound to the good of everyone The era of revolution was not over, the rich had become the new privileged class and the aim of the new revolution was to end all inequality and to assure happiness to all [30]

By April 14, 1796 the Government, frightened by the influence of Babeuf's group, posted a proclamation denouncing the "anarchists" for aiming to overthrow all authority and misrepresenting their aims. Babeuf and his collaborators were

attacked as disguised royalist agents who were trying to discredit the republic, men in the pay of foreign powers whose object was to restore the monarchy in France, anarchists who wanted to pillage and divide all forms of property, "even the simplest household and smallest shop and to bathe in your blood" [31]

On April 16 drastic laws were passed which drove the agitation underground and resulted in the final suppression of the *Tribun du Peuple*. Despite a desperate attempt to put out the *Tribun* in secret, it was forced to close down But the insurrectionary movement spread Babeuf became more than ever the responsible leader In May 1796 the Secret Directory decided on action and issued an Act of Insurrection The Party of Equals had about 17,000 followers in Paris and many branches in the Provinces They included several ex-members of the Paris Sections and the Convention and based their strength on the former Jacobin organization But the plan of insurrection was betrayed by an *agent provocateur*, on May 10, the Government swooped down on the Secret Directory which was preparing the uprising and arrested it together with many of its followers The "Conspiracy of the Equals" was smashed It was clear that the people of Paris were not prepared to play the part that they had played on August 10, 1792 or in the days from May 31 to June 2, 1793

Babeuf and his followers were brought to trial For three months they were subjected to slanders and accusations of serving under the banner of the Pretender to the Throne In his defense, Babeuf claimed that his writings, manifestoes, decrees and proclamations contained nothing more than the precepts put forward by such eminent writers as Mably, Rousseau, Diderot, Morelly and others who were tolerated and were the great masters of whom he and his colleagues were only the disciples. As a matter of fact, Babeuf's conspiracy only represented the drawing of the logical conclusions for equality from the democracy of 1793 as far as it was possible at the time [32]

On May 28, 1797 Babeuf and his colleague Darthé were executed The Directory was victorious, but it continued to be a vacillating power, fluctuating between the royalists and republicans As a result, the army and its leaders attained decisive importance, with the Directory turning to the army for help when a royalist or democratic insurrection was to be suppressed On November 9 (18th Brumaire), 1799, Napoleon Bonaparte overthrew the Directory and took power with the aim of protecting the bourgeois gains of 1789 against both a royalist restoration and popular democratic upsurge The First French Republic came to an end But it could not end the historical development of which the great republican revolutions of the 17th and 18th centuries were the expression "In 1648," Marx declared, "the bourgeoisie, in alliance with the new nobility, fought against the monarchy, the feudal nobility and the ruling church

"In 1789 the bourgeoisie, in alliance with the people, fought against the monarchy, the nobility and the ruling church

"The only prototype of the 1789 revolution (at any rate in Europe) was the revolution of 1648, while the revolution of 1648 had only the rising of the Netherlands against Spain as the prototype Each of these revolutions was a century ahead of its prototype, not only chronologically but also in substance

"In both of them the bourgeoisie was the class really leading the movement The proletariat and the elements of the urban population not belonging to the bourgeoisie, either had as yet no interests apart from the bourgeoisie, or did not constitute independently developed classes or class sections And so when they opposed the bourgeoisie, as in 1793-94 in France, they only fought for the realization of bourgeois interests, even if they did it in a manner different from that of the bourgeoisie The whole of French terrorism was nothing but the plebeian manner of dealing with the foes of the bourgeoisie—absolutism, feudalism and philistinism

"The revolutions of 1648 and 1789 were not merely an

English and a French revolution they were revolutions on a European scale They represented, not the victory of one class of society over the old political order, they proclaimed the political order of the new European society The bourgeoisie was victorious in them, but at that time the victory of the bourgeoisie signified the victory of a new social order, the victory of bourgeois over feudal property, of the nation over provincialism, of competition over the guild system, of the division of property over the right of primogeniture, of the owner dominating his land over the land dominating its owner, of enlightenment over superstition, of the family over the family name, of industry over idleness, of bourgeois law over medieval privileges.

"The revolution of 1648 was the victory of the seventeenth century over the sixteenth, the revolution of 1789, that of the eighteenth century over the seventeenth These revolutions expressed the requirements of the world of that day to an ever greater extent than those of the parts of the world in which they took place, *i e*, England and France" [33]

CHAPTER IV Democracy Irrepressible

I

THE great American and French Revolutions opened a new era of democracy, but the old order clung frantically to its hopeless positions For twenty-five years the kings and monarchs of the old regime waged war against the democratic upsurge in Europe In alliance with the bourgeoisie of England, they marshaled their material, military and intellectual resources to preserve the remnants of the tottering feudal structure They bewailed the "rage of liberty" sweeping over the continent, the "political fermentations," and the "revolt of nations against their sovereigns" They ranted against the "democratical license" which threatened to bury all the thrones of Europe in their own ruins They lamented the "fatal influence" of the writers of democracy who propagated their "destructive principles" everywhere and, by "impudent loquacity and effrontery" obtained the notice of the world and captured public opinion in most nations They raised the specter of "horrible anarchy and confusion" unless democracy were defeated [1]

During the first fifteen years of the nineteenth century this effort to defeat democracy centered in the struggle against Napoleon whose conquering armies carried the principles of the French Revolution throughout Europe, abolishing feudalism and serfdom, spreading the idea of popular participation in government, and introducing religious tolerance

When in 1799 Napoleon overthrew the counter-revolutionary rule of the bourgeois Directory in France, he consolidated the new bourgeois property relations, legalized the ownership of land by the peasants, drove the foreign invaders far beyond the borders of the country and preserved the fundamental direction of the Great French Revolution Even when he embarked upon his wars of conquest and poured his armies again and again over Germany, for example, he undermined feudal relations in backward "Christian-Germanic" society. "Napoleon," as Frederick Engels observed, "was not that arbitrary despot to Germany which he is said to have been by his enemies, Napoleon was in Germany the representative of the revolution, the propagator of its principles, the destroyer of old feudal society Of course he proceeded despotically, but not even half as despotically as the deputies from the Convention would have done, and really did, wherever they came, not half so much as the princes and nobles used to do whom he sent a-begging. Napoleon applied the *reign of terror*, which had done its work in France, *to other countries, in the shape of war*—and this 'reign of terror' was sadly wanted in Germany Napoleon dissolved the Holy Roman Empire, and reduced the number of little states in Germany by forming large ones. He brought his code of laws with himself into the conquered countries, a code infinitely superior to all existing ones, and recognizing equality in principle"

Nevertheless, Engels agreed that the longer Napoleon reigned "the more he deserved his ultimate fate" "His ascending the throne," Engels declared in qualification of his estimate of Napoleon, "I will not reproach him with, the power of the middle classes in France, who never cared about public interests, provided their private ones went on favorably, and the apathy of the people, who saw no ultimate benefit themselves from the revolution, and were only to be roused to the enthusiasm of war, permitted no other course, but that he associated with the old anti-revolutionary dynasties by

marrying the Austrian Emperor's daughter, that he, instead of destroying every vestige of Old Europe, rather sought to compromise with it—that he aimed at the honor of being the first among the European monarchs, and therefore assimilated his court as much as possible to theirs—that was his great fault He descended to the level of other monarchs, he sought the honor of being their equal—he bowed to the principle of legitimacy—and it was a matter of course, then, that the legitimists kicked the usurper out of their company" [2]

As a matter of fact, Napoleon's wars fell into two distinct phases, the first progressive, the second reactionary, the Peace of Tilsit which Napoleon negotiated with the Russian Czar Alexander I in 1807 marked the dividing line "After Napoleon had created the French Empire by subjugating a number of large, virile, long established national states of Europe," Lenin wrote, "the French national wars became imperialist wars, which *in their turn* engendered wars for national liberation *against* Napoleon's imperialism" [3]

That Napoleon was a military despot was evident to the entire world But in this respect he stood in the same relation to the Great French Revolution as Cromwell did to the British Revolution of the mid-seventeenth century Cromwell resorted to military despotism in a final effort to realize the bourgeois democratic program of the Gentlemen Independents. Napoleon became a military dictator who continued the progressive direction of the Revolution from which he arose and yet, in his effort to conquer the world, compromised with reaction and was finally conquered by it Cromwell was Robespierre and Napoleon in one, while Napoleon took the revolutionary work in his own hands after the money-loving French bourgeoisie had executed Robespierre and stifled the Revolution.[4] Both were followed by monarchic restoration

It is indicative of the dual character of Napoleon's role that reactionaries and democrats alike the world over came to fear and hate him In Europe, British capital combined with feudal

reaction to crush him, in the infant trans-Atlantic Republic, the foes of democracy condemned him because he was "the enemy of England, the Pope and the Inquisition." [5] But it is also true that Thomas Jefferson, one of the foremost democrats of the world during his time, likewise developed a profound and lasting hostility to him

Watching the progress of Napoleon's conquests from across the Atlantic, Jefferson at first greeted them as the means of demolishing the power of England In 1799 and 1800, he still regarded Napoleon as the exponent of the "republican world" against feudal and monarchic reaction, and spoke of him as "our Napoleon" When Napoleon took power into his own hands, Jefferson did not lose confidence in the general democratic course Napoleon was pursuing, though he expressed fear that "our friends on the other side of the water, laboring in the same cause, may yet have a great deal of crime and misery to wade through" [6] He regarded Napoleon's action as a transfer of the destinies of the Republic from the civil to the military arm, providing a lesson, not against the impracticability of republican government, but against the danger of standing armies

In the ensuing years, when the sweep of Napoleon's triumphs seemed to threaten the conquest of Britain itself, Jefferson saw through the effort of the anti-democratic forces in America to use the scare of a Napoleonic conquest of the United States as a means of rallying the country to the support of Britain He vehemently rejected the arguments of the "Anglomen" as a line of "first letting England plunder us, as she has been doing for years, for fear Bonaparte should do it, and then ally ourselves with her and enter into the war" [7] He ridiculed the English King as a cipher and castigated England as least faithful in alliances, its only morality being power, consequently providing no guarantee that she would not make a separate peace with Napoleon.

By 1811, however, he gave up hope that any good could be effected by the United States with Napoleon

While Jefferson continued to wish Napoleon success in curbing the power of Britain, he did not wish him to conquer Russia, insisting that the preservation of its independence, as of the independence of the other countries of Europe, and even of England, was vital from the viewpoint of America's national interests, even were we not men to whom nothing human should be indifferent [8] By 1814, Jefferson's condemnation of Napoleon knew no bounds "That Bonaparte is an unprincipled tyrant," he wrote, "who is deluging the continent of Europe with blood, there is not a human being, not even the wife of his bosom, who does not see" [9]

He greeted the capture of Napoleon as the close of "a deflated career," the end of "the ruthless destroyer of ten millions of the human race, whose thirst for blood appeared unquenchable, the great oppressor of the rights and liberties of the world" The "Attila of the age" was now dethroned, he declared, though "he should have perished on the swords of his enemies, under the walls of Paris " [10] Jefferson "grieved to see even good republicans so infatuated as to this man, as to consider his downfall as calamitous to the cause of liberty In their indignation against England which is just, they seem to consider all *her* enemies as *our* friends, when it is well known there was not a being on earth who bore us so deadly a hatred In fact, he saw nothing in this world but himself, and looked on the people under him as his cattle, beasts for burthen and slaughter Promises cost him nothing when they could serve his purpose On his return from Elba, what did he not promise? But those who had credited them a little, soon saw their total insignificance, and, satisfied they could not fall under worse hands, refused every effort after the defeat of Waterloo Their present sufferings will have a term, his iron despotism will have had none" [11]

By the summer of 1815, following the return of Napoleon from Elba, and alarmed by the action of the Allies in Europe, Jefferson was inclined to change his view of the French tyrant, especially since he saw "with anxiety the tyrant of the

ocean (England) remaining in vigor" Europe, he felt, had turned topsy-turvy a second time. "As far as we can judge from appearances," he wrote, "Bonaparte, from being a mere military usurper, seems to have become the choice of his nation, and the Allies in their turn, the usurpers and spoliators of the European world," whose victory would destroy the independence of nations and constitute the greatest danger to the freedom and independence of the United States [12] He was one of those who were ready to credit Napoleon's promises of independence to all nations, though he had no illusions about Napoleon's hostility towards the United States, which was only a little less than that he bore towards England. He felt that Napoleon's usurpation of the government and his establishment of a hereditary despotism would have a "baneful effect in encouraging future usurpations, and deterring those under oppression from rising to redress themselves" Furthermore, he was convinced that Napoleon's restless spirit left no hope of peace to the world But Jefferson was ready to wait and see "whether the war we have had with England, and the achievements of that war, and the hope that we may become his instruments and partisans against that enemy, may induce him, in future, to tolerate our commercial intercourse with his people ..." [13]

Nevertheless, Jefferson was not long in returning to his vehement rejection of Napoleon, characterizing his promises as empty, although later again, in 1823 when he read O'Meara's biography of Bonaparte, he did not hesitate to correct some of his underestimation of Napoleon's intellectual abilities, without, however, changing his basic view of him as "a moral monster" guilty of numberless crimes against humanity, a man "against whom every hand should have been lifted to slay him" [14]

The defeat of Napoleon marked the triumph of reaction, but it was a pyrrhic victory for the feudal orders. "While the Great French Revolution," Marx declared, "was undergoing defeat in the conquest of Europe, England was revolu-

tionizing society through the steam engine, conquering world markets, crowding off the stage all classes which had become historically obsolete, and preparing the way for a great and decisive struggle between the industrial capitalists and the industrial workers The fact that Napoleon failed to send from Boulogne to Folkstone an army of 150,000 men, and, with the aid of the veterans of the Republican army, to conquer England, was of the utmost significance for the whole of European development." [15]

While concentrating on the destruction of the remnants of the French Revolution, the European enemies of democracy did not give up the idea of undermining that other center of world democratic influence, the young American republic Unlike revolutionary and Napoleonic France, the United States offered no immediate danger to their institutions, but it was no less an object of their aristocratic contempt and they scarcely concealed their desire to see it destroyed Even when they were compelled to recognize its existence, they chose to cultivate the anti-democratic forces in the United States or to cast doubt upon the durability of democratic institutions.

The British, who had invested enormous sums of money to keep up the war against Napoleon in order to re-open the continental markets and to maintain and extend their commercial supremacy while retaining the lion's share of the colonial plunder and weakening all of Britain's rivals, were also the most active and persistent in their efforts to disrupt the American Union. They had failed to defeat the American colonies in their war for independence, but they were determined to prevent the consolidation of the new American Republic

In 1812 John Henry, a former British agent, provided documentary proof to the President of the United States that the Ministry of Great Britain, in co-operation with Sir James

Craig, Governor of Canada, had been engaged for some years in a scheme to destroy the American Union Henry, who as early as 1808 had published articles against republican governments, had been engaged by the Governor of Canada as a secret agent of England and Canada to aggravate popular discontent in New England, growing out of the embargo and other restrictions on commerce, and to induce the Eastern states to secede from the Union and join Canada This scheme failed, Sir James Craig died before Henry was paid, and enraged by the refusal of the British Government to pay him, Henry revealed the whole conspiracy to the American Government [16]

If the British had reason to believe that their project might meet with success, it was largely because some such project was actually being considered by the powerful group of American Federalists following the victory of the democratic forces in the election of Thomas Jefferson to the Presidency in 1801 They planned to have the seven northern states secede and establish a separate Union They discussed these plans in the autumn of 1804 and scheduled a meeting in Boston which would "recommend the measures necessary to form a system of government for the Northern States" [17] It was only Hamilton's death which prevented this meeting from being held, although some maintained that Hamilton disapproved of the disunion project of 1804 But if Hamilton did disapprove, it was not because he had given up his hostility to democracy On April 20, 1804 he wrote to his brother-in-law, giving his view "of the course and tendency of our politics," expressing the sentiment "that dismemberment of our empire will be a clear sacrifice, of great positive disadvantages ... administering no relief to our real disease which is democracy, the poison of which, by a subdivision will only be the more concentrated in each part and consequently the more virulent." [18] Hamilton was ready to maintain the Union because he considered it valuable as a means of placing a con-

stitutional restraint upon democracy in which he saw great social and political dangers.

The Federalists repeated their efforts shortly before the end of the War of 1812 Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island held a convention at Hartford and claimed the right to secede from the Union. They proposed a number of amendments to the Constitution with the object of weakening the Union The conclusion of peace on December 24, 1814, put an end to their plot The Hartford Convention was repudiated as a treasonable conspiracy and from this time on the influence of the Federalist Party declined [19]

England's political and economic struggle against the young republic which culminated in the Anglo-American War of 1812, failed to undermine the American Union Instead, the war, by throwing the country upon its own resources, laid the basis for the rise of the factory system and industrial capitalism in the United States Thus it helped to create the economic foundation for an even greater and swifter development of the young Republic that was ultimately to challenge the economic supremacy and world position of Britain itself. At the same time, the growth of industrial capitalism provided the basis for the rise of an American working class and labor movement that was to become the backbone of a new and even more powerful democratic upsurge in America, Jacksonian democracy.

3

By 1815 the four-power coalition of Austria, Prussia, Russia and England finally succeeded in mastering the lusty young democratic force which had been released by the American and French Revolutions. Reactionaries in both Europe and America heaved a sigh of relief at the defeat of Napoleon which they regarded as the defeat of democracy. The old Federalist, Gouverneur Morris, for instance, was jubilant and looked forward to the crushing of "Jacobin"

principles everywhere, for, "when democracy has reached a certain height there is little chance for the duration of freedom" [20]

This was essentially the position of Metternich who, as late as 1836, was still arguing that monarchy was the only aceptable form of government He was afraid of democracy, he told George Ticknor with a nostalgic glance back at the "good old days" of "legitimacy," because he felt that it could not stand still and would have to become much more democratic, by which he meant that the propertyless classes would have to come to power. He did not know where or how it would end, but he was sure it would not end in a quiet, ripe old age As for democracy in America, he was convinced that it would wear out fast [21]

For twenty-five years, the intellectual spokesmen of reaction in Europe had striven to discredit democratic principles and to give a reactionary direction to public opinion. They built up a body of literature which attempted to defend the Old Order and combat the rise of democracy This literature sought to popularize a "philosophy of conservatism," deriving the source of royal, aristocratic and ecclesiastical power variously from God, from nature and from history It was grounded in a denial of the doctrines that power derives from the people It repudiated the idea that the free life of the individual is the end of society It scorned the great documents of the new historic current which, like the American Constiution, broke with the aristocratic tradition and proclaimed the concepts of democracy.

In England, Blackstone and Burke were the representatives of this reactionary literature and traditionalist thought. In Germany, it was Savigny and von Gentz, Secretary of the Congress of Vienna and Metternich's aide In France, it was Haller, Joseph de Maistre and Bonald All of these borrowed from one another and influenced one another. All stood for the maintenance of kings, nobles and priests, and the power of monarchies and aristocracies [22] This reaction was especially

pronounced in Germany after 1800 where Burke's book attacking the French Revolution was widely read Writers like Novalis, Schlegel, Kleist, Brentano, Schelling and Adam Muller produced an extensive literature rejecting the doctrine of Natural Rights and political democracy that inspired the great Revolutions of the eighteenth century.

Now their day seemed to have come The representatives of the victorious coalition met in a congress at Vienna to draw up treaties of peace, restoring the old order and uprooting the principles of democracy spread by the French Revolution The Congress of Vienna, at which Prince Metternich, Chief Minister of the Emperor of Austria and Chairman of the conference, played the leading role, based its decisions on the policy of legitimacy and compensation—legitimacy meaning the restoration of former rulers to their thrones and the return of territories which had been lost during the Napoleonic wars Where this was considered impossible, the Congress applied the principle of compensation, that is, of assigning an equivalent block of territory to make good the loss, these territories were taken, in the main, from the allies of Napoleon and from the weak states in Germany and Italy.

The Congress of Vienna gave rise to the Holy Alliance which was organized by Czar Alexander of Russia, as well as to the Quadruple Alliance formed by Metternich with the object of maintaining the settlement adopted by the Congress The Congress launched upon a European-wide campaign to suppress all liberal and revolutionary activities—in the name of peace And in the name of maintaining the settlements made at Vienna, every effort was made to sustain autocracy, with Metternich employing the Quadruple Alliance for the suppression of liberal uprisings against the autocratic rulers.

As a result, Europe was again in the control of kings, nobles and priests as it had not been since the age of Louis XIV. The feudal aristocrats ruled in all cabinets from London to St. Petersburg. The ascendancy of democracy, which had begun

with the American and French Revolutions, was checked. Reaction seemed to be permanently entrenched and Metternich became its hated symbol in the eyes of the entire world. In 1819, the Six Acts in England, the Carlsbad Decrees in the Germanies and the repressive measures used by all governments, had driven the resistance underground The surface of political life from Lisbon to St Petersburg bore the appearance of profound calm.

Nevertheless, the Congress of Vienna was unable to turn back the clock of history and permanently restore the old regime It could not erase the fundamental social and economic reforms of the revolutionary and Napoleonic periods between 1789 and 1815. Serfdom and feudal privileges had been abolished throughout most of Western Europe, the peasants retained possession of the lands they had acquired, and capitalist economy continued to grow despite the political reaction The fortunes of war and the purse, especially of the British bourgeoisie, had restored the monarchies and aristocracies to political control, but the economic power, at least within the society of Western Europe, was systematically accumulating in the hands of the bourgeoisie, which became more powerful than ever With their fortunes swelled by the steady growth of commerce and manufactures, the bourgeois manifested their increased well-being in an increased spirit of speculation and a growing demand for comforts and luxuries.

Since they had paid for the job of defeating Napoleon and had assisted in doing it, the bourgeoisie wanted to have their share of the power Far from placing the interests of the bourgeoisie in the ascendant, the restored governments actually neglected and even flouted them, as the passage of the English Corn Law of 1815 so strikingly revealed The bourgeoisie, therefore, could not submit to being governed by a class whose decay had been going on for centuries, whose interests were opposed to their own, and whose momentary return to power they themselves had facilitated The struggle between the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy thus was inevi-

table, it began almost immediately after peace, with the working people lining up behind the bourgeoisie [23]

The restoration of 1815, consequently, was more apparent than real Five years later, the democratic undercurrents broke through to the surface again The year 1820 had hardly opened before a series of revolutionary disturbances broke out In Spain and Portugal, in some of the Italian states, and eventually in Greece, the revolutionaries overthrew the existing order, even in England and France, attempts were made on the lives of members of the government Within a few years, a serious revolt broke out in the Russian army [24] By 1830 the Metternichian restoration was over forever after a brief existence of fifteen years.

4

In their struggle, the democratic forces everywhere looked to the United States for inspiration and guidance, for after 1815, America remained the sole stronghold of democracy in the world South America, Greece and France turned directly to the American Republic for aid.

The Spanish colonies in America had revolted as early as 1810 and, by the early 1820's, established themselves as republics after the model of the United States When Metternich's monarchic coalition threatened to reach across the Atlantic in 1822 and intervene to restore the colonies to their "legitimate" ruler, King Ferdinand of Spain, the North American democracy came to their active support and recognized the South American republics. John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, who had refused to subscribe even privately to the Greek Committee as a "breach of neutrality," [25] was sufficiently alarmed by the threat of the Quadruple Alliance to the Western Hemisphere and sufficiently confident of British support to urge the President to issue a categoric warning to the self-appointed suppressors of revolution wherever they occurred The United States

took advantage of Britain's refusal to follow her former partners in the Quadruple Alliance in their policy of intervention in Spanish America, to inform the monarchs of Europe in effect that the young American Republic was now too strong to allow them to crush the extension of republican institutions in the New World This proclamation by President Monroe in 1823, which came to be known as the Monroe Doctrine, henceforth barred the American continents as fields for future colonization by European powers and proscribed any attempt by European monarchy to extend its political system to this hemisphere

In Greece, which had been part of the Osman Empire since 1456, a great national uprising broke out in 1821 The Greeks had grown steadily in wealth and population since the middle of the eighteenth century and they hoped to create their own independent national state Their struggle, secretly encouraged by Czarist Russia, which sought to undermine the Osman Empire, went on for six years until, in 1829, Greek independence was finally declared and a republic established, despite the efforts of the Quadruple Alliance—which was split on the Greek question—to help the Sultan so he would not "lose this pearl out of his Osman Crown through illegitimate riots of rebelling subjects"

The Greek people looked especially to America which they knew had been under the foreign dominion of Great Britain, suffering the same colonial oppression that they suffered from the Turks They knew that America, by a desperate struggle, had thrown off the yoke of oppression and was now enjoying the freedom and independence for which the Greeks themselves were fighting "All talked about the Republic of America and wished to make it serve as a pattern for their own," Dr Samuel G Howe reported from his personal experience in Greece where he had gone in 1824-25 to give direct aid to the Greek Revolution, becoming surgeon-in-chief to the Greek fleet American aid was particularly heartening to them, not only because "the people of Franklin"

hailed "the dawn of our regeneration," and through their President "expressed aloud, before earth and its monarchs the prayers of humanity," but because they felt that the Americans were the one people who could give them extensive aid, having "no despots to bind" them [26]

The United States Congress, in 1822, expressed its solidarity with the Greek "rebels", although a year later, in reply to an appeal from the Greeks, the American Government declared itself sympathetic but unable to interfere In the autumn of 1825, however, an American squadron made its appearance in the Mediterranean, which Metternich's secretary, von Gentz, called the "monstrous intervention" of America But the object of this squadron was merely to protect American merchants at Smyrna and to obtain, if possible, a commercial treaty with the Porte [27] In 1826, through the active asistance of a few members of Congress, the United States did wink at its own neutrality by Congressional authorization to the President to purchase one of two frigates built for the Greeks by profiteering American firms that had sent only one of the promised frigates and attempted to swindle the Greek Government out of additional huge sums in connection with the second frgiate In order to remove the stain of wringing a million dollars from the Greeks, the United States Government intervened quietly, thereby preventing this scandal from disillusioning the Greek people who looked with great faith to America and who, unaware of the swindle by the American shipbuilders, had greeted the arrival of the first frigate with the greatest joy [28]

The Greek struggle aroused sympathy throughout Europe and America Philhellenic committees were organized in England, France, Germany, Switzerland and the United States. Funds were collected, women prepared medical aid, and volunteers, including Britain's great poet Byron, went to the assistance of the Greek patriots.

In France, following the restoration of the monarchy, the leading forces in the opposition camp, including part of the

bourgeoisie, were republican-minded and were encouraged to continue the struggle by the very existence of a successful democratic republic in the United States at a time when the world once more seemed securely in the control of kings and nobles A month before the outbreak of the Revolution of July 1830, for instance, William Cullen Bryant, who was well known to European democrats for his active sympathy and support to the revolutionary democratic movements of Europe and South America, received a letter from France asking for assistance and advice This letter was written by one of the distinguished Garnier-Pagès brothers, probably the elder, whom Frederick Engels described as "the well-known democrat" noted for "the energy, courage and uncompromising spirit which secured so prominent a position to the deceased leader of French democracy." [29] Writing to Bryant as one "whose occupations and labors, as well as personal character," would be of the greatest assistance to the liberal cause in Europe, Pagès asked for information regarding the American system of government which "furnishes us with the model that we wish to imitate." "We have," M Pages wrote, "the most incomplete notion of the United States. ..You have arrived at that happy state in which you have nothing to think of but the conservation of the political well-being you enjoy, while we in France must fight continually to acquire what you already possess May I then ask of you, who are so competent to give them, the instructions that we so much need in our circumstances?" [30]

An indirect indication of the extent to which the French democrats looked to the United States was also given shortly after by the young French aristocrat Beaumont who accompanied Alexis de Tocqueville to America in 1832 "American society, its progress and its prosperity," Beaumont wrote from Boston to his brother Jules in France, "prove nothing at all, and offer nothing for the imitation of the old nations But I am nonetheless satisfied thoroughly to understand this republic of which they speak so much and from which they claim

to draw so many arguments in favor of 'democratic' innovations There are many people who, in good faith, consider the United States a powerful argument in favor of republics" [31]

5

Following the defeat of Napoleon, the young expanding industry, encouraged by the wars, received a severe setback, creating a state of national affairs, particularly in England, unprecedented in the history of Europe or of any other continent Industry was depressed, trade was bad, employment was scarce, the suffering of the workers and the unemployed was extreme The transformation of England into the leading industrial capitalist country in the world and the capitalist development of Europe were thus creating the conditions not only for the irresistible advance of democracy but also for the simultaneous sharpening of the social question which political liberty alone obviously could not solve

While the British capitalists developed classical political economy in an effort to penetrate into the mysteries of the new industrial system in order to make it work, others sought to improve the lot of the working people by drawing up blueprints for a more workable system free from the evils of capitalism Confronted by the crying abuses of the existing order, they believed that the answer was to figure out a more perfect social system, which needed only to be discovered by them and demonstrated to society by propaganda and, wherever possible, by actual experiments, to win universal acceptance Thus, in the absence of an independent working class movement, the dominant tendency of these thinkers was to search for the solution of the social problem, which lay hidden in undeveloped economic conditions, in utopian schemes to be financed by the capitalists themselves [32] The three men who played a European and even a world role in

the development of such utopian communist and socialist ideas were Robert Owen, Charles Fourier and Saint Simon

In the elaboration of their plans, the first two thinkers drew upon the experience of the communist communities which had existed in the United States since the end of the eighteenth century At that time, the first colony of the kind in the world was established by the religious sect of so-called Shakers Early in the nineteenth century, additional colonies were established by another body of communists under the leadership of George Rapp who came to the United States from Germany to escape religious persecution

During the 1820's, Robert Owen turned to the United States for the purpose of establishing his communist communities Owen, who had achieved a European reputation as a philanthropist and reformer, had been inspired by accounts of what the Shakers and Rappites had done In 1817, he published a *Sketch of the Origin and Proceedings of the Shakers* which narrated "the successful practice of these singular people" and which Owen presented as evidence of the superiority of a communal way of life From 1817, when he first turned to communism, until 1824, when he left for America, Owen conducted an intensive propaganda for his system throughout Europe.[33]

At this time, he found sympathy and support in the United States, where his writings were welcomed and read by wide circles, especially among the educated, well-to-do and government leaders And when, in 1824, George Rapp tried to sell his Harmony Colony, Owen, encouraged by the success of the Rappites, bought it He saw in the United States a new fertile soil in which to sow the seeds of his system, "the rational and only true system of society" He was convinced that the United States Constitution marked the greatest progress of mankind so far made in the direction of liberty. But he felt that it was not able to solve the "social malady."[34]

And, in fact, Owen's community, which he called New Harmony, became singularly prosperous and received more

applicants than could be accommodated But within six months it began to break up And before the year had elapsed, Owen, discouraged by the wreck of his project, left the United States Despite this failure, Owenite communities continued to spring up during the next few years at Yellow Springs, Ohio, at Blue Springs, Indiana, at Kendal near Canton, Ohio, at Pittsburgh, at Coxsackie, New York, at Haverstraw, New York, and at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania

The communist movement in Europe during this period was bound to be predominantly utopian in character because the working class, despite its growth, was still insufficiently developed, and its struggle, hampered by the absence of the most elementary democratic rights, was therefore still subordinate to that of the bourgeoisie striving for a share of political power The destruction of feudal conditions remained the chief political task before the working class at this time In all countries of Europe, therefore, from 1815 to 1830, the democratic movement of the working classes was necessarily more or less subordinate to the liberal movement of the bourgeoisie. The working people, as Engels observed, "though more advanced than the middle classes, could not yet see the total difference between liberalism and democracy —emancipation of the middle classes and emancipation of the working classes, they could not see the difference between liberty of *money* and liberty of *man*, until money had been made politically free, until the middle class had been made the exclusively ruling class Therefore the democrats of Peterloo were going to petition, not only for Universal Suffrage, but for Corn Law Repeal at the same time, therefore, the proletarians fought in 1830 in Paris, and threatened to fight in 1831 in England, for the political interest of the bourgeoisie

"In all countries the middle classes were, from 1815 to 1830, the most powerful component, and, therefore, the leaders of the revolutionary party. The working classes are necessarily the instruments in the hands of the middle classes, as

long as the middle classes are *themselves revolutionary* or progressive The distinct movement of the working classes, is, therefore, in this case always of a secondary importance But from that very day when the middle classes obtain full political power—from the day on which all feudal and aristocratic interests are annihilated by the power of *money*—from the day on which the middle classes *cease* to be progressive and revolutionary, and become stationary themselves, from that very day the working class movement takes the lead and becomes the national movement." [35]

CHAPTER V A New Epoch

I

THE period of the Napoleonic Wars, ending with the victory of the reactionary monarchs of Europe in 1815, also saw the rise and development of modern industry Factories sprang up and replaced household production, and the population began to concentrate in large cities In practically one generation, England was transformed from an agricultural to a manufacturing nation, an example which the other nations of Europe were soon to follow The irresistible advance of capitalist economy, propelled by the Industrial Revolution of the 1760's, foredoomed the short-lived effort of the kings and nobles to restore the old feudal order At the same time, it accumulated the materials and the forces throughout Europe for the emergence of a new epoch in the ascendancy of democracy whose arrival was signalized, on the economic plane, by the introduction of the steamboat and the locomotive, and, on the political plane, by the French Revolution of 1830 Stimulated by the success of republican institutions in the United States, the spirit of republicanism had grown to such an extent throughout monarch-ridden Europe during the 1820's that by 1830 there were substantial republican movements in nearly every European country [1] The driving force of these movements was the new class of wage earners that arose together with the factory system The July 1830 Revolution in France, which swept out the restoration and replaced

it by the bourgeois monarchy, therefore marked a turning point in European history and in the character of the world *struggle for democracy*

Hitherto the struggle had been between the feudal orders on the one hand and the more or less republican-minded bourgeoisie, supported by the people, on the other With the growth of industry, accelerated by the building of railroads, the chief antagonists were henceforth to become the bourgeoisie and the working class which now began to emerge as an independent political force This change was determined in a large measure by the behavior of the bourgeoisie In 1830 in France, it let the workers do the fighting, ostensibly for a republic, but then seized the fruits of victory and established a bourgeois monarchy, and in 1832 in England, it utilized labor to secure the franchise, but gave labor nothing for its pains In England, this treachery of the bourgeoisie gave rise in 1835 to a powerful independent movement of labor known as Chartism which was in sharp contrast to the utopian socialism of the preceding decade with its reliance on the force of reason and example to convince the bourgeoisie to emancipate the working class In France, because of the defeat of the general republican movement and the complete suppression of political rights, it gave rise, beginning in 1834, to various secret societies and conspiracies led by the working class and predominantly communist in character This treachery of the bourgeoisie and the rise of the new class of proletarians gave the struggle for democracy a new historical content Henceforth it was to be led by the modern working class, the most consistent democratic force in bourgeois society

The uprising of the Lyons silk weavers in 1831 which made an extraordinary and indelible impression all over France and Europe, signalized this historical turn Drawing the lessons from this revolt, the *Journal des Debats*, organ of the right wing of the big bourgeoisie, somberly declared on December 8, 1831 "There is no reason to conceal matters,

for what is the use of covering up and keeping silent? The Lyons uprising has revealed an important secret the struggle within society between the property owning class and the propertyless class Our commercial and industrial society, like all other societies, has its wound the workers There is not a single factory without workers, and yet with an ever-growing and ever-needy working population there can be no calm for society If trade is abolished, then society becomes sick, it comes to a stop, it dies off, when trade revives, develops, extends, the proletarian population increases simultaneously, living from hand to mouth and in danger of losing its means of existence at every occasion If you compare the number in the trading and industrial classes with the number in the working class in the cities, you will be shocked by the disproportion Every manufacturer lives in his factory like the plantation owner among his slaves, numerically, the classes are like one to one hundred It is necessary that the middle class be fully conscious of the state of affairs, it must understand its situation Besides the middle class there is a proletarian population which is in a state of excitement and which is gripped by spasms, which does not know what it wants, where it is going, what its interests require Things are bad for it It wants a change That is a danger for modern society, here perhaps new barbarians will arise to destroy this society And the middle class would be deceived if it permitted itself by any demagogic principles to be induced stupidly to give its enemies arms and rights, to allow the proletarian stream to enter the National Guard and the communal institutions, to open up to the proletariat the electoral laws and everything that belongs to the state" The article concluded by saying "Do not give political rights or national arms to those who do not own anything"[2]

In 1836, in the course of the debate on the tariff in 1836, the big industrialist, Jaubert, summed up the situation and bluntly proclaimed that "No society can do without an aristocracy, every government requires one. You want to know

who the aristocracy of the July 1830 Government was? It was the big industrialists, they are the nobility of the new dynasty" [3]

2

The victory of the financial bourgeoisie in France did not end the struggle for democracy in that country They had achieved power and established a bourgeois monarchy with Louis Philippe as king only because they had been able to secure the agreement of Lafayette, who was the outstanding leader of the republican movement at the time of the July Revolution and commander-in-chief of the National Guard Once Lafayette had served their purpose, they moved to strip him of his military authority

The government of Louis Philippe was thoroughly reactionary, despite the fact that it pretended to base itself on republican institutions The republican-minded workers, lower middle class and even part of the bourgeoisie of France were the first victims of this reaction Lafayette's acceptance of the bourgeois monarchy had been a terrible blow to the French republicans By this act, he had helped to give power to the Royal dynasty of which the banker Laffitte declared "Now the reign of the bankers begins" Lafayette himself, after his removal as head of the National Guard, had joined the official opposition in the new Chamber of Deputies He had been a representative of the Constitutionalists in the first French Revolution and even at that time had shown his fear of the masses and their demands for full equality And yet, as the British labor leader and democrat, George Julian Harney, one of the editors of the *Northern Star*, said in 1846, he was "perhaps the most honest and best man of the Constitutional Party," a man who enjoyed greater popularity in Europe and America up to the time of his death than any one of his contemporaries [4]

By 1832, the bourgeois republicans, backed by the work-

ers, began to wage a struggle against Louis Philippe and his repressive measures This movement, and especially its Left wing representing the lower middle class and workers, developed considerable activity through republican societies, the most prominent of which were the Society of the Friends of the People and the Association for the Defense of the Liberty of the Subject and the Freedom of the Press, the latter under the presidency of Lafayette.

In June 1832, during the funeral of General Lamarque, a revolt broke out in Paris which frightened the financial aristocracy even more than the Lyons uprising of the year before. The workers raised barricades but the rising was crushed

In 1833 the Society of the Friends of the People was succeeded by the Society of the Rights of Man This latter society grew quickly and took a strong hold on the country. Its object was to keep alive the popular movement begun in 1830 and to prevent republican feeling from subsiding About the middle of 1833, serious differences split the society into two parties, the Left wing being led by old Jacobin revolutionaries, including Philippe Buonarroti, a colleague of Babeuf and by such young adherents of Babeuvism as Auguste Blanqui.

In 1834 the government launched a new attack against all sections of the republican movement, threatening their existence with a law re-enforcing Article 291 relating to associations. This law was aimed expressly at the Republican Party, intending to destroy it But it also affected the workers united in mutual associations, as well as the small trades people whose numbers had increased considerably in the course of the '30's. A virtual death sentence was also passed on the popular publications by the enactment of a law which required police permission for all writings sold, distributed or cried in the public streets.[5]

On April 9, 1834, the workers of Lyons, whose historic uprising of 1831 had brought fear and trembling to the property-owning classes throughout Europe, revolted again. This

revolt was the reply of the associated silk workers to the government's new law threatening the existence of associations. The silk workers had shown marked political tendencies for several months prior to the revolt, and they had come to an understanding with the workers organized in societies in other parts of the country, as well as with the bourgeois republicans, in order to resist by force the government's new law But after five days, the troops of Louis Philippe had drowned the insurrection in blood. On April 13, the republicans in Paris struck and the next day the government massacred the supporters of the Society of the Rights of Man, and, utilizing these events, proceeded to smash the Republican Party in France [6]

While the bourgeois monarchy was thus waging war against French democracy in an attempt to liquidate it, it was pursuing a foreign policy that threatened to lead it into war with American democracy On July 4, 1831, the two countries had signed a treaty in which the French Government had agreed to meet American claims of $25,000,000 for damages suffered by American shipping during the Napoleonic Wars between 1806 and 1812 This treaty had been ratified by both America and France on February 2, 1832. But in 1834, when payment on the claims fell due under the treaty, the French Chamber of Deputies refused to pass the necessary appropriation bill. As a result, President Jackson sent a strongly worded message to Congress in December proposing that the United States make reprisals on French shipping to the amount of the defaulted payments unless the French Chamber fulfilled its treaty obligations by making the proper appropriations The President, who was prompt to quell the threat of rebellion within the country in order to keep the states united, could not tolerate any external threat to the Union He understood that unless the other great powers were to honor their agreements with America, the young republic would lose prestige and it could no longer carry on its trade and commerce in safety [7]

The dissolution of the Republican Party in 1834 opened a new stage in the struggle for democracy in France. Up to 1830 the liberal bourgeoisie had taken the lead in all conspiracies against the Bourbon Restoration The July Revolution was the joint work of the middle and working classes, the liberals and republicans. After the financial aristocracy took power, the republican bourgeoisie continued in the forefront of the struggle until the bloody suppression of the apparently futile insurrections of the workers caused them to fall away After 1834, therefore, the leadership of the conspiracies was taken over by the proletariat, which had grown with the progress of industry throughout France.

The government had been able to take advantage of the industrial and commercial crisis in November 1830 temporarily to crush the political aspirations of the workers But it could not suppress their economic needs nor prevent the development of the workers' movement which a year later culminated in the historic insurrection at Lyons By the end of 1832 industrial recovery had progressed so far that several months later the workers began a general action for the improvement of their conditions In some places this movement assumed a distinct social and political character The monarchy regarded this movement as a threat to its existence and entered into a struggle with the organized workers. By mass arrests and drastic sentences in Paris, it was able to check the agitation which was being encouraged by the Republican Party.[8]

But it was not able to prevent the rise of new currents of thought among the masses who saw how the rapid economic development which followed the July Revolution enriched the financial aristocracy, while they were forced to toil long hours at miserable wages This, together with the tyranny of the government, its bloody suppression and persecution of the labor and political movements of the people, facilitated the rise of a new doctrine among the workers In the first Revolution the struggle for democracy and the republic had given rise to the communist movement led by Babeuf. The second

Revolution of 1830 gave rise to another, more powerful communist movement. The republican working men saw that even after having succeeded in their democratic plans, their social condition, the cause of their political discontent would not be altered fundamentally by a purely political change. They turned to the history of the Great Revolution and eagerly seized upon Babeuf's communism [9]

Following the execution of Babeuf and Darthé and the banishment of Buonarroti and his comrades in 1797, the French communist movement had disappeared from the surface of political life for three decades But in 1827 Babeuf's ideas began to spread again through the work of Buonarroti, then living in Brussels The French Charbonnerie, of a mixed liberal-bourgeois and democratic republican character, who hated tyranny and aspired to liberty and equality, established contact with Buonarroti and acquired from him the ideas of the Babeuf conspiracy One of the first members of the Charbonnerie to go beyond mere republicanism and to become a staunch follower of Babeuf's teachings was the young Louis Auguste Blanqui In 1828 Buonarroti published his book *Conspiration pour l'égalité dite de Babeuf* (*Babeuf's Conspiracy of the Equals*) which was widely read not only by Frenchmen but later also by many German exiles in France and even by Chartists in England. Buonarroti's book helped the workers to pass from a general republican position to communism During the July monarchy, Buonarroti returned from exile and became the center of a group of revolutionists. By 1834 Babeuf's teachings had taken hold sufficiently to form the basis of the revolutionary labor movement in France for the next decade

They had been first discussed, as Engels described it, "in the dark lanes and crowded allies of the Parisian suburb, St. Antoine, and soon after in secret assemblies of conspirators. ...Communism spread rapidly over Paris, Lyons, Toulouse, and other large and manufacturing towns of the realm, various secret associations followed each other, among which the

Travailleurs Égalitaires or Equalitarian Workingmen, and Humanitarians were the most considerable The Equalitarians were rather a 'rough set' like the Babeuvists of the Great Revolution, they proposed making the world a workingman's community putting down every refinement of civilization, science, the fine arts, etc, as useless, dangerous, and aristocratic luxuries, a prejudice necessarily arising from a total ignorance of history and political economy. The Humanitarians were known particularly for their attacks on marriage, family and other similar institutions. Both these, as well as two or three other parties, were very short-lived, and the great bulk of the French working classes adopted, very soon, the tenets propounded by M. Cabet, 'Père Cabet' (Father Cabet) as he is called, and which are known on the Continent under the name of Icarian Communism." [10]

After the crushing of the second Lyons' revolt in the Spring of 1834 and the subsequent dissolution of the Republican Party, the group of republicans headed by Blanqui, leader of the Left wing in the Rights of Man Society, organized a Society of the Families in July 1834 as a more effective and conspiratorial form of organization in the struggle to overthrow the monarchy This society was essentially proletarian and communist in character. It spread rapidly In the beginning of 1836 it numbered 1200 men, and had important ramifications in two regiments garrisoned in Paris. Arrests soon followed, Blanqui was sentenced to two years, and the Society broke up In 1836 and 1837, with the release of Blanqui in a general amnesty, the work was resumed and the Society of the Families was transformed into the Society of the Seasons which was still more distinctly working class and communist in character. In 1839, the years of the insurrection, it had an enrollment of 1000 men.

The Blanquists regarded the financial magnates as the aristocrats after July 1830, and the people, consisting of all the workers, as no better off than serfs or Negro slaves They therefore insisted that it was not enough merely to overthrow

royalty, that the next revolution would be social, not political, and would destroy all privileges whatsoever which must be replaced by "the government of the people, by the people, that is to say, the republic,"—the republic, that is to say, the government of equality, "and for the attainment of this government it would be necessary to employ a revolutionary power which is to prepare the people for an exercise of their rights" [11]

The Blanquists also looked with sympathy towards American labor, but regarded the United States as "a ridiculous republic, and a money-loving aristocracy" This aroused the indignation of Lewis Cass, the American Minister to France from 1836 to 1840, who reported these views and exclaimed "When a French republican, the great burden of whose complaint is the unequal distribution of riches in his contry, and the profligacy of his rulers, arraigns the American Government for its economy, there is nothing farther to be expected in the whole range of human inconsistencies" [12]

After the defeat of the insurrection and the suppression of the Society of the Seasons in May 1839, other secret societies were organized under the name of New Seasons, but they were insignificant and without the benefit of the leadership of Blanqui and Buonarroti, the latter having died and the former being confined in prison from 1839 to 1848

Some of the British Chartists were either members of the Blanquist Societies of the Families and the Seasons or were in communication with them The Chartist rising in 1839 was possibly planned to coincide with the Paris insurrection The German communists Weitling, Schapper, Bauer and other members of the London German Educational Society, which later formed the nucleus of the Communist League, first became acquainted with revolutionary communism in the Societies of the Families and the Seasons Weitling and Schapper also took part in the revolt of May 1839

The Icarian communism of Cabet, which after 1840 came to enjoy the support of the great bulk of the French working

classes, also grew out of the general republican movement. Étienne Cabet was originally a middle class republican Persecuted by the bourgeois monarchy, he was elected by the Opposition to the Chamber of Deputies, where he boldly championed his convictions Condemned to imprisonment in 1834, he fled to London where his observation of the Owenite movement and his study of Thomas More's *Utopia* made him a communist. He returned to France to become "the most popular even if the shallowest representative of communism," as Karl Marx asserted [13] Cabet's book, *Voyage en Icarie*, became the "holy book" of the Icarian communists, who advocated the establishment of communities along lines very little different from those of Robert Owen They also embodied in their plans everything rational they found in St Simon and Fourier, but while the English socialists were opposed to Christianity, the French Icarians declared themselves Christians and advanced the slogan that *Le Christianisme c'est le communisme* (Christianity is Communism) Furthermore, in contrast to the other utopians, Cabet called for the rule of political democracy as a necessary transition period He called upon the workers of France to be, first of all, democrats and reformers, to sign petitions for the abolition of suffrage restrictions which were based on the principle of active and passive citizens and which put electoral power in the hands of a small, rapacious minority of no more than 240,000 in the country [14]

The bourgeois monarchy was not overthrown until 1848. Deprived of public life, the democratic movement was compelled to resort to conspiratorial methods and insurrection as the only way to establish the democratic republic In the first six years of Louis Philippe's rule, nearly a dozen laws were passed depriving the people of their political rights, followed by more than a dozen attempts to assassinate the "citizen king," and at least three dozen revolts For nine years after the failure of the Blanquist rising of May 1839, the people of France, and particularly the working class, resorted

to other methods of struggle for the overthrow of the despised monarchy In this battle for the second democratic republic, the various groups of communists proved to be a vital force in France in the decade between 1837 and 1848

3

As in France, so in England after 1830, it was the labor movement, striving to solve the social question, that was the heart and soul of the struggle for democracy England at that time, unlike France and America, was a land where the majority of people were members of the working class, that class which the economists defined as having nothing but its labor to sell As one contemporary writer described it, "In England, where, in every department of industry, a complete separation has taken place between capitalists and workmen, the laboring class compose the bulk of the people " And it lived under such frightful conditions that, as this writer observed, "if there be one subject in particular upon which Englishmen love to dwell, it is the misery and degradation of the bulk of the people " [15]

Another subject was the absence of full electoral rights for all except the aristocrats The working class was more than ready to help the capitalists achieve electoral reform. But, while the British capitalists had no qualms about using the working class to win this fight, they had no intention of extending this reform to British labor, that is, to the bulk of the people. The reason for this was stated very bluntly by Thomas Atwood, leader of the Political Union of Birmingham and head of the bourgeois electoral reform movement. Drawing a parallel between the political situation in England and America where Negroes and foreigners had no vote, he said in a speech before his colleagues in the latter part of 1830

"In America there were at least nine men interested in property to one man interested in labor alone In England the case was exactly the reverse Here there were nine persons in-

terested in the sale of their labor, to one who was interested in the preservation of his property Therefore, if it had not been deemed safe for the national interests in America to confer political power indiscriminately upon every individual in the community, they ought not to be surprised if it was deemed still more unsafe in a state of society like that of England, where property was gathered up into immense masses and where extreme poverty might so act upon the passions and necessities of the people as to have them unfair judges over the property of their neighbours, and probably to urge them on to measures alike destructive of the interests and happiness of all." [16]

This, as we have seen, was substantially the same argument that was being given currency by the French financial magnates against the workers of Paris, Lyons and other centers of industry in France.

When the Reform Bill of 1832 gave electoral rights only to the British bourgeoisie, the laboring masses were deeply disappointed, especially since it had been the action of the workers of Lancashire and Yorkshire that secured the passage of the Bill

Ever since 1799, when the workers organized secret societies in reply to the first drastic attempts to deny them the right to organize, they had not given up the struggle for democratic rights When the prohibition of the right to organize was finally lifted by Act of Parliament in 1824, it was followed immediately by a rapid spread of trade union organization throughout industry, accompanied by strikes for better conditions Parliament was frightened and hastened, the very next year, to curb union organization But labor was already on the march and its organizations continued to grow despite all restrictions The disappointment of 1832 only spurred the workers to greater efforts In 1834 they organized a strong central body with distinct communist aims and initiated a series of strike struggles which nevertheless ended in defeat Though the organization was broken up, this did not stop

the growth of the trade unions The class consciousness of the British working class had been awakened and it continued to organize the struggle for democratic rights For this purpose, it united with the radical petty bourgeoisie which was also striving for universal suffrage and Parliamentary reform

The behavior of the bourgeoisie in the Reform Parliament only increased the disappointment of the workers and drove them into political opposition The factory law of 1833, which was a backward step in comparison with previous factory laws, aggravated the situation Consequently, in 1835, the workers organized an independent movement in London and adopted a six-point program known as the People's Charter These points were 1 Universal suffrage for every man of sound mind and not a criminal, 2 annual Parliaments, 3 payment of members of Parliament, 4 secret ballot, 5 equal voting districts, and 6 the right of every voter to be elected [17]

The movement for this Charter was the first effort on the part of British labor to conquer political power and use it for its own interests But the Chartist movement was not a purely proletarian movement, moreover, the trade unions, discouraged by the defeat of their strike struggles, remained aloof The Chartists took advantage of the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy over the Corn Laws to secure the enactment of the ten-hour work day By 1842, the movement revealed its full social character in the slogan· Political Power Our Means, Social Happiness Our Goal [18]

The Chartists fought to win political rights for labor as the basis for the social emancipation of the working class. And in this struggle they looked to America as the highest achievement of democracy in the world at the time, while recognizing its bourgeois limitations They consistently cited the example of America, used it to refute the bourgeois and Tory arguments in England, wrote articles in the press about it, sent addresses to the American workers, and associated themselves with Abolitionism, the American anti-slavery movement [19]

4

In the United States, the historical turn in the democratic struggle was manifested in the rise of Jacksonian democracy representing the alliance of the small independent farmers and the newly emerged factory proletariat which was just beginning to develop its own independent political movement and socialist thought [20] The spokesmen of the American bourgeoisie advanced the same arguments in the same language against the new labor and democratic movement as their French and British counterparts In 1831, for example, Thomas Cooper, the leading economist in America, opposed universal suffrage and the removal of property restrictions on voting because he expected the political power of the country, sooner or later, "and within no long period," to be "thrown irrevocably into the hands of those who represent the operatives, the laboring classes, the men of no property, to the exclusion of the men who possess property This event is now exultingly expected by the mechanics' meetings of New York and Pennsylvania .. " [21]

"Suppose," Cooper argued, "the representatives of the mechanics, who are now openly advocating an equal division of property among adults, under the auspices of Messrs Alex. Ming and Thomas Skidmore, in their prospectus and defence of it, (*Free Enquirer*, New York, for December 1829, and January 1830), to become the efficient legislative majority; whose property would be safe under this system of liberty and equality, enforced by such a majority? What a glorious range of rapine and of plunder, would present itself to the benevolent advocates of the right of robbery! This would be the true millenium of the jail tenantry throughout the civilized world! I impute no bad design to Messrs Ming and Skidmore, but I regard this as fair deduction from the principles they have recommended and proclaimed " [22]

In the United States, however, unlike France, it was democracy that was victorious at this time. Elected President

of the United States in 1828, Andrew Jackson was the leader and symbol of the fighting American democracy which won during the next period greatly extended suffrage, the liberalizing of state constitutions and the greater popular control of political parties and government The chief driving force in this democracy was the new labor movement

The political upsurge of labor began in 1827 in Philadelphia in connection with the struggle for the ten-hour day By May 1828, the new trade union center, which had arisen out of the struggle the previous year, became the spearhead for independent political action by labor It nominated candidates to "represent the interest of the working classes" in the Philadelphia City Council and State Legislature Many of these candidates were endorsed by the Jacksonian Democratic Party and were elected For the next three years, a distinctly labor turn was given to the politics of Philadelphia

New York, Boston and other industrial centers followed suit Labor's struggle for the ten-hour day was transferred to the political field Local labor parties were formed in at least fifteen states, at least 50 labor papers were established.

This movement bore a distinctly militant class struggle character This first movement of labor was conscious of its own class interests The newspapers, pamphlets and political platforms issued by labor at this time were animated by a class philosophy, hostile to the rich and displaying contempt for them Thus, the Declaration of Faith issued by the Workingmen's Republican Political Association of Penn Township in Philadelphia in 1830 stated "There appears to exist two distinct classes, the rich and the poor, the oppressor and the oppressed, those that live by their own labor, and they that live by the labor of others, the aristocratic and the democratic, the despotic and republican who are in direct opposition to one another in their objects and pursuits, the one aspiring to dignified station and offices of power, the other seeking for an equality of state and advantage " [23]

The ten-hour day, free education, abolition of imprison-

ment for debt, were among the chief demands in the program of this movement, which made steady progress during the '30's By 1836 Philadelphia had 53 trade unions, Newark and Boston 16 each, Baltimore 23, New York 52 Central labor bodies were organized also Attempts were made to set up a national trade union organization, but nothing came of it During 1835-36 no less than five separate crafts or trades held national conventions of their own Growth of the railway facilitated this

The capitalists responded with bitter attacks on labor The workers were called levellers, mob, rabble, anarchists and communists Indeed, between 1829 and 1842, capital made a systematic effort to crush the trade union movement At least eight important prosecutions for criminal conspiracy were instituted against the unions which were accused of representing foreign influence.

But this new labor movement was part of the democratic upsurge signalized by the victory of Andrew Jackson in 1828 and 1832 In the elections of 1836, the workers in New York organized their own party, the Equal Rights Party This party was dubbed the Locofocos by the enemies of labor because matches of that name were used when the light went out at one of their meetings It directed its main fire against the monopolies and banks The Locofoco Party, as one authority noted, "believed that it was their influence which made the election of Andrew Jackson a possibility, and there can scarcely be a doubt that the Democratic Party from 1829 to 1841 was more truly a workingman's party than has been the case with any other great political party in our country [24]

In 1837 the outbreak of the economic crisis, which lasted almost without interruption to 1842, smashed this first trade union movement [25]

The chief domestic issues of Jackson's administration revolved around Nullification and the National Bank Under the leadership of Calhoun, South Carolina, spearhead of the cotton planting slaveocracy, rejected the national tariff of

1832 and declared that the laws of the United States were null and void and of no effect in the state. Slaveowners prepared for armed resistance and sent agents to the other slave states This was the first overt action of the slave powers against the integrity of the National Union It was a typical reactionary policy of rule or ruin But Andrew Jackson took such prompt and energetic measures that the rebellion was stamped out before it had a chance to spread He sent troops and vessels to South Carolina and co-operated with loyalist elements in the state.

The struggle over the National Bank, however, overshadowed every other issue during Jackson's Administration Behind the Bank were grouped all the elements of the growing capitalist class, the great financial interests, the expanding manufacturing interests and the large Eastern seaboard planters Men like Daniel Webster and Henry Clay who defended the Bank, were actually on the Bank's payroll Since the charter of the Bank expired in 1836, the opponents of Jackson, under Clay's leadership, decided to make the re-chartering of the Bank the issue for the 1832 election Accordingly, they passed a bill for the re-charter of the Bank, incidentally with the votes of many administration supporters Jackson replied with a veto in language unprecedented in any Presidential message

"It is to be regretted," he wrote, "that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their selfish purposes Distinctions in society will always exist under every just government Equality of talents, of education, or of wealth cannot be produced by human institutions In the full enjoyment of the gifts of Heaven, and the fruits of superior industry, economy and virtue, every man is equally entitled to protection by the law, but when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities, and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humbler members of society—the farmers, mechanics, and laborers who

have neither the time nor the means of securing like favors to themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their government .

" . Many of our rich men have not been content with equal protection and equal benefits, but have besought us to make them richer by Act of Congress By attempting to gratify their desires, we have in the results of our legislation arrayed section against section, interest against interest, and man against man in a fearful commotion which threatens to shake the foundation of our Union we can at least take a stand against all new grants of monopolies and exclusive privileges, against the prostitution of our government to the advancement of the few at the expense of the many.. ." [2c]

Jackson's Bank veto caused a tremendous sensation throughout the country To the Bank men it appeared so monstrous and treasonable that they had thousands of copies printed and distributed at the Bank's expense But to the common people of America, the message was such a convincing exposure of the "national Octopus," that they rallied behind "Old Hickory" as never before and re-elected him to the Presidency in 1832 by an overwhelming vote.

During his second term, Jackson proceeded to carry out the mandate of the people. He stripped the National Bank of all special privileges enjoyed from the government and reduced it to the status of an ordinary state bank In 1834 he removed the public deposits from the Bank and distributed the funds among several state banks In his annual message of that year, he called for the severance of all relations with the Bank and proposed selling the Bank stock owned by the government.

In the course of this struggle, the National Bank used every means at its command With such political leaders as Clay and Webster conducting the fight in Congress and Nicholas Biddle, the Bank President, using money freely, the Bank was no mean adversary, it bought up newspapers, put key Congressmen on its payroll, lent money on easy terms to impor-

tant public figures During the election of 1832 it expanded its loans from $35,000,000 to $70,000,000 with a view to extending its influence as far as possible In 1834, when the public deposits were removed, it suddenly called in its loans and contracted the currency so sharply that it induced a panic, the blame for which it tried to lay on Jackson As it became more and more desperate, it resorted to increasingly irresponsible methods Finally, its books were closed to government investigation, the government-appointed members of the Board of Directors were kept out of meetings and, as a crowning treachery, the Bank bribed foreigners who held U S. Bonds maturing in 1834 not to call for payment for which the Bank was responsible, so that the Bank could keep government money with which to attack the government [27]

Notwithstanding its unlimited resources and unscrupulous devices, the Bank was crushed by the steadfast leadership of Andrew Jackson backed up by the power of the farmers and workers who were mobilized by a disciplined party Jacksonian politicians who sold out to the Bank were completely isolated and discredited, the party ranks kept solid

At the close of his second term in 1837, Jackson delivered a Farewell Message to Congress "The planter, the farmer, the mechanic, and the laborer," he said, "all know that their success depends upon their own industry and economy, and that they must not expect to become suddenly rich by the fruits of their toil Yet these classes of society form the great body of the people of the United States, they are the bone and sinew of the country—men who love liberty and desire nothing but equal rights and equal laws, and who moreover hold the great mass of our national wealth, although it is distributed in moderate amounts among the millions of freemen who possess it But with overwhelming numbers and wealth on their side they are in constant danger of losing their fair influence in the government, and with difficulty maintain their just rights against the incessant efforts daily made to encroach on them The mischief springs from the

power the moneyed interest derives from a paper currency they are able to control, from the multitudes of corporations with exclusive privileges which they have succeeded in obtaining in the different states, and which are employed altogether for their benefit, and unless you become more watchful in your states and check this spirit of monopoly and thirst for exclusive privileges you will in the end find that the most important powers of government have been given or bartered away, and the control over your dearest interests has passed into the hands of these corporations " [28]

Jacksonian democracy was a continuation and at the same time a further development of democracy of the first decades of the Republic At the time of the earlier democratic upsurge, the country was still in its infancy, essentially a land of small, independent farmers, with a rudimentary manufacture which was still in the artisan stage, and commerce, fisheries, and credit the dominant form of capitalist activity. Jacksonian democracy had a different economic foundation created by the rise of the new factory system and a factory proletariat. But though the economic difference was significant, it was too little developed as yet to eliminate the great similarity in the social and political conditions of the two periods Nevertheless, Jacksonian democracy extended the democratic gains registered in the earlier period. While the first democratic movement forced the enactment of a popular Bill of Rights, Jacksonian democracy achieved a rudimentary charter of the rights of labor. While Jeffersonian democracy saved the republic, the later democracy eliminated aristocratic controls in the State constitutions, took the control of government finances out of the greedy hands of private capital, temporarily curbed the power of the growing corporations, safeguarded the public lands from predatory manipulations, abolished imprisonment for debt, and extended the suffrage for the common people. Yet, with all these advances, democracy was restricted by its capitalist basis, and in the last analysis, it was the development of capitalist economy which

determined the character and destiny of the American republic.

5

In 1837 the United States was shaken by a tremendous economic crisis The factory system was just being established when the entire structure came tumbling down in a terrible crash Unemployment and hunger, which seemed to have been the exclusive attribute of crowded Europe, the Europe of Malthusian gloom, now made its institutional appearance in the prodigal land of America American economy was prostrate for six years, recuperating only in 1842

Actually the crisis of 1837 was only the prelude to a greater economic advance The crisis shook up American social relations, but because of the favorable long-term trends within which it occurred and the fact that America was still predominantly agrarian in character, its immediate social consequences were to make the decade of the 1840's pre-eminently a decade of sympathy for various utopian communist experiments of the Fourierist type, particularly among the American intelligentsia Even the labor movement, which began to stir again in 1845, assumed the form of a movement for free land Whereas in Europe, it was the newly developing labor movements which put forward communist ideas and organized practical political struggles for democracy and the realization of their social aims, it was characteristic of the American situation at this time, that the labor movement was striving to make every worker an independent property owner through the acquisition of free land, while the middle class intelligentsia, seeking an answer to the breakdown of society, were the chief proponents of communism, but the utopian communism of the Fourierist phalanx which had no connection with the actual life of the country and could flourish only in the genial atmosphere of industrially unde-

veloped conditions, contrary, of course, to the fundamental trend of development of the United States

It was from 1842 to 1846 that Fourierism extended rapidly over the country under the leadership of Albert Brisbane, Horace Greeley, Charles A Dana and others At least 34 communities were organized during this time

Brook Farm was the most outstanding of the Fourierist experiments in the United States It was not called a phalanx at first, although from the start it incorporated many features of Fourierism Its leading spirits were Ripley, Dana and Margaret Fuller Others associated with the experiment were George William Curtis, Horace Greeley, Dr Channing and Nathaniel Hawthorne

The Fourierist colonies which attained the proportions of a national movement, represented the peak of interest in such utopian communist communities in the United States, although as late as 1886, there were still from 70 to 80 communist communities in the country, with an estimated membership of from 6,000 to 7,000 and an estimated property value of $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 Altogether, over 100 and possibly 200 communist villages were founded in the United States, covering nearly every state in the Union, before the triumph of industrialism eliminated the space, the temper and the conditions congenial to such experiments [29]

The American people, especially in the 1840's, were friendly and generous towards these communist experiments They also witnessed with sympathy the rise of the communist movements in France, Germany, Switzerland and England at this time The 1840's were a decade astir with social movements and aspirations And the young generation in America, contemporary with the young Karl Marx in Germany, looked upon the new historical developments in the world with eager optimism [30]

CHAPTER VI The Democratic Movement in Germany

I

GERMANY entered upon the course of modern capitalist development later than England or France In England a rich and powerful bourgeois class had begun to flourish as early as the seventeenth century, in France it came into existence in the eighteenth century But in Germany it was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century that such a class emerged. There had been, of course, many beginnings of capitalist production in Germany before that time There were individual wealthy shipowners in the Hanseatic cities; and, despite the general poverty of the country, the old commercial and maritime centers had accumulated considerable capital There were a few wealthy bankers in the interior, and even the fiscal policies and needs of the diverse despots served as levers of capitalist development But there was no class of big capitalists and least of all of big industrial capitalists prior to the opening of the nineteenth century.[1]

It was Napoleon, with his Continental system and his pressure on Prussia for freedom of trade, who laid the actual foundations of German industry But like the rest of Europe after his defeat, Germany was "restored" by the Congress of Vienna, which established a German Confederation consisting of 38 principalities in which Metternichian reaction reigned supreme As a result, after 15 years of "restoration," Germany in 1830 had not advanced beyond the economic level of 1800.

Less than one-third of the population lived in cities, and even here, handicraft, though on the decline, still predominated [2]

It was in Western Germany, benefitting from the impact of the French Revolution, that industry attained the level of modern bourgeois development In the east, in the province of Silesia with its linen weaving and in the Kingdom of Saxony, weighed down by feudal fetters, capitalism was based upon domestic industry, the oldest and most backward form of capitalist production, carried on by small peasants who were compelled to supplement their meager income by the sale of their labor power. But in the Rhine province of Prussia, industry was more developed and diversified than in Silesia or Saxony because the province having been annexed to France in 1795 and, encouraged by the liberating effect of the legislation of the French Revolution, had undergone a profound political, administrative, economic and social change Machine industry had appeared early in the province, the first mechanical spinning machine operated by water-power in Germany having been introduced in 1783 by an Elberfeld manufacturer The destruction of feudal remnants encouraged the rapid development of the new industry, extended German mining and stimulated commerce

But in 1815 the Vienna Congress turned Westphalia and the Rhine province back to Prussia The Rhine province was compelled to abolish its reforms and re-establish its pre-revolutionary status The Government in Berlin did its utmost to reduce the province to the cultural level of the East Elbe provinces.

The Metternichian restoration, however, was not able to destroy the foundations laid by Napoleon for the bourgeois development of Germany In a few years the new or extended branches of production became sufficiently important, and the bourgeoisie they created became sufficiently influential, so that by 1818 the Prussian Government was compelled to take its first official notice of the bourgeoisie and grant its demand for a protective tariff.[3] Reluctantly it conceded that

the bourgeoisie had become an indispensable class for the country, even though a year later it stifled the first frail beginnings of political life manifested in the student agitation by passing the Carlsbad Decrees and inaugurating a witch-hunt against the so-called demagogues In 1834 the Prussian Government, motivated by purely fiscal and political considerations, had to make a second concession to the bourgeoisie in the form of the *Zollverein* or customs union. This *Zollverein* increased competition and eliminated the previous means of production, and while it gave the nobility and petty bourgeoisie a few small, but temporary advantages, it benefitted primarily the Prussian bourgeoisie It was the beginning of a comparatively rapid development of capitalist economy in Germany, most branches of modern industry were introduced, peasant or petty bourgeois patriarchialism was driven out in several districts, capital was concentrated to some extent, a considerable network of railroads was built, and a proletariat was created

Backward as Germany was, it could not escape the impact of the French Revolution of July 1830, although it lacked the economic conditions for a national democratic movement While the bourgeoisie in Prussia remained undisturbed, there was some response in other parts of North Germany The petty ruler of Brunswick was driven out of his principality A co-regent was introduced in Cassel as a means of curbing the power of the despot In Hanover, feudal remnants were partly wiped out as a result of student actions in Gottingen and militancy of the peasants, in Saxony it was as a result of riots in Leipzig and Dresden By and large, however, the North German movement was quite mild and forced the removal of only the most intolerable evils [4]

In South Germany the response was more vigorous There, too, in such places as Baden and Hesse, the problem was to abolish feudal services and burdens. Essentially, however, the South German movement was a constitutional movement whose immediate object was the nullification of the repressive

Carlsbad Decrees of 1819 Some of the bolder spirits aspired to a Free United States of Germany on the American model. The center of the movement was in the Bavarian Rhine Palatinate, partly because of the freedom allowed by French law, partly because of the acute suffering of the small peasants and the petty bourgeoisie The agitational efforts of the South German press culminated in a great demonstration at Hambach in 1832 which the exiled idol of German republicans, Ludwig Borne, described in the most ecstatic terms The hope awakened among German liberals by the July Revolution, that the various German governments might be pushed onto the path of liberalism, received a new impetus. But it was not long before Metternich, by invoking the laws of the German Confederation, was able to paralyze the entire constitutional movement After the Hambach demonstration reactionary measures of repression piled up quickly. The newly adopted constitutions were suppressed, and freedom of the press, assembly and association were annulled in all states of the German Confederation By 1834 every democratic impulse was successfully stifled

The numerous insurrections and movements following the July Revolution betokened a new era of popular and middle class agitation in Germany, which assumed a republican character, especially in the North In contrast to the movements of 1819 and 1823 which were student movements, the violent agitation of 1830-34 showed that the middle class had now taken up the question for itself. In the realm of literature this agitation was developed by a group of young writers known as Young Germany which attempted to spread liberal political and social ideas by means of the pen, they attained the status of a semi-opposition But with Germany divided into many states, almost every one of which had its own customs and duty rates, there was no community of interest in these movements. Furthermore, the struggles of the liberal middle classes of Germany remained fruitless as long as they were confined to the smaller Southern states, they became im-

portant as soon as the middle classes of Prussia were aroused from their lethargy which was not until the next decade Indeed, from 1834 to 1840 every public movement died out in Germany There were no political meetings or societies, no parliamentary tribunes, and censorship reigned supreme. The agitators of 1830 and 1834 were either imprisoned or fled to foreign countries.[5]

2

In 1840 the political movement came to life again in Prussia The middle classes believed that the time had come to show that things had changed since 1815. They began to put forward demands for a representative constitution, liberty of the press, open courts of law, and trial by jury The occasion for this was the death that year of Frederick William III of Prussia whose bureaucratic, patriarchal government had maintained a monopoly on politics. The new king, Frederick William IV, who had aroused great hopes because of his liberal promises when he ascended the throne in the spring of 1840, proved to be even more reactionary than his father.

All his sympathies were with the feudal nobility. He could not tolerate the legislation adopted under the influence of the Enlightenment nor the abolition of most remnants of feudalism in Prussia from 1807 to 1813 He therefore grasped at every remnant of feudalism that he could find. He bolstered the nobility by granting loans to them, he treated the bourgeoisie as a separate estate representing trade and industry to be distinguished from the nobility and the peasants. He showed a predilection for everything medieval, especially for the system of feudal corporations, monopolies and privileges, and sought to restore the Christian state, at least its theological appearance. Reaction in the state had begun to unite with reaction in the Church even before Frederick William IV ascended the throne. But no sooner was he crowned than he hastened to erect a consistent Christian, feudal monarchy.

The political struggle at this time, therefore, assumed the initial form of a theological and philosophical conflict The philosophy of Hegel, which had been the dominant state philosophy in Prussia for twenty years under Frederick William III's Minister of Culture, Altenstein, was now regarded as incompatible with the new Christian state Frederick William IV saw in Hegelianism a menace to religion because of its rationalist character and to the monarchy because of its liberal tendencies. The Hegelians were systematically replaced by orthodox pietists, reactionary romanticists, and representatives of the Historical Rights School The philosopher Schelling was called from Munich to the University of Berlin to drive out Hegelian "pantheism" with his Philosophy of Revelation It was not long before Hegelian philosophy actually revealed its revolutionary side

Hegel had died in 1831 By 1835, D F Strauss' *Life of Jesus* appeared, the first work to show progress beyond the limits of orthodox Hegelianism Others followed, and in 1837, the Hegelian school revealed a sharp cleavage between the orthodox followers of Hegel and those they called the New Hegelians In 1838 Arnold Ruge established the *Hallische Jahrbucher* (*Halle Annals*) as a liberal review in opposition to the organ of the Old Hegelians, the *Berliner Jahrbucher* (*Berlin Annals*) He supported the Prussian Government in its conflict with the Catholic Church, affirmed the supremacy of the State over the Church, reason over faith, and thought the Prussian State would support him in his struggle against religious and political conservatism. In 1839 Ruge was joined by Bruno Bauer who attacked the Christian religion and viewed philosophy as the critique of the existing

The orthodox Hegelians denounced the new Hegelians as atheists and called for the intervention of the State But the State did not intervene and the controversy continued The new or Young Hegelians all denied the charge of atheism and called themselves Christians and Protestants, although they denied the existence of a God who was not a man and,

following Strauss' *Life of Jesus,* declared the history of the Gospels to be pure mythology [6]

When, instead of a liberal reign, worse reaction set in under the new king, the Young Hegelians were keenly disappointed and soon found themselves in opposition to the Prussian State with its benighted, pietist tendencies They sought to defend the rights of reason against the attacks of reaction and felt that all that was needed was to use the dialectic method of Hegel to eliminate the irrational elements in reality They wanted to apply this method to reform the Prussian State which they believed, with Hegel, would achieve a synthesis of the rational and the real To accomplish its mission, they said, Prussia need only remain faithful to its past, to the spirit of reform and to the era of Enlightenment which liberated reason In the course of the conflict with the Government, the Young Hegelians were soon faced with the problem of passing from thought to action The struggle had begun in the field of religion, but it quickly assumed an openly political character and became the center of liberal opposition in Prussia

All the Young Hegelians joined the fight Bruno Bauer denounced the nefarious role of the Church and showed the fundamental opposition between the Christian state installed by Frederick William IV and the rational state Only the principle of liberty, he declared, could assure the development of Germany against the reactionary tendencies which were more and more endangering philosophy and the party of progress To face this danger, philosophy would have to lose its abstract character and cease to be a stranger to life, it would have to become a practical, agitating philosophy, capable of assuring the triumph of reason in the world But Bauer, who originally had been a Right Hegelian, felt that this critical philosophy should confine itself to the criticism of religion, while Ruge thought that it must pass beyond this and assume a political aspect In 1841 Moses Hess, another Young Hegelian, published his *European Triarchy* which de-

veloped the idea of a philosophy of action and declared that the object of philosophy must be life and action, not thought, which was the defect of Hegel's philosophy

In the struggle against the Christian State of Frederick William IV, the Young Hegelians soon passed to the struggle against the monarchic principle as such and became democratic republicans Arnold Ruge wrote a critique of Hegel's teachings on the state which ended with the demand for the dissolution of liberalism into democratism "The constitution of the state, if it is a real one," he wrote, "is always a republic and the republic is never a real one if it is not democracy" [7] Ruge rallied around him such young university students and teachers as Friederich Koppen, Bruno and Edgar Bauer, Karl Marx and Ludwig Feuerbach When the *Hallische Jahrbucher* was banned in June 1841, Ruge launched the *Deutsche Jahrbucher* (*German Annals*) a month later

In November 1841, Ludwig Feuerbach published his *Wesen des Christentums* (*Essence of Christianity*), based upon the materialist premise that ideas are the product of existence and not vice versa Whereas D F Strauss and Bruno Bauer had dealt with the origin, or historical character of Christianity, Feuerbach applied his materialist principle to the criticism of the very nature of Christianity and showed that religion is the product of man who creates God in his own image, that religion, therefore, despoils man of his true nature, and that to become a true human being, man must get rid of his religious illusions and must replace the love of God by the love of humanity This undermined metaphysics together with religion and raised the need of dealing with living concrete nature Feuerbach thus broke with the philosophical idealism of Hegel and Hegel's teaching that reality arises from the idea He went beyond Bauer by declaring that Hegel's philosophy was itself the last prop of theology and that he who does not surrender Hegel's philosophy cannot give up theology.

Feuerbach's book made a great impression on the Young

Hegelians who immediately became his followers His contributions to the *Deutsche Jahrbucher* gave trenchancy to the publication edited by Ruge Indeed, Ruge was one of the first to yield to Feuerbach's influence, having steadily sharpened his line from the time on February 13, 1841, when he first entered into an open fight against the government, through July 2, 1841, when he replaced the *Hallische Jahrbucher* by the *Deutsche Jahrbucher*, changing not only the title, but also embarking upon a new orientation

The ideological struggle against Frederick William IV revealed the necessity of a political party to lead this struggle. Throughout 1842, when a conditional press freedom prevailed, the need for political parties was widely discussed. This discussion also found expression in the political poetry of Herwegh, Sallet, Dinglestedt, Prutz, Carl Beck, Rudolf Gottschall, and others who supplemented the work of the philosophical writers.

These young political poets in 1842-43 glorified the party as the mother of all victories, parties were hailed as the salt of the earth, channelizing the unbridled vacillation of the chaotic mass into a regulated movement, historical, ethical and political arguments for the necessity of parties were advanced, they looked enviously at England and France where the struggle of parties reflected, without restriction, the class struggle of the bourgeoisie and provided the condition for the formation of a truly public opinion [8] Ludwig Borne, who had been exiled to Paris in 1830 for his republicanism, became their model of devotion to a political cause The young Frederick Engels, in his office at the Leopold Merchants in 1841, portrayed the Frankfurt Jew, Borne, as the "man of political practice" side by side with Hegel, "the man of thought", and he considered the unity of thought and action, the merging of Hegel and Borne, as the task of the times [9]

Actually, the Young Hegelians were a party and we have the testimony of the young Engels as to the role it played, especially in 1842. "The Young Hegelians of 1842," he wrote,

"were declared Atheists and republicans, the periodical of the party, the *German Annals,* 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 town of Germany of any size, we provided all the liberal papers with the necessary matter, and by this means made them our organs, we inundated the country with pamphets, 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 authorization 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 uttered 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" [10]

3

The establishment of the *Rheinische Zeitung* (*Rhenish Gazette*) in Cologne in 1841 gave the Young Hegelians a daily organ It was launched by a group of rich bourgeois of Cologne who wanted the paper to support their economic interests and their demand for industrial and commercial development The promoter of the paper, whose full title was to be the *Rheinische Zeitung fur Handel, Politik und Gewerbe* (*Rhenish Gazette for Commerce, Politics and Industry*), was an attorney at the Court of Appeals in Cologne, by the name of G Jung Moses Hess had converted Jung to the ideas of the Young Hegelians, and the latter, anxious to make the

Rheinische Zeitung an organ of Rhenish liberalism, asked Hess to secure the editorial staff for the paper Hess undertook the job in June 1841, securing collaborators and subscribers During this time, Hess had made the acquaintance of Karl Marx and immediately idolized him The financial backers of the paper offered the direction of the paper to Frederick List, the economist who had spent a number of years in the United States But List could not accept the offer because of a broken leg In his place, he proposed one of his disciples, Gustav Hofken, the editor of the *Augsburg Gazette* Hess was indignant that the moneyed aristocrats had not chosen him, nevertheless, he accepted a position as co-editor on a three-year contract Hess reserved the greatest freedom of editing. He took charge of articles on France, Gustav Hofken edited those dealing with Germany, and Rave, former director of the *Allegemeine Rheinische Zeitung* (*General Rhenish Gazette*), those dealing with England Hofken soon came into conflict with Jung, who wanted to make the paper the organ of the Young Hegelians On January 18, 1842, Hofken quit. On Karl Marx' recommendation, Dr Adolf Rutenberg, brother-in-law of Bruno Bauer, took Hofken's place as editor. With Rutenberg, the whole group of Young Hegelians were taken into the paper [11]

The paper raised bourgeois democratic demands improvement of means of communication on a large scale, self-administration, free development of economic forces The government accused the paper of having set itself the task of propagating French-liberal ideas in Germany and of working for the constitutional representative state Karl Marx, who joined the editorial board on October 15, 1842, replied to the pressure of the government by saying it is not true that the paper regards as its task the dissemination of French ideas and sympathies Its task is to direct its attention to Germany and to produce not a French but a German liberalism, which should not displease the government of Frederick William IV[1] The government characterized Marx' views as "ultra-

democratic views" which were in complete contradiction to the principle of the Prussian state By March 31, 1843, the paper was forced to suspend

In the summer of 1842, a certain tendency to communism was manifested in the paper, although the *Rheinische Zeitung* had no definite or consistent position on the social question or socialism Nevertheless it paid more attention to these questions than other big papers And several members of its board of directors had begun to discuss the social question in weekly meetings A great deal of news about the Chartist movement in England was carried in the paper, and occasionally the ideas of French Socialism were smuggled in by Moses Hess, who was the first communist among the Young Hegelians. He criticized liberalism and constitutional monarchy, and took advantage of this to develop his communist ideas He showed that the question was essentially a social question which the French Revolution did not solve and which the constitutional monarchy, lauded by the liberals as a panacea, would be equally unable to solve The conflict must lead to a social revolution Only communism could solve the problem. In England and France, he said, it was already being viewed as the future organization of society

In an article in the *Rheinische Zeitung* of September 11, 1842, Hess indicated the limitations of bourgeois democracy, including that in the United States The Berlin circle of Young Hegelians paid considerable attention to this article. In it, Hess showed how both French Revolutions gave power not to the whole people but solely to the bourgeoisie, the task, therefore, he said, is to emancipate the entire people and bring a completely new principle into history Certain ideas, he thought, were in the air of an historical epoch that could not be escaped [12]

In the course of his travels, Hess had learned of the miserable conditions of the proletariat, and he posed as the final aim of humanity, not liberty, the ideal of the revolutionary bourgeoisie, but social equality. He was the first in Germany

to advance the theory of social revolution provoked by misery and the concentration of wealth, he also foresaw a society without classes where the State as such would disappear By his criticism of society, Hess relegated political and constitutional questions to a secondary place while the liberals were still attached to them exclusively [13]

4

At the end of October 1842, Frederick Engels, who was on his way from Berlin to England, was converted to communism by Hess Engels was Hess' first convert In the spring of 1843, Hess also converted Frobel and Bakunin to communism, showing them the connection between Fuerbach's doctrine of humanism and communism, and demonstrating that the latter was the realization in the social sphere of Feuerbach's humanism Hess really had a vague idea of communism, but he moved to Paris as the French correspondent of the *Rheinische Zeitung*, there he came into contact with the communist ideas of Wilhelm Weitling, a native of Magdeburg in Prussia, who was a simple journeyman tailor and the actual founder of German working class communism Weitling's book *Garantien der Harmonie und Freiheit* (*Guarantees of Harmony and Freedom*) was published in December 1842 Another book published at this time was Ludwig Stein's *Der Sozialismus und Kommunismus des Heutigen Frankreichs* (*Socialism and Communism of Present-day France*) They helped Hess get a clearer idea of communism. While Stein combatted the ideas of communism and socialism, the net effect was to popularize them Despite its reactionary tendency, this book enjoyed a great success among the Young Hegelians Hess rejoiced at the unwilling support it gave communist propaganda.

In the course of their republican agitation, many of the Young Hegelians developed further and further the consequences of their philosophy and became communists. As Fred-

erick Engels said in 1843 "The princes and rulers of Germany, at the very moment when they believed to have put down forever, republicanism, saw the rise of communism from the ashes of political agitation" [14] Engels described this transition for Owen's *New Moral World* in 1843 as follows "As early as autumn, 1842, some of the party contended for the insufficiency of political change, and declared their opinion to be, that a *social* revolution based upon common property, was the only state of mankind agreeing with their abstract principles But even the leaders of the party, such as Dr Bruno Bauer, Dr Feuerbach, and Dr Ruge, were not then prepared for this decided step The political paper of the party, the *Rhenish Gazette*, published some papers advocating communism, but without the wished-for effect. Communism, however, was such a *necessary* consequence of New Hegelian philosophy, that no opposition could keep it down, and in the course of this present year (1843), the originators of it had the satisfaction of seeing one republican after another join their ranks Besides Dr Hess, one of the editors of the now suppressed *Rhenish Gazette*, and who was, in fact, the first communist of the party, there are now a great many others, as Dr Ruge, editor of the *German Annals*, the scientific periodical of the Young Hegelians, which had been suppressed by resolution of the German Diet, Dr. Marx, another of the editors of the *Rhenish Gazette*, George Herwegh, the poet whose letter to the King of Prussia was translated last winter, by most of the English papers, and others, and we hope that the remainder of the republican party will, by and by, come over too" [15]

The process which Engels described began to manifest itself at the end of 1842 when the Young Hegelians revealed two opposing groups one group consisting of Feuerbach, Ruge, Hess and Marx, the second of Bruno Bauer, Koppen and his friends in Berlin known as the Berlin *Freien* (Freemen). Bauer's group, until the beginning of 1842, had clung to their faith in the mission of the Prussian state and took an

active part in the constitutional movement. However, after Bauer's expulsion from the University of Bonn, on March 29, 1842, they began to send articles to the *Rhemische Zeitung* which, as Marx said, were full of world-upheaving and thoughtless filth in a slovenly style veneered somewhat with atheism and communism (which the gentlemen never studied). Marx agreed with their criticism of the constitutional monarchy in principle, but he was opposed to their intransigeant attitude, he believed that only stubborn, daily political struggle—the importance of which the Freien regarded with contempt—could overthrow reaction, and that the struggle on the political field could be successful only if a conflict with the liberal bourgeoisie were not provoked The Berlin Freien had no conception of the concrete struggle They soon broke with Ruge and Herwegh and then with Marx They wanted to abolish everything in thought. Marx, on the other hand, was beginning to attribute the predominant role to reality in its interaction with thought and he rejected the superficial articles of the Freien on communism and atheism

As Marx told Ruge, in a letter of November 30, 1842, he refused to continue the former editor Rutenberg's practice of uncritically accepting their articles This stuff, Marx said, was not freedom, it only aspired to be free from all thought. And in the conflict between the Freien and Ruge and Herwegh, Marx supported the latter He told the Freien that he expected fewer resounding phrases and more definite treatment of concrete conditions and factual knowledge in their articles "I told them," he informed Ruge, "that I considered the smuggling in of communist and socialist dogmas, hence of a new world outlook, in incidental theater criticism as improper, indeed, unethical and demanded an altogether different and more fundamental discussion of communism if it was to be discussed at all. I desired that religion be criticized more in the criticism of political conditions than political conditions in religion, since this was more in accord with the nature of a newspaper and the education of the public and

since religion as such did not come from heaven and lived from the earth and would be overthrown of itself with the abolition of perverted reality whose theory it is Finally, I insisted that when they speak of philosophy, they play around less with the term atheism (which amounts to childishly assuring everyone that they are not afraid of bogeymen) and really bring the contents of philosophy down to the people" [16]

As editor of the *Rheinische Zeitung*, Marx was absorbed in the political struggles which the paper was waging, and the political and economic problems which he met in the course of this activity were soon to open a new path of development for him.

When the *Augsburger Zeitung*, which was edited by a disciple of List, accused the *Rheinische Zeitung* of communism, Marx replied in an article which admitted his lack of adequate knowledge of the content of the French communist currents and declared that communism was only a matter of theoretical concern in Germany, but that it could not be disposed of in a phrase as the *Augsburger Zeitung* tried to do And Marx announced his intention of studying this serious question which two great peoples were working to solve

However, as long as Marx remained on the paper, his conceptions remained Hegelian, he continued to consider the Spirit as the element regulating political and social life and the state as its highest manifestation, although experience in the struggle was pushing him more and more to the study of concrete facts, to the observation of concrete reality which was emphasized by Feuerbach in his philosophy Ruge was also inspired by Feuerbach's criticism of Hegel's *Philosophy of Right* which had appeared in the *Deutsche Jahrbucher* of February 1842

The suppression of the *Rheinische Zeitung* in March 1843, among other events, led the Berlin Young Hegelians to break completely with politics After their break with the philosophical radicalism of the Berlin Freien, the group around

Marx and Ruge preferred to use the word democracy in referring to their own tendency. Following the suppression, not only of the *Rheinische Zeitung* but of a number of other periodicals and journals by the Prussian King, they planned to set up an agitational center abroad, but this never materialized

Arnold Ruge was particularly disappointed by the failure to secure broad support for this plan and by the fact that the bourgeoisie would not make any pecuniary sacrifices for this Despite the fact that Ruge was counted as an adherent of the party of philosophical communists at this time, he was actually unable to go beyond his humane liberalism and draw the conclusions from his democratic position, although he desired to emancipate the oppressed masses He regarded communism as a sect which would go to pieces in the first storm.[17]

CHAPTER VII The Rise of Marxism

I

ONCE the *Rheinische Zeitung* was suppressed, Karl Marx undertook to fulfill his pledge to study the question of communism seriously. He was determined to eliminate the cause of the embarrassment he had suffered when, as editor of the *Rheinische Zeitung*, he had to take part in discussions concerning so-called material interests As Marx himself told the story in 1857 "The proceedings of the Rhine Diet in connection with forest thefts and the extreme subdivision of landed property, the official controversy about the condition of the Mosel peasants into which Herr von Schaper, at that time president of the Rhine Province, entered with the *Rheinische Zeitung;* finally, the debates on free trade and protection, gave me the first impulse to take up the study of economic questions. At the same time a weak, quasi-philosophic echo of French socialism and communism made itself heard in the *Rheinische Zeitung* in those days when the good intentions 'to go ahead' greatly outweighed knowledge of facts I declared myself against such botching, but had to admit at once in a controversy with the *Allegemeine Augsburger Zeitung* that my previous studies did not allow me to hazard an independent judgment as to the merits of the French schools When, therefore, the publishers of the *Rheinische Zeitung* conceived the illusion that by a less aggressive policy the paper could be saved from the death sentence pronounced upon it, I was glad

to grasp that opportunity to retire to my study from public life" [1]

Through the medium of the paper, Marx had taken a leading part in the democratic movement in Germany He had become deeply absorbed in social and political questions Indeed, just before the suppression of the paper, he had criticized Feuerbach for being indifferent to such questions, although Marx continued to be under the influence of Feuerbach's humanism until the Spring of 1845 Marx' political activity and contact with practical economic questions as editor of the paper had raised certain doubts in his mind regarding the entire Hegelian philosophical and juridical concept of the state, which, until then, had constituted the basis of his thought on political matters.

As an Hegelian, he believed the "law of gravitation" of the state was to be found in the state itself Hegel distinguished the sphere of the state from the social sphere, but he regarded the state as the axis around which the social world moved, and the state was supposed to be a rational state, the state of rational freedom To Marx, therefore, as an Hegelian, a state which was not the realization of rational freedom was a bad state And in the *Rheinische Zeitung* he had polemized against the Christian, theocratic state, which Frederick William IV was seeking to impose, and insisted that constitutions are not derived from the nature of Christian society but from the nature of human society, that the state is not to be constituted out of religion but out of the logic of freedom, that all that is needed is to view the state with human eyes and develop its inner laws from reason and experience, not from theology [2]

But the debates of the Rhenish Diet had shown him that the State did not have the rational and moral character attributed to it by Hegel's doctrine, that it was not the creator and regulator of a rational order in the political and social domain, and that its power, instead of being put at the service of reason and right, actually served to defend special inter-

ests, and that, therefore, the problem of the state could not be resolved in the purely juridical manner of Hegel

Marx read the writings of the French socialists for the first time in October-December 1842 Among them were Proudhon's *What is Property?*, Dezamy's *Calommies et politique de M Cabet* (*Calumnies and Politics of M Cabet*), also the works of Leroux and Considerant These works only helped to strengthen his doubts and stimulate his desire to learn more about communism He was determined to get a clearer understanding of society as it was, of civil society as Hegel and the eighteenth century writers had called it But of greater influence and help to Marx at this time was the appearance of Feuerbach's theses on the reform of philosophy which Marx received with enthusiasm

Although Feuerbach's fundamental criticism of Hegelian philosophy demonstrated that consciousness arises out of existence and not vice versa, he did not solve the problem confronting the Young Hegelians His theses, however, pointed the way for Marx, who saw the need for adapting Feuerbach's materialist philosophy to political and social action "The only point on which I differ with Feuerbach in his aphorisms," Marx wrote to Ruge on March 13, 1843, "is that, in my opinion, he attaches too much importance to nature and not enough to politics" In short, it was necessary to connect the liberation of man, not merely with his religious emancipation but particularly with his political and social emancipation.[3]

2

The first task undertaken by Marx in order to resolve his doubts was a critical revision of the Hegelian philosophy of Right, since German juridical and political philosophy "received through Hegel its most consistent, most ample and most recent shape", and to criticize Hegel "is at once both the critical analysis of the modern state and of the actuality which is connected therewith, and in addition the decisive re-

pudiation of the entire previous mode of the German political and juridical consciousness" [4] This entailed an analysis of the general relation between the modern state and bourgeois society In the course of this, Marx did not merely confine himself to the internal logical criticism of Hegel's thought, he turned more and more to the analysis of specific history and the concrete political situation As a result, beginning in August 1843, he studied the history, character and structure of modern democracy, and excerpted extensively works on French history, the French Revolution, the history of Venice and England, of Sweden and Germany, of Machiavelli, Rousseau and Montesquieu, as well as works on the United States

In this task of critically revising Hegel's juridical and political conceptions, Marx regarded himself as being in the tradition of the long line of thinkers who contributed to the forging of the democratic thought from Machiavelli to Hegel. When Marx began to re-examine critically his views on the state in the summer of 1843 and inaugurated that process which less than two years later was to lead him to the formulation of Marxism, he commenced by reading the classics in the literature of democracy He read Rousseau, who undertook to explain why man is born free and yet everywhere is in chains He read Montesquieu, to whom the principle of democracy was virtue which he defined as the love of country, "that is the love of equality," not a moral nor a Christian virtue, but a political virtue [5] He read Machiavelli, in whose *Prince* Rousseau had seen essentially a cunning concealment of republican love of freedom and which he described as the book of republicans, [6] and in whose *History of Florence*, which Marx many years later described as a masterpiece, Machiavelli directed his fire against the Church, the Pope and the clergy, against all the reactionary forces of feudalism, and raised as the main task of the historian to study the struggle between the nobility and the people (bourgeoisie), the peo-

ple and the masses (proletariat), to understand the history of Florence [7]

What concerned Marx, as one who had just left the field of practical struggle for democracy in Germany to study and reorientate himself, was how to raise Germany to the level of modern nations, to the level of contemporary democracy. In his re-examination of the Hegelian philosophy of Right, Marx flayed the "one-sidedness and stunted growth" of Germany and caustically criticized the "narrow-minded actuality of the German status quo," "the most servile fact of German history," [8] which was beneath the level of political-social reality Contrasting the "dream history" of the Germans with conditions in France and England, he declared "Germans have thought in politics what other people have done .. German juridical and political philosophy is the sole element of German history which stands on a par with the official modern present " German governments, he continued, "combine the civilized shortcomings of the modern state world, whose advantages we do not possess, with the barbarous shortcomings of the *ancien regime*, which we enjoy in full measure " [9]

And before he was through re-evaluating his conception of the State, he was to pose as the question before Germany "Can Germany attain to a practice *à la hauteur de principes*, that is, to a revolution which will not only raise her to the level of modern nations but to the human level which will be the immediate future of these nations?" [10]

Following his *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, Marx wrote an article *On the Jewish Question* which was directed against Bruno Bauer, and then an *Introduction* to his *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* All three of these writings fall between August and November 1843 The article on *The Jewish Question* revealed a further development of Marx' thought Basing himself on Feuerbach's "real humanism," he advanced for the first time the idea of emancipation, distinguishing sharply between "political emancipa-

tion" and "general human emancipation." He charged Bauer with uncritically confusing the two. He emphasized the significance of political emancipation, arguing for the democratic freedom and equality of all groups and individuals in relation to the State, irrespective of their religion, as proclaimed by the American and French Revolutions, and consequently, for the extension of political and civil rights to the Jews of Marx' native Prussia. At the same time, he noted the limitations of "political emancipation," or bourgeois democracy. "The limit of political emancipation," he declared, "is immediately seen to consist in the fact that the state can cast off a fetter without men really becoming free from it, that the state can become a free state without men becoming free men."[11] He studied its operation in the United States in relation to religion. Political emancipation or democracy has not "the right to demand of Jews the abolition of Judaism, or from men generally the abolition of religion." To understand the relationship of the Jewish question to democracy, one must look, not at Germany "where no political state" exists and not even at France, the constitutional state, because of "the incompleteness of political emancipation," but at the United States where "the political state exists in its completeness", in short, "the democratic state, the real state [which] does not need religion for its political completion." "It is only in the North American Free States—at least in part of them—that the Jewish question loses its theological significance and becomes a really secular question." It is only in a democracy where the relation of religion to the state can "be studied in its special features and its purity," where criticism of this relationship ceases to be theological criticism and the state adopts a purely political attitude toward religion. And such a study shows that in a democracy there is complete separation of state and religion, the state as state acknowledges no religion, and religion, in relation to the state and political rights, is purely a private affair, a private right, religion is banished from the state into bourgeois society, thus completing political emancipation

which "thus neither abolishes nor seeks to abolish the real religiosity of the individual" [12]

"In the United States," Marx observed in illustrating his point, "there is neither a state religion (as in Germany) nor a religion declared to be that of the majority (as in France), nor the predominance of one cult over another The state is alien to all cults.... There are even North American States 'where the constitution does not impose religious beliefs or the practice of a cult as a condition of political privileges'... Yet North America is pre-eminently the country of religiosity, as Beaumont, Tocqueville and the Englishman Hamilton assure us with one voice" In the United States, "the country of completed political emancipation, we find religion not only existing, but in a fresh and vital state" This only proves that "political emancipation from religion is not a thorough-going and consistent emancipation from religion, because political emancipation is not effectual and consistent human emancipation." [13]

He criticized bourgeois society for transforming everything into cash value, into objects of commerce His analysis of political emancipation showed that it was only a stage on the road to full human emancipation. "Political emancipation [democracy]," he wrote, "at least represents important progress, while not the last form of human emancipation generally, it is the last form of human emancipation *within* the existing world order. It is understood that we are speaking here of real, of practical emancipation." [14]

He accepted the democratic achievements of the two eighteenth century revolutions, but noted that man was "not freed from religion, he received religious freedom He was not freed from property, he received freedom of property. He was not freed from the egoism of trade, he received freedom of trade." And "not until the real, individual man is identical with the citizen, and has become a generic being in his empirical life, in his individual work, his individual relationships, not until man has recognized and organized his own capacities

as social capacities, and consequently the social force is no longer divided by the political power, not until then will human emancipation be achieved" [15]

Marx had definitely arrived at the position of "philosophical communism," the position which Hess had first introduced among the Young Hegelians in the summer of 1842 and to which he had converted the young Engels in November 1842, a position which Marx had not been ready to accept at that time until he had studied the question through for himself. In this article on the *Jewish Question*, however, Marx said nothing as yet of the proletariat as the bearer of the communist principle, the principle of human emancipation

It was in his *Introduction to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, which was written at the turn of the year 1843-44, only a short time after the article on the *Jewish Question*, that Marx raised the question of the proletariat for the first time He now grasped that bourgeois society leads to the creation of a new class, the proletariat, which is the chief social force for the realization of the "real, practical emancipation" of which he spoke in the *Jewish Question* He recognized the industrial backwardness of Germany and criticized the German bourgeoisie for its inability to aspire to rule for society as a whole "Even the moral self-esteem of the German middle class is only based on the consciousness of being the general representative of the philistine mediocrity of all the other classes," that "each class, as soon as it embarks on a struggle with the class above it, becomes involved in a struggle with the class below it" He compared Germany with France. "In France partial emancipation is the basis of universal emancipation . The role of emancipation, therefore, flits from one class to another of the French people in a dramatic movement, until it eventually reaches the class which no longer realizes social freedom upon the basis of certain conditions lying outside of mankind and yet created by human society, but will rather organize all the conditions of human existence upon the basis of social freedom." [16]

Marx posed the question wherein lies the positive possibility of German emancipation, and gave the answer in the formation of a class which finds itself in bourgeois society, but which is not of it, a sphere which possesses a universal character by virtue of its universal suffering, a sphere which cannot emancipate itself without emancipating all the other spheres of society—the proletariat, but the proletariat arises in Germany only with the beginning of the industrial movement. And the spiritual weapon of this class, according to Marx, is philosophy—the materialist philosophy of Ludwig Feuerbach "The *head* of the emancipation of man," he declared, "is philosophy, its *heart* the proletariat" [1] Philosophy has now found a firm, material basis in the proletariat Philosophy turns to the masses

His political, historical studies in connection with his critical analysis of Hegel's *Philosophy of Right,* between August and November 1843, helped Marx to deepen his grasp of the character of democracy and society They led him to the historical, critical analysis of the bourgeois state and bourgeois society While upholding the achievements of bourgeois democracy, he noted its limitations and worked his way towards a scientific understanding of social development, undertaking to discover in existing society itself the forces of development and change and to study these real forces instead of dreaming up fancy schemes to recommend to or impose upon society from without The process of becoming a Marxist was for Marx a process of becoming a more profound and consistent democrat.

3

Marx opened still another stage in his development when he was expelled from Germany in November 1843 and went to Paris where he lived until January 1845 He continued the intensive study which he had begun in Germany in the summer of 1843, and, for the first time, came face to face with

the labor movement He eagerly visited the meetings of the German and French workers and studied their secret organizations without becoming a member himself For nearly three-quarters of a year, he steeped himself in philosophical, historical and economic studies, beginning an especially intensive study of the French Revolution, French socialism and political economy It was not until August 7, 1844 that he wrote again for the public press, at which time he published some critical notes on Arnold Ruge in the Paris *Vorwarts*

In these notes, Marx revealed how far he had traveled since the suspension of the *Rheinische Zeitung* He sharply criticized Ruge as a bourgeois democrat, and indicated the road the working class must take in its struggle for emancipation Paris had brought Marx into contact with a new social and political world There also he moved from the criticism of politics to the criticism of economics and finally discovered "that legal relations and state forms are to be understood neither out of themselves nor out of the so-called general development of the human spirit, but rather are rooted in the material conditions of life, the totality of which Hegel . subsumed under the name 'civil society', that the anatomy of bourgeois society is to be sought in political economy" [18]

Marx had arrived at the materialist conception of history, which laid the basis for his later scientific investigation and discovery of the exact process involved in the exploitation of labor by capital This new conception of history, as Engels later explained, proved "that hitherto all history proceeded by class antagonisms and class struggles, that there always had been ruling and ruled, exploiting and exploited classes, and that the great majority of mankind had always been condemned to hard labor and little enjoyment of its fruits. Why was this so? Simply because at all previous levels of humanity's development, production had been so little developed that historical development could proceed only in this antagonistic form, that historical progress, by and large, de-

volved upon the activity of a small privileged minority, while the great mass was condemned to earn a meager existence for themselves and, in addition, for the privileged minority which was constantly growing in wealth But this same investigation of history, which in this way gives a natural and rational explanation of the class domination existing heretofore and otherwise attributed to men's malevolence, also leads to the insight that, as a result of the colossal increase of the modern forces of production, the *last* pretext for dividing humanity into rulers and ruled, exploiters and exploited, has disappeared, at least in the most advanced countries, that the ruling big bourgeoisie has fulfilled its historical mission, that it has outlived the leadership of society and has even become an obstacle to the development of production as demonstrated by the commercial crises and especially the last big crash and depressed state of industry in all countries, that historical leadership has passed to the proletariat, a class which, because of its entire historical position, can emancipate itself only by abolishing all class rule, all bondage and all exploitation, and that the social productive forces, which have outgrown the bourgeoisie, are waiting only to be taken posession of by the associated proletariat in order to create a situation making it possible for every member of society to participate not only in the production but also in the distribution and administration of the social wealth and, by the planned operation of all production, to enhance the social forces of production and their products to such an extent that everyone is assured the satisfaction of all rational needs to an ever-increasing extent." [19]

4

In the summer of 1844, Engels, returning from a two-year stay in England, visited Marx in Paris for ten days and found himself in full agreement with Marx on all theoretical questions. He had first met Marx on November 24, 1842 when, on

his way to England, he stopped in the editorial offices of the *Rheinische Zeitung;* but at that time he was cool to Marx because he was close to the Berlin Freien whose phrase mongering about communism Marx had rejected At their meeting in Paris, Marx and Engels agreed to write a joint polemic against Bruno Bauer and other Left Hegelians who had attacked them for their materialism and communism, the result was the *Holy Family* of 1844, still bearing a Feuerbachian imprint

Engels had gone to England in the autumn of 1842 He was still an idealist, but having been converted to communism on his way over, he immediately began to study the English state, English economy and England's social struggles, applying the Hegelian dialectic from the viewpoint of a revolutionary This dialectic application to the material realities of England provided the elements in the process which culminated in the development of Engels to the position of a dialectic materialist In England, Engels came face to face with the various classes and their parties, the landowning aristocracy, the merchant and manufacturing Whigs and the radical democracy of the workers

Engels observed that the radical democratic principles of Chartism were permeating the working class more and more each day He displayed a concrete grasp of political forces and groupings in England, took part himself in its political life and studied its economic and socialist literature The democratic movement in England was exclusively proletarian, Strauss, Voltaire, Holbach, Byron, and Shelley were read mainly by the lower classes At the end of 1843, Engels wrote an outline of political economy, which was published in the *Deutsche-Franzosische Jahrbucher* (*German and French Annals*) in 1844 He admired British action and energy, the role of the proletariat made a profound impression on him, as did the atheism and all-around views of the British socialists He studied British society and saw the "two-faced Whigs" in action, and observed that only the Chartists and Socialists

were "consistent democrats," that the people were the only source of democracy and a democratic movement in England. He read Carlyle's *Past and Present* which had appeared in 1843 and discussed the latter's views on democracy in a review which was published in 1844

"To what extent democracy has now reached, how it advances irresistible with ominous, ever-increasing speed," Carlyle wrote, "he that will open his eyes on any province of human affairs may discern. Democracy is everywhere the inexorable demand of these ages, swiftly fulfilling itself From the thunder of Napoleon battles, to the jabbering of Open-Vestry in St Mary Axe, all things announce democracy" Carlyle criticized democracy on the ground that "liberty is a divine thing, but liberty to die by starvation not so divine. Freedom from oppression, an indispensable yet most insignificant portion of liberty." Carlyle, Engels remarked, demands a "true aristocracy" and heroes But if he had understood man as man he would not have divided humanity into two categories, governors and governed He would have taken the stand that talent's role is not in violent rule, but in stimulating and pioneering. Talent must convince the mass of the correctness of its idea Humanity passes through democracy not to end where it started Carlyle is unclear on the goal of modern democracy, but for the rest, what he says about it is correct—democracy is the road to real human freedom, not to a new aristocracy. Engels ended his review of Carlyle's book with the declaration that "democracy, Chartism, must soon succeed, and then the mass of English workers will have only the choice between starvation and socialism" [20]

In a study on the *Condition of England* written for the Paris *Vorwarts* in 1844, he wrote "The next future of England will be democracy. But what kind of democracy? Not that of the French Revolution whose contrary was monarchy and feudalism, but the kind of democracy whose contrast is the middle class and property. This is shown by the whole preceding development, the middle class and property rule,

the poor man is without rights, is oppressed and robbed, the Constitution denies him, and the law abuses him, the struggle of democracy against aristocracy in England is the struggle of the poor against the rich The democracy towards which England is moving is a *social* democracy But mere democracy is not capable of curing social evils. Democratic equality is a chimera, the struggle of the poor against the rich cannot be fought out on the basis of democracy or politics in general This stage also is therefore only a transition, the last purely political means which can still be tried and from which must emerge a new element, a principle transcending all political things This principle is socialism " [21]

From November 4, 1843 to February 3, 1844 Engels wrote a series of articles for Robert Owen's *The New Moral World* in which he reported on the "progress of Social Reform on the Continent," describing the rise of communism in Germany and how German philosophy, "after a long and troublesome circuit" had "at last settled upon Communism " Engels also undertook to study and describe the communist movements in France and Switzerland.[22]

After Engels returned from his two-year stay in England, he spent the winter of 1844-45 writing *The Condition of the Working Class in England* He had learned to appreciate the role of the material forces of production and the role of the proletariat. He understood that the United States and Germany were emerging as England's economic rivals. At this early date he gave in a few paragraphs a succinct, accurate estimate of the United States and of its economic resources, and foresaw its economic development, its national character and world role. He correctly ridiculed the British economist, MacCulloch, for failing to understand the United States and brushing it aside as a young country which is still agrarian and which, because of its great territory, will remain so for a long time to come and hence will offer no competition to England In this respect, Engels agreed with Richard Cobden who had advanced these views ten

years earlier, in 1835. Evaluating the outlook for England, Engels saw the United States as rapidly surging forward as its chief rival, although he saw Germany developing as a competitor, Engels was impressed with the great potentialities and power of America The only hope for England, he said, was a democratic revolution England, he felt, was rapidly heading towards democracy, but a new kind of democracy—communism [23]

He returned to Germany in 1844 full of enthusiasm and plans His own Wuppertal had undergone intense industrial development during his sojourn in England, and he came back to find it above the level of the country as a whole He found that socialism was the question of the day in Germany and he was astonished by the enormous amount of propaganda carried on, especially by the communists in Cologne, but he was also impressed by their lack of a firm foundation and by the fact that True Socialism, which consisted of a translation of French socialist and communist ideas into the language of the German ideologists, held sway with its vague phrase-mongering He had intended his book on *The Condition of the Working Class in England* to provide a basis, as a description of the classic land of industrial development, for a better grasp of socialism Nevertheless, Engels' own thinking was still marked by strong remnants of utopianism which existed side by side with a grasp of the role of the working class He plunged into communist agitation, reported to *The New Moral World* in London on the progress of the communist movement in Germany and even felt that the movement was growing strong enough to organize a community on Owen's model As proof of the practicability of communism he cited the Communist colonies in the United States, delivered long talks on them and wrote an extensive article on them, based on material provided in the series by Finch which appeared in *The New Moral World* Engels could still declare that the philosophers would do the thinking and the workers the fighting But the remnants of idealism and utopianism

were being shed in the course of forging the new democratic party, the party of communism. By the end of 1845, the historic role of the proletariat as the backbone of communism was already clearly established in Engels' articles in the *Northern Star*, organ of the Left Chartists, and Engels speaks as the representative of the "extreme proletarian party" and raises the banner of "communist democracy" as distinct from "pure political democracy." [24]

His emergence onto the clear path of Marxism had taken place in the Spring of 1845 In April of that year, Engels visited Marx in Brussels, where Marx had been compelled to move three months earlier He found that Marx had already completed the formulation of the materialist conception of history with which he was in full accord It was in Paris that they had begun their life-long friendship and collaboration as the founders of scientific communism, and now, after completing the outline of their materialist conception of history, Marx and Engels set about working out their new outlook in various directions and waging a struggle, during 1845-46, against all conceptions which stood in the way of forging a communist movement based on scientific conceptions They began by writing their *German Ideology*, settling accounts with the idealism and metaphysics of the Hegelians, Bauer and Stirner, with the one-sided materialism of Feuerbach, and finally, with True Socialism which, as Engels said in *Ludwig Feuerbach*, "spread like a plague throughout 'educated' Germany from 1844 onwards, substituting literary phrases for scientific knowledge and in place of the emancipation of the proletariat by the economic transformation of production, putting the liberation of mankind through 'love'" Marxism was born and immediately became active in the international movement for democracy which, in the mid-forties, labor alone consistently represented in Europe It was no accident that in the 1840's those who stood for the abolition of private property were called "pure democrats" [25]

Marx and Engels had developed towards communism in the

course of their participation in the democratic struggle in Germany. The Young Hegelians, who supplied the personnel of the German democratic press in 1840-42, and especially of the *Rhemische Zeitung*, actually had constituted a democratic party which carried on republican and democratic agitation and the Left wing of which rapidly developed into a German Communist Party under the leadership of Marx and Engels Scientific communism, as distinct from pre-Marxist communism, made its appearance in 1845 On September 22, 1845, an international celebration was held in London on the occasion of the founding of the French Republic in 1792. At this celebration, an alliance of democrats of all nations was announced, including the Scientific Communists The new Communist Party that emerged simultaneously with the new theory found itself a part of the international democratic movement from the day of its birth.

CHAPTER VIII Marxism and the Democratic Tradition

I

THE modern democratic tradition was born in revolution and developed in the class struggle of the masses to realize the democratic promise of the revolution against feudalism It has been pre-eminently a people's tradition, associated with the activity, the welfare and the flourishing of "the common man" Militant in character, republican in principle, and international in outlook, it is, above all, a tradition of progress and freedom, of work and happiness for everyone Its intellectual qualities are distinguished by the spirit of enlightenment, the affirmation of reason, and an organic aversion to ignorance and prejudice Its development has been interwoven with the growth of modern science and has been animated by the temper of humanism with its concern for the rights, dignity and elevation of every individual—all essential elements of a social climate indispensable to a free and rapid development of the productive and creative capacities of society

What is the relation of Marxism to this tradition?

Modern democracy, as we have seen, had its genesis in the struggle for the abolition of feudal property relations and the establishment of freedom for bourgeois property This historical origin endowed the democratic tradition with a two-fold character which shaped the main features of its subsequent development.

1. The bourgeoisie wanted political power for the purpose of protecting and promoting its economic interests, it strove to introduce democratic improvements not to abolish privilege but to replace feudal privilege by the privilege of wealth. It sought from the outset to restrict the scope and range of these democratic rights by restricting liberty to political liberty and equality to formal equality before the law. By establishing property qualifications for the right of electing and being elected, it intended to retain the suffrage for its own class By limiting equality to a mere equality before the law, based upon the inequality of rich and poor, its object was to preserve it as a purely bourgeois privelege Consequently, the democratic current, which arose with the ascendance of the bourgeoisie, was bound, in the course of its development, to reveal an unmistakable divergence between its formal premises and its actual historical substance The bourgeois reality of limited liberty and equality could not assert itself without constantly breaking through the formal premises of unlimited freedom, thereby exposing them as largely an appearance in sharp contrast to the real substance The appearance, in turn, representing the aspirations of the people, was bound constantly to "embarrass" and "plague" the reality, finding over and over again that it could come into its own only by itself becoming the historical reality

The chief premise of the democratic conception, as established in the historical declarations of the American and French Revolutions, is that all power derives from the people. The struggle against feudal privileges and the feudal state, based on the divine right of kings, was waged in the name of the sovereignty of the people Appearing as early as the fifteenth century in France, the conception of the equal participation of all people in the conduct of the nation's affairs was further encouraged by the Dutch and British Revolutions of the seventeenth century, and was given its clearest theoretical expression by Rousseau in the eighteenth century. It was the fundamental argument of the American Declara-

tion of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man

True, the bourgeoisie in the American and French Revolutions restricted the concept of "the people" to the property owners But the very nature of bourgeois society, based on cities, and the historic need of involving the urban masses in the struggle to overthrow feudalism, could not long maintain this restriction The history of the democratic struggle, from the middle of the seventeenth century to the middle of the nineteenth century, is replete with efforts of the people to realize the full and literal meaning of the concept of the sovereignty of the people, first of all, by abolishing qualifications and restrictions on suffrage and the holding of office and by securing a bill of rights which would implement this concept In the United States during this time, this effort was expressed in two chief periods of collaboration of the urban masses, artisans and petty bourgeoisie with the small farmers, first during the period of Jeffersonian democracy, and then during the period of Jacksonian democracy, when the emergent labor movement, based on the new factory system, united with the small farmers and other democratic forces of the cities.

The idea of the sovereignty of the people was grounded in the concept of natural rights This concept first served the rising bourgeoisie while it was still developing within the framework of the feudal system Belief in a Law of Nature or Law of Reason had been an element prominent in medieval thought since the time of Thomas Aquinas, it fed the idea of Natural Rights by which the gentry and the middle class corporations defended their interests against the unlimited and irresponsible power of despotic kings In the seventeenth century, John Locke transformed the theory of Natural Rights into a philosophic justification of the British Whig Revolution of 1688, and through Locke, it passed into British classical political economy Through Locke also, and to a lesser extent through Montesquieu, it became the philosophy of the

eighteenth century revolutions and of the leading rationalist thinkers of the Enlightenment throughout Europe Thus, the so-called natural, inalienable rights of man were in their historical origin no more than the rights of a member of bourgeois society

2. As a result of this two-fold character of the democratic current, part of the bourgeoisie preferred a constitutional monarchy to the hazards of a republic with its democratic promise and opportunities. Indeed, the first efforts at establishing a republic in the seventeenth century ended in monarchic restoration. The British bourgeoisie, for instance, struggling to emerge from the local and provincial limitations which circumscribed it at that time, dreaded the despotism of pure monarchy and was no less hostile to pure aristocracy, but since it regarded democracy as more terrifying than either, it chose the constitutional monarchy as the best means for its rule [1] The financial aristocracy of France did the same thing in the Revolution of July 1830, establishing a bourgeois monarchy despite the fact that the republicans and workers fought and won the Revolution with the object of establishing a democratic republic. To maintain the pretense, Louis Philippe, the bourgeois king, spoke glibly of his republican institutions Even Prussia, in 1830, presented itself as a monarchy surrounded by republican institutions. And in Italy at this time, the bourgeois Party of Moderates likewise tipped their hats to the republic, but preferred the surer safety of the monarchy, a tendency which became all the more marked after 1830 with the emergence of the modern proletariat as the leading democratic force This was repeated in Germany in 1848 when the king sacrificed the nobility to the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie sacrificed the people to the king, the monarch, as Marx aptly remarked, becoming bourgeois and the bourgeoisie becoming monarchist.[2] It was historic irony that Metternich, arch-symbol of feudal restoration and reaction in the first half of the nineteenth century

should have been the one to put his finger on this contradiction embodied in the bourgeois fear of democracy.

3 In the light of this relationship of the bourgeoisie to democracy, it is understandable why the working people were the most consistent "pure democrats," as they were called after 1830 in Europe It was the people, not the bourgeois property owners, who were the most ardent champions of the republic, who believed in democracy and strove for its realization.

"For the past six hundred years," Engels said, "every progressive movement had its origin in the cities, so much so that the independent democratic movements of the farm population (Wat Tyler, Jack Cade, Jacquerie, Peasant War) not only made a reactionary appearance but also were suppressed The industrial proletariat of the cities has become the kernel of all modern democracy, the petty bourgeois, and more so the peasants, depend entirely upon its initiative. The French Revolution of 1789 and the most recent history of England, France and the Eastern states of America demonstrate this " [3]

Democracy meant political rights for the people, and the people, in turn, were anxious to secure these rights and to give them substance through the fulfillment of its economic demands and social aspirations It therefore strove to enlarge the concept of democracy to include social, as well as political rights

4 The democratic current was thus characterized historically by an inner contradiction already implicit in the struggle between bourgeois and feudal property This contradiction was constantly threatening to emerge and become the central issue, and actually did emerge in the great democratic revolutions of Europe and America It was a contradiction created by bourgeois property itself—the contradiction embodied in the social question It expressed itself in the rise of movements, within these revolutions, for the abolition of all inequality, not only political inequality, through the abolition

of private property. These were movements of the people who saw in private property the source of the exploitation of the many by the few and of the political domination of the wealthy minority in possession of economic power and, consequently, of effective political power

They were communist movements that arose historically within the stream of modern democracy It was for this reason that Karl Marx declared, "Socialism and communism did not originate in Germany, but in England, France and North America The first appearance of a really active communist party may be placed within the period of the middle-class revolution, the moment when constitutional monarchy was abolished The most consistent republicans, in England the Levellers, in France Babeuf, Buonarotti, etc, were the first to proclaim these 'social questions.' The 'Conspiracy of Babeuf,' written by his friend and comrade Buonarotti, shows how these republicans derived their social insight from the 'historical movement' It also demonstrates that when the social question of princedom versus republic is removed, not a single social question of the kind that interests the proletariat has been solved." [4]

Scientific communism, or Marxism, represented the historical continuation of this development It arose in the course of the struggle for democracy in the 1840's Like its predecessors, it originated within the bourgeois democratic movement in response to the social problems which this movement had no interest in solving Arising on the basis of the most advanced thought of Western Europe and America, Marxism was the historical continuation of the democratic efforts represented by the seventeenth and eighteenth century revolutions, the struggle of the Levellers within the British Revolution of 1648 and of the Babeuvists in the French Revolution of 1789. It was the continuation, on a more advanced level, of the humanitarian efforts of the great utopian socialists and communists after 1815 during the unfolding of the Industrial Revolution, and of the stream of scientific knowledge em-

bodied in French eighteenth century materialism, British political economy, and German classical philosophy It was the historical continuation of the democratic struggle of the proletarian communist movements of England, France and America after 1830 From the day of its birth as a scientific viewpoint of social development and as a practical party, Marxism therefore inscribed democracy on its banner and allied itself with the democratic movements of Europe and the United States

5 Thus the democratic tradition associated with the rise and growth of modern democracy is identified exclusively with the progressive tendencies, material, social, and intellectual, in the historical process of which it is a part The ascendant bourgeoisie made a series of major contributions to the origin and development of democracy The growth of commerce and towns, the Renaissance and the Reformation, the eighteenth century Enlightenment and the subsequent American and French Revolutions are the eternal monuments of these contributions This ascendant bourgeoisie created the conditions for the growth of science, the rule of reason and respect for the worth of the individual, but it subordinated all these to the needs of its material enrichment and the accumulation of capital Thereby it impressed a bourgeois stamp upon them with all its limitations and restrictions This was illustrated most strikingly by the central concept of the Rights of Man elaborated by the philosophers and inscribed on the banner of the great eighteenth century revolutions Behind the stirring concept was the prosaic reality of bourgeois individualism based upon private interest and free competition. The man whose rights they proclaimed was the egoistic man of bourgeois self-interest The rights which they assigned to him were rights which, as Marx said, left "every man to find in other men not the realization but rather the limits of his freedom "[5]

The growth of the factory system in the nineteenth century provided democracy with a new economic foundation and linked its further development with the ascendance of the

new industrial working class and labor movement. After 1830, democracy in Europe became pre-eminently a proletarian principle, the principle of the masses, since it was the European working class which emerged at that time as the main force in the struggle for democracy In the principal countries of Europe, the bourgeoisie was demonstrating its unwillingness and inability to wage a consistent fight for democracy, despite the fact that the democratic republic provided the most logical form for its economic and political domination With the emergence of this new type of working class, the industrial proletariat, striving to organize itself and conscious of its own class interests and aims, the bourgeoisie found consistent adherence to democracy too dangerous for the continuation of its economic and political rule.[6] The working class movement deepened and enriched the democratic tradition which had attained such a high degree of development in the eighteenth century Enlightenment

The eighteenth century philosophers and men of letters had made respect for the human being and the dignity of man a fundamental concept of modern civilization, and they allowed neither geographical boundaries nor racial distinctions to limit or restrict this concept They were humanitarians and their humanitarianism was as universal as mankind As firm believers in the unity of the human race, they displayed the same interest towards all peoples and lands and opposed the domination of one people by another. "If I knew something useful to my nation but ruinous to another," Montesquieu declared, "I would not propose it to my prince because I am a human being before I am a Frenchman, because I am by necessity a human being, whereas I am a Frenchman only by chance" And again "If I knew something useful to my fatherland which were prejudicial to Europe or something which were useful to Europe and prejudicial to mankind, I would consider it a crime"[7] Diderot wanted to spread the Enlightenment to all humanity and combatted those who

sought to plunge the world into barbarism and darkness in order to dominate it more securely. Herder, proclaiming the fact that the old feudal order had outlived itself, summoned his fellow beings to direct their lives according to the spirit of humanity [8]

The eighteenth century thinkers grounded their humanism and universalism in the idea of the universal validity of truth and justice and the universal operation of reason in "all known nations." They were convinced that the law of the land which failed to conform to reason, even when sanctioned by the majority of the nation, could become the worst tyranny. But the men who provided the philosophical justification of the inalienable rights of the individual and extended those rights to all mankind, nevertheless were limited by the historical realities out of which their thought arose. These were the realities of bourgeois society just emerging out of the feudal world, the society to which "the bourgeoisie" was a synonym for "the people."

The working class movement of which Marxism was the most advanced expression, freed the humanism and universalism of the Enlightenment from its bourgeois limitations. It provided them with new social content. In place of the competitive, antagonistic individualism which separated man from man and based the realization of the rights of one individual on the denial of the rights of many individuals, it introduced a new principle of human fellowship based upon the common bond of co-operative labor, a principle corresponding not to the private ownership but to the social character of bourgeois production. The working class movement also proclaimed the Rights of Man, but the right of every man to find in other men the realization of his freedom, not the obstacle to it.

Thus, the contradiction that appears to exist between Marxism and the democratic tradition is actually the contradiction historically inherent in the democratic current itself.

2

The first point at which Marxism allegedly departs from the democratic tradition is the property question This was the question around which the theory of modern democracy had its origin And yet here, too, there is an historical continuity despite the difference as is evident from the various theories which the early champions of bourgeois private property advanced against feudal property with a freshness, boldness and energy characteristic of the rise of a new social system Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when feudalism was breaking up and a powerful bourgeois class was arising in countries like England and France, the leading thinkers of Europe engaged in an extensive discussion on the origin of private property and its relation to society and the state

In the seventeenth century, the theories of Grotius and Hobbes, Pufendorf and Locke were the most notable Hugo Grotius, an apologist for absolute monarchy, attributed the origin of the right of private property to "possession by right of prior occupancy," the "only natural and primitive manner of acquisition" [9]

John Locke offered a new justification for property, based not upon conquest but upon man's labor Locke was a youngster at the time of the first British Republic, later, like Hobbes, he lived for a time in Holland where he could watch the development of the energetic Dutch bourgeoisie He began to write at the time of the rise of stock companies, the Bank of England and England's mastery of the sea Karl Marx described him as "an advocate of the new bourgeoisie in all forms, the manufacturers against the working classes and paupers, the commercial class against the old-fashioned usurers, the financial aristocracy against the state debtors, and who went so far as to prove in his own work that the bourgeois reason is the normal human reason" [10] He placed a new emphasis on property and its enjoyment in safety and security.

"The great and chief end of men uniting in commonwealths, and putting themselves under government," Locke wrote, "is the preservation of their property." He argued the natural right of private property on the ground that "the earth and all that there is therein is given to men for the support and comfort of their being .. and nobody has originally a private dominion exclusive of the rest of mankind in any of them," and that whatsoever the individual removes out of the state of nature by the labor of his body and the work of his hands is his property. Property, therefore, emerges and property rights are justified when labor has been expended on useless material things. Its natural and legitimate limits, according to Locke, are the needs of the possessor, "the same law of nature which by this means gives us property does also bound that property," and "he who possesses in excess of his needs, oversteps the bounds of reason and of natural justice and appropriates the property of others." Locke therefore declared that "all excess is usurpation and the sight of the needy ought to awaken remorse in the soul of the wealthy," which did not prevent him from being one of the most uncompromising advocates of the flogging of vagabonds and paupers.[11]

Samuel von Pufendorf, who refuted Grotius' and Hobbes' doctrine of absolute monarchy, advanced a third theory in his *Law of Nature and Nations*. Starting from the premise that human wants presume man's right to control the necessary things for their satisfaction, he concluded that there are no inherent rights in property, that property does not exist in a state of nature, but arises as a result of convention, agreement, law, whereby dominion over certain things is fixed in one person. Property, he contended, was the result of a division of goods by common consent, to the end that all, and particularly the producers, might be assured of permanent possession, whole or partial. The existing inequality of possessions, therefore, is an injustice which only involves the other injustices because of the insolence of the rich and cowardice of the poor.[12]

Hobbes, whom Engels described as "an absolutist in a period when absolute monarchy was at its height throughout the whole of Europe and when the fight of absolute monarchy versus the people was beginning in England," [13] agreed with Pufendorf regarding the origin of property. There was no idea of property before institutions arose, Hobbes maintained. Man in his primitive state had no property, property arises out of social organization and depends upon the institution of the coercive powers of the state, property is a legal and social rather than an individual or natural thing, and since property is not a natural right and would not be found in a state of nature, the first possession, therefore, has valid claim to property.

In other words, power is the basis of right in a society of unrestricted competition—*bellum omnium contra omnes*—and consequently the starting point in the last analysis is competition, force, generally the conflict of every individual interest against every other It is from this that Hobbes proved the necessity of the state and state power for such a society, and began his analysis of the state machine, in the spirit of his contemporary Descartes who regarded men as animals and animals as machines It "is demonstrated that by nature all men are equal," Hobbes contended, "hence the present inequality of wealth, power, nobility, etc. stems from the laws of state" [14] Hobbes proceeded from laws and contracts, juridical practice, and derived politics, ethics, property, the form of the state from contract and laws of the state

During the eighteenth century, this discussion on the question of private property was continued, especially in France. Rousseau asserted that modern civilization rests largely upon the institution of private property, there was no private property in a state of nature, society and property came into existence together and are complementary "The first man who, having enclosed a piece of land," he declared, "thought of saying 'This is mine,' and found a people simple enough to believe him, was the true founder of civil society" [15] But

he hastened to exclaim "How many crimes, how many murders, how many wars, how many misfortunes and horrors would that man have saved the human race, who, pulling up the stakes and filling up the ditches should have cried to his fellows 'Be sure not to listen to this imposter, you are lost if you forget that the fruits of the earth belong equally to all and the earth to nobody'"[16] Nevertheless, Rousseau regarded property as one of the steps in the transition of man from the lower to the higher state and regarded the abandonment of property as meaning a reversion to barbarism "Every man," he argued, "has by nature a right to all that is necessary to him . . His position allotted, he ought to confine himself to it, and he has no further right to the undivided property" The right of private property, he insisted, must be established before it could be property, and hence the explanation or justification of the origin of property could not be found in the right of prior occupancy. Property right rests upon law and is a contractual and not a natural right, it is of such importance that society cannot dispense with it Property is the true foundation of civil society and the true guarantee of the order of the citizen.[17]

It is true that on the property question, Marxism represents a revolutionary departure from the position of the bourgeois theorists, inasmuch as it establishes the fact that the very development of capitalist economy ultimately creates the conditions and the necessity for the replacement of private property by communal property But it is not a departure from the democratic tradition First of all, the democratic state itself annulled private property in theory as soon as it abolished the property qualifications of suffrage, as Marx noted in 1843 with respect to many North American states He quoted the British traveler Hamilton who, he said "interprets this fact quite correctly from the political standpoint· 'the great multitude has won the victory over the property owners and the monied men'" And Marx went on to ask "Is not private property ideally abolished when the have-nots become the

legislators of the haves? The census is the last political form to recognize private property" [18]

Actually, this triumph of democracy not only did not mean the abolition of private property, but even implied its existence, as Marx pointed out, because "the state leaves private property, education, occupation operating in their own manner" [19] From the viewpoint of the premises of democracy, Marxism is thus entirely in harmony with the democratic tradition which makes the exclusion of private property from the political realm a condition for political liberty, a test of its own democratic principle The transformation of private property into social property is the outcome of the economic development of capitalism, the recognition of this fact is merely the scientific recognition of an objective process taking place in society itself This transformation, far from being anti-democratic, represents the material foundation for the highest development of democracy for all the people, not only for part of society.

Locke justified private property on the ground that whatsoever the individual removes out of the state of nature by the labor of his body and the work of his hands is his individual property Marx demonstrated that social production is leading to social ownership, in short, that the products of associated labor will become the property of the associated producers who labor with their bodies and work with brain and hand If Locke's position is in the democratic tradition, then surely Marx' scientifically established proposition is also within the democratic tradition, since it represents the most consistent development of Locke's line of thought.

3

The difference between Locke and Marx in relation to the democratic tradition is that they stand at opposite ends of the same historical process and represent opposite social classes with opposite historical tasks But with this difference, there

is at the same time an historical continuity, the contradiction, far from excluding either from association with the democratic tradition, is rather one of its distinguishing features The fact is that the capitalist mode of production is part of a continuous historical process, and produces the material conditions and the social forces for its own transformation. This historical tendency of capitalist production is unquestionably revolutionary, and its fulfillment would constitute a complete revolution in the property relations underlying the bourgeois social order But surely this does not place Marxism beyond the pale of the democratic tradition, since one of the chief pillars of the democratic tradition is the right of revolution, a "right" which presided over the burial of feudal property and the birth of bourgeois property, the starting point of modern democracy and the democratic tradition, and which the founders of the theory of the democratic tradition derived from Natural Law and counted among the inalienable Rights of Man

John Locke, who systematized the doctrine of Natural Law, placed great emphasis upon reasonableness and moderation, but he attached even greater importance to property and work. And because of this, he fully justified a revolution in property relations in order to free the new bourgeois economy from its feudal chains. In his *Treatises of Government*, published a year after the British Whig Revolution of 1688, he laid down the principle that government is a moral trust dependent upon the free consent of the governed To the argument that "all men, being born under government, they are to submit to that, and are not at liberty to begin a new one," Locke replied "It is plain, mankind never owned nor considered any such natural subjection that they were born in, to one or to the other, that tied them, without their own consent, to a subjection to them and their heirs" [20] The end of political society and government is "the good of mankind," and since, in creating the political state, men do not surrender all their authority, but only that which is necessary to

create it and give it force, the government is the agency of the collective will and may be called to account And if the government in any of its branches, executive, legislative or judicial, exceeds its authority and subverts the purpose of its existence, the people have the right to revolution "In all states and conditions the true remedy of force without authority is to oppose force to it," Locke argued in opposition to absolute monarchy and on behalf of the constitutional monarchy of 1688 [21]

This inalienable right, proclaimed so emphatically in the seventeenth century, became one of the chief premises of eighteenth century thought in Europe and America Rousseau, even more consistently than Locke, recognized the right to revolution as an inalienable right Since men entering into the social compact, Rousseau maintained, enter it as equals and the compact is an agreement among equals, they remain equal, they do not contract with a sovereign, they *are* collectively the sovereign. "The act which institutes the government," he says in his *Social Contract*, "is not a contract, but a law, the depositories of executive power are not masters of the people, but its officers. It may establish them and dispense with them as it pleases" And further on in the same work "There is no fundamental law in the state which cannot be revoked, not even the social compact." [22]

The concept and even the language of Locke became the common idiom of the American Declaration of Independence, the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, as well as of all those, even the most timid and cautious, throughout Europe who hailed the dawn of the new era of liberty With the American Declaration of Independence, they fervently believed "that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends (life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness), it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to constitute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and hap-

piness." This belief was the heart of the argument with which the champions of the new freedom defended ascendant democracy.

During the monarchic restoration which followed the defeat of Napoleon, the right of revolution was loudly proclaimed in England by Jeremy Bentham, the world-renowned philosopher of Utilitarianism Bentham was tireless in holding up American democracy as a model for Europe to follow and praised it particularly because it recognized the right of revolution It is one of the marks of a despotic government, he declared, to deny this right On the other hand, "of a government that is not despotic it is ... the essential character, even to *cherish* the disposition to eventual resistance On some other occasion you shall see how effectually and pointedly that indispensable element of security has been cherished, cherished by the only government that stands upon a rock—the government of the Anglo-American United States" [23]

For a hundred years after the American War for independence, belief in the right of revolution was one of the articles of faith and fundamental truths by which Americans lived. It played a prominent role throughout the entire period of the Second American Revolution, or Civil War, indicating the extent to which this concept had become an integral part of the national heritage It never occurred to anyone on either side of the "irrepressible conflict," between the Southern system of slave labor and the Northern system of wage labor, to question this right [24]

When the Southern democrats projected the right of secession as the basic issue in the Congressional elections of 1850-51 in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and other parts of the South, the Southern Whigs denied any such right and countered by proclaiming the inalienable right of revolution while affirming their loyalty to the Union The editorials of the Whig press, the letters and speeches of the Whig candidates, the official and unofficial utterances of the Whig office holders, the resolutions of local and state Union conventions, besides those

which the Mississippi Constituent Convention and the Tennessee Legislature officially adopted under Whig influence, all proclaimed that when conditions became intolerably oppressive and all other remedies had been tried and failed, there remained recourse in the last resort, only to the inalienable right of revolution Resolutions giving expression of loyal devotion to the Union would close with the declaration "We hold ourselves in duty bound to maintain the government as long as it maintains us, but when it becomes our open enemy, by some *hostile* act, if that time should come, then we should be for *Revolution and Independence*" [5] The Southern Whigs argued that the right of secession was confounded with the inherent and inalienable right of revolution—"a right nobody disputes and terrible to tyrants only" But they insisted this was not a right fixed by constitutional provision or regulation and that its exercise, justifiable only in case of extreme oppression, meant bloody civil war, a remedy which they did not believe the existing situation required

What the Southern slave owners were preparing, however, was a counter-revolution against American democracy, and they used the next decade for this purpose It is indicative of how entirely undisputed the belief in "the right of revolution" was as yet that the main charge of Northern spokesmen against the slave owners at the beginning of the Civil War was that they sought to conceal their real intention of civil war behind professions of peaceful secession This was expressed most clearly by John Lathrop Motley, the well-known historian of the Dutch Republic, who had been appointed Ambasador to Austria by President Lincoln At the outbreak of the Civil War, he wrote a long letter to the London *Times* explaining the nature of the Union and the causes of the Civil War This letter, as Motley informed his wife and daughters on June 14, 1861, "was at once copied bodily into the Boston and New York papers with expressions of approbation," and, according to the evidence of George William Curtis, editor of Motley's *Correspondence* and his

personal friend, was "universally read and approved" in the United States.[26]

"No man," Motley wrote in this letter, "on either side of the Atlantic, with Anglo-Saxon blood in his veins will dispute the right of a people, or of any portion of a people, to rise against oppression, to demand redress of grievances, and in case of denial of justice, to take up arms to vindicate the sacred principles of liberty Few Englishmen or Americans will deny that the source of government is the consent of the governed, or that any nation has the right to govern itself, according to its own will. When the silent consent is changed to fierce remonstrance the revolution is impending The right of revolution is indisputable It is written on the whole record of our race British and American history is made up of rebellion and revolution Many of the crowned kings were rebels or usurpers Hampden, Pym and Oliver Cromwell, Washington, Adams and Jefferson—all were rebels It is no word of reproach But these men all knew the work they had set themselves to do. They never called their rebellion 'peaceable secession' They were sustained by the consciousness of right when they overthrew established authority, but they meant to overthrow it They meant rebellion, civil war, bloodshed, infinite suffering for themselves and their whole generation, for they accounted them welcome substitutes for insulted liberty and violated right. There can be nothing plainer, then, than the American right of revolution" [27]

There was no doubt that Motley was expressing the point of view of the entire North Emerson said essentially the same thing a few years earlier in his study of *English Traits* published in 1856. In Parliament, he wrote, the English people "have hit on that capital invention of freedom, a constitutional opposition And when courts and Parliament are both deaf, the plaintiff is not silenced Calm, patient, his weapon of defense from year to year is the obstinate reproduction of the grievance with calculations and estimates. But, meantime, he is drawing numbers and money to his opinion, resolved that if

all remedy fails, right of revolution is at the bottom of his charter-box." [28]

Edward Everett, America's leading orator, reiterated Motley's sentiments in an address which he delivered in New York on July 4, 1861 Everett combated the argument of the right of secession by a sovereign state After enumerating a number of things a sovereign state, in his opinion, could do, he also mentioned her right to "ratify and adopt a constitution of government ordained and established not only for that generation, but their posterity, *subject only to the inalienable right of revolution possessed by every political community*." "But," he said farther on in the same speech, "it may be thought a waste of time to argue against a constitutional right of peaceful secession, *since no one denies the right of revolution*, and no pains are spared by the disaffected leaders, while they claim indeed the constitutional right, to represent their movement as the uprising of an indignant people against an oppressive and tyrannical government" [29]

But the real democratic essence of this devotion to the American principle of the "right of revolution" and the reactionary essence of the slave-owners' rebellion was given a few months earlier by Wendell Phillips, the Boston abolitionist, whose democratic consistency and sincerity had evoked the admiration of Karl Marx. "No government," Phillips declared in a speech in Boston on April 21, 1861, "provides for its own death, therefore there can be no constitutional right to secede But there is a revolutionary right The Declaration of Independence establishes, what the heart of every American acknowledges, that the people—mark you, the *people*—have always an inherent, paramount, inalienable right to change their governments, whenever they think—whenever they think—that it will minister to their happiness That is a revolutionary right" [30] In short, it was a right which the slave-owning oligarchy could not claim, because it belonged only to the people It was a right belonging to progress and freedom, never to reaction and slavery.

This right was so completely accepted that the New York *Tribune*, organ of the industrial capitalists and perhaps the most popular paper in the North during the Civil War, even accorded it a sort of legal status which no one had the right forcibly to obstruct "We," it declared in an editorial entitled "The Right of Revolution" in its issue of May 24, 1862, "have steadfastly affirmed and upheld Mr. Jefferson's doctrine, embodied in the Declaration of American Independence, of the Right of Revolution We have insisted that, where this right is asserted, and its exercise is properly attempted, it ought not to be necessary to subject all concerned to the woes and horrors of a civil war In other words, what one party has a right to do, another can have no right to resist" After the Civil War, the tradition of the right of revolution passed almost entirely to the labor and agrarian movements in the United States

This brief review provides sufficient evidence that on this question, too, Marxism is in full harmony with the democratic tradition It was entirely within this tradition that Frederick Engels discussed the question in 1884 when it arose as a practical political issue in Germany "Throughout the whole of Europe," Engels wrote, "the existing political situation is the product of revolution The legal basis, historic right, legitimacy, have been everywhere riddled through and through a thousand times or entirely overthrown But it is in the nature of all parties or classes which have come to power through revolution, to demand that the new basis of right created by the revolution should also be unconditionally recognized and regarded as sacred The right to revolution *did* exist—otherwise the present rulers would not be rightful—but from now onwards it is to exist no more!" [31]

In 1886 Engels reiterated his observation "In contrast to the pale and cowardly protests and protestations of peaceful procedure under all circumstances on the part of our petty-bourgeois socialists," Engels wrote, "the time has come, in fact, to show how English Ministers—Althorp, Peel, Morley,

even Gladstone—preach the right of revolution as a constitutional theory—to be sure, only *as long as they are in Opposition*, as Gladstone's subsequent insipidity shows, although he does not dare to deny the right as such—and especially because this comes from England, the land of legality *par excellence*." [32]

In 1895, just before his death, Engels again emphasized the point. "It goes without saying," he wrote, "that our foreign comrades do not relinquish their right of revolution The right of revolution is after all the only actually 'historical right,' the only right upon which all modern states without exception rest" [33]

The essence of the question was summarized by Marx in 1878, in reply to the charge of the Prussian Government accusing the German Marxists of advocating force and violence. "What Eulenburg actually wants to say," Marx declared, "is. the peaceful development towards the goal is only a stage which is to lead up to the violent development of the goal and this later transformation of the 'peaceful' into the 'violent' development arises for Herr Eulenburg from the nature of the desired goal The goal in this case is the emancipation of the working class and the transformation of society involved in this emancipation The fact, however, is that historical development can remain 'peaceful' only as long as those who hold power in society at a given time do not place any violent obstacles in its way If, for example, the working class in England or the United States should win the majority in Parliament or Congress, it could legally abolish those laws and institutions which obstruct its development and it could do this only to the extent that social development exhibits such obstructions And yet the 'peaceful' movement could turn into a violent one as a result of the insurrection of those interested in the old order, if they are crushed by *force* (as they were in the American Civil War and the French Revolution), it is as rebels against the 'legal' power. But what Eulenburg preaches is *violent reaction* on the part of those in

power against the *course of development* proceeding peacefully apparently in order to prevent 'violent' conflicts on the part of the ascendant social classes This is the battle cry of violent counter-revolution against what is actually a 'peaceful' development of the revolution, in point of fact, the government is attempting to crush by *force* a development which displeases it but which is *legally* unassailable This is the necessary introduction to violent revolutions It is an old story but it remains eternally true " [34]

4

Another conception regarded as exclusively Marxist and cited as evidence of the undemocratic character of Marxism is the concept of the class struggle Here, too, this represents not a point of departure from the democratic tradition but one of the points of closest contact and historical continuity between the two Political equality, or the abolition of class privileges, historically the first aim of modern democracy, did not exclude class antagonisms, on the contrary, it implied them, since political liberty required the state to leave private property free to operate in its own manner, and hence, to produce the social classes and the economic inequalities associated with capitalist private property, the inequalities of capital and labor, wealth and poverty The doctrine of Natural Rights, which invoked the sanction of nature on behalf of bourgeois private property, therefore, automatically covered its consequences, the class contradictions and antagonisms of bourgeois society

This was demonstrated most strikingly in the young American Republic which had just established free political institutions Nowhere was the doctrine of class antagonisms more clearly proclaimed than in America after the War of Independence, and that by the Founding Fathers themselves Democratic America was the birthplace *par excellence* of the modern concept of class struggle, which explains why Arthur

Schlesinger, one of America's leading historians, in his *New Viewpoints in American History* published in 1926, suggested that "the student of American history may prefer to ignore the Marxian origin of the doctrine and claim for it an earlier and purely American authorship Certainly the thought underlying the theory has seldom been better expressed than by James Madison, the 'Father of the Constitution,' in No 10 of the *Federalist Papers,* which were written in 1787 to win popular support for the Federal Constitution then pending before the state ratifying conventions After pointing out that mankind has constantly been influenced and divided by differences over religion and government or by attachment to outstanding leaders, Madison added 'But the most common and durable source of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society Those who are creditors, and those who are debtors, fall under a like discrimination A landed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations, and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views' " [35]

This was the position of all groups aligned with the Federalists on the issue of the adoption of the Constitution John Adams, leader of the "moderates," was as convinced as any Federalist of the need for a wealthy class and sought to protect its rights from encroachment by the poor Like all Federalists, he also talked of protecting the poor from the rich, though like them also, he was convinced that the government should be run by and for the "wise, rich and good" He accepted the viewpoint of the seventeenth century James Harrington that economic power, as represented by wealth, and political power had gone hand in hand throughout history.[36]

As one who grounded his views regarding economic classes and class antagonisms in a wide reading of history, politics and economics, Adams was an adherent of the doctrine of Natural Law, an avid reader of the seventeenth century Brit-

ish republicans, an admirer of John Locke and a student of Adam Smith, founder of British classical economy which had taken over the doctrine of Natural Rights through Locke, although he dismissed the theoretical differences among these various schools of thought as "mysteries, paradoxes, and enigmas" [37] These were the same sources which later contributed to Karl Marx' understanding of the class struggle proceeding in capitalist society

Marx himself made it quite clear that he did not discover or introduce the concept of the class struggle As he explained in 1852 to his friend Joseph Weydemeyer who was living in America and, later during the Civil War was commissioned as an officer by Abraham Lincoln "As far as I am concerned, I can't claim to have discovered the existence of classes in modern society or their strife against one another Middle class historians long ago described the evolution of the class struggles, and political economists showed the economic physiology of the classes" [38] What Marx did was to show "that the existence of classes is bound up with certain phases of material production," to establish the significance of this fact for social evolution, and to draw the practical political conclusions from it for the working class

Indeed, as Marx observed later, the idea of the opposition between rich and poor was as old as European civilization But in the 20's and the 30's of the nineteenth century following the Industrial Revolution, the rise of the factory system and modern industry, this opposition for the first time assumed the form of a class-conscious antagonism between capital and labor Great Britain was the country where the complete separation between capitalists and workers had assumed its classic form In France this separation became pronounced after the Revolution of July 1830 In the United States, despite the fluidity of its class structure, the essentially agrarian character of its economy at this time and the newness of its factory system, an independent labor movement con-

scious of its own class position and interests appeared as early as 1827.

In a period, therefore, which was preceded by half a century of acute social struggles, revolutionary upheavals, the rise and formation of new nations and new social institutions, and which itself witnessed the sharpest class struggles between capital and labor in England, the classical home of capitalism, in France, the land of proletarian revolts throughout the 1830's, and even in distant America, starting point of the economic crisis of 1837 and home of the militant labor movement, it was only "natural" to think of society in terms of sharp class divisions and antagonisms and of history as a succession of class struggles Marx could not leave the democratic struggle in Germany in order to study contemporary society without being confronted at every hand with the evidence of these struggles

The problem which he set out to solve as a young democrat was being posed by bourgeois society in England, France, Germany and the United States, and the more Marx studied, the more he recognized the true character of this problem All the books he read in order to get an understanding of the structure and workings of modern society led him to the class struggle He read Thierry, Mignet and Guizot on the French Revolution and all of them described the class struggle as the main driving force of social development He read Alexis de Tocqueville, Thomas Hamilton and others on America and they, too, drew attention to the class structure of the trans-Atlantic democracy and described the class struggle which was at its height precisely when democracy, under the leadership of Andrew Jackson, exerted its greatest influence and power. He could not even re-evaluate Hegel's conception of history without finding in it a recognition of the role of classes and their struggle in bourgeois society and especially in America, its politically most advanced form And when he steeped himself in the literature of British Chartism and contemporaneous French communism, British-French utopian so-

cialism and finally British classical economy, the conclusion was inevitable The theoretical conclusions of the study room only confirmed and deepened the meaning of the picture presented by life itself And that picture showed that the class struggle, instead of being alien to the democratic tradition, was historically associated with its very inception

When we get down to it, however, it is not the recognition of the existence of a class struggle which has been the ground for the charge that Marxism is alien to the democratic tradition, it is really the fact that Marxism looks forward to the ultimate abolition of all classes and regards this as the historic mission of the working class to whom the realization of this aim is the indispensable condition for its full emancipation from exploitation.

The difference here is the historical difference between the bourgeoisie and the working people on the question of equality In the struggle against feudalism, the bourgeoisie fought for equal rights, and therefore demanded not the abolition of classes but the abolition of all class privileges which interfered with the growth of capital This concept of equality represented such an historic advance over feudal conditions that the French workers even took it over to express their demands But the modern labor movement aspires to more than the abolition of class privileges, it aspires to the abolition of exploited and exploiting classes altogether

For that reason, Marx and Engels always rejected any superficial use of the concept of equality In 1847, Marx criticized Proudhon, who regarded equality as supreme good, for using a mere phrase which only covered up the economic and historical realities [39] In 1869 Marx also criticized the German Marxists for calling for "political, economic and social equalization of the classes" [40] The demand of the working class, he pointed out, is for the abolition of classes, not just for the abolition of class privileges, a task associated with the overthrow of feudalism In the 1870's Marx and Engels waged a struggle against the Lassallean efforts to replace the accurate

scientific socialist concepts of Marxism by those phrases representing bourgeois democratic demands. Thus, they insisted that the phrase "doing away with all social and political inequality" is also a very questionable phrase in place of "the abolition of all class differences" [41] Engels objected to it on the ground that it is a superficial idea, since there will always exist a certain inequality in the conditions of life "The notion of socialist society as the realm of equality," he stated, "is a superficial French idea resting upon the old 'liberty, equality, fraternity'—an idea which was justified as a stage of development in its own time and place but which, like all superficial ideas of the earlier socialist schools, should now be overcome, for they only produce confusion in people's heads and more precise forms of description have been found" [42]

If the independent role of the working class was not associated with the inception of the democratic tradition, it was decidedly associated with its development The emergence of labor as a distinct class, in the wake of the Industrial Revolution, was accompanied by an historic struggle to secure the right to organize as a class in defense of its economic interests, to appear in the political arena as an independent class force and to strive for the realization of its ideal of a classless society This right, long accepted as an integral part of democracy and the democratic tradition, was won at great cost and was sufficiently established by the end of the 1830's in France, England and the United States to enable Marxism to recognize the historic role of the working class in the evolution of capitalist society. In this respect, therefore, Marxism was merely the theoretical expression of the position of the proletariat in the class struggle and the theoretical summary of the conditions of the emancipation of the working class It registered in theory what was proceeding in actual society, and thereby built its entire outlook upon the foundation of the living labor movement whose achievements entered into the democratic tradition

In advancing the perspective of a classless society arising

from the economic development of capitalism itself, in regarding the working class as the social force which, because of its position, *must* take the lead in establishing this new society; and in enlightening and organizing the working class as the power capable of replacing the old by the new social order, Marxism was therefore entirely within the democratic tradition

5

The final and "crushing" item in the "evidence" that Marxism is undemocratic is its position on the dictatorship of the proletariat In his letter to Weydemeyer of 1852, in which Marx denied any claim to have discovered the existence of classes or their conflict in modern society, he went on to say: "I have added as a new contribution the following propositions 1. that the existence of classes is bound up with certain phases of material production, 2 that the class struggle leads necessarily to the dictatorship of the proletariat, 3 that this dictatorship is but the transition to the abolition of all classes and to the creation of a society of free and equal " [43]

It is evident from this that the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a fundamental feature which distinguishes Marxism from all other concepts of the class struggle At the same time it is also evident that Marx regarded the dictatorship of the proletariat as the outcome of the historical process, and not as something to be imposed arbitrarily by minority action. In this respect, Marxism distinguishes itself sharply from Blanquism, the French proletarian communist movement, which believed that the revolutionary party of the working class could seize political power by its own efforts, irrespective of the readiness of the working class as a whole. Engels summarized the essence of Blanquism, and consequently its distinction from Marxism, as follows "Blanqui is essentially a political revolutionist .. In his political activity he was mainly a man of action, believing that a small and well

organized minority, who would attempt a political stroke of force at the opportune moment, could carry the mass of the people with them by a few successes at the start and thus make a victorious revolution... From Blanqui's assumption that any revolution may be made by the outbreak of a small revolutionary minority, follows of itself the necessity of a dictatorship after the success of the venture This is, of course, a dictatorship, not of the entire revolutionary class, the proletariat, but of the small minority that has made the revolution and who are themselves previously organized under the dictatorship of one or several individuals. We see, then, that Blanqui is a revolutionary of the preceding generation "[44]

According to Marxism, therefore, the same process of capitalist development which creates the economic conditions and necessity for socialism simultaneously confronts the working class with the task of acquiring political power as the first condition for carrying through the socialist reorganization of society In other words, the class struggle which arises out of the conditions of existence of capitalism cannot develop to its logical conclusion without, as Marx says, necessarily leading to the dictatorship of the proletariat The dictatorship of the proletariat is, therefore, not the result of a plot or conspiracy by an unrepresentative minority, but the inevitable result of the political action of the vast majority in response to the economic, social and political development of capitalism itself In other words, it is the natural process of the transfer of state power from the hands of the capitalist class, a minority in society, to the working class, representing and leading the exploited majority, under conditions where the majority is ready and able to assume state power

Marxism has therefore always regarded the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the political condition for the introduction of socialism, as a higher form of democracy It never regarded it as opposed to democracy or as a departure from democracy, but, on the contrary, as the full realization of democracy. In contrast to bourgeois democracy, where the

appearance of majority rule conceals the actual rule of the exploiting minority which possesses the economic power of the country, the dictatorship of the proletariat enables the majority to rule for the first time by placing state power in the hands of the people and using it to deprive the capitalists of their economic monopoly Marx illustrated the profound democratic essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat in describing the Paris Commune of 1871, the only example provided by history during his lifetime One need only read his description of the Commune to see the extent to which Marx equated the dictatorship of the proletariat with the full realization of democracy.[45]

Lenin, who applied and developed Marx' teachings, and under whose leadership socialism was established on one sixth of the earth, stated the theoretical and historical relation between the dictatorship of the proletariat and democracy as follows "It would be a fundamental mistake to suppose that the struggle for democracy can divert the proletariat from the socialist revolution, or obscure, or overshadow it On the contrary, just as socialism cannot be victorious unless it introduces complete democracy, so the proletariat will be unable to prepare for victory over the bourgeoisie unless it wages a many-sided, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy "[46] The Soviet system was a further development of the principles of the Paris Commune. For the first time in history scores of millions of people were able to put into practice the principle of the sovereignty of the people divested of all shams and to establish a government truly of the people and by the people And it demonstrated the genuineness of its democracy by the heroism and self-sacrifice with which the masses of the people fought and defeated Hitler's Nazi legions when they sought to conquer and destroy the first socialist country in the world.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a scientific term describing the character of the state power that comes into being during the transition from capitalism to socialism. It is

the scientific description, in class terms, of the real relations between the various sections of the exploited majority, on the one hand, and the capitalist class, on the other It is the rule of the majority of the exploited population led by the working class It justly acts and speaks in the name of society as a whole It describes the conditions and form of state power under which the fundamental concept of democracy, the sovereignty of the people, can be truly realized Whereas bourgeois democracy, as a form of state power, appears to be the exercise of the sovereignty of the people, actually only one class, the capitalist class, fully exercises this sovereignty, since the state is but the expression of the character of a society and the social relations prevailing in it

No one can deny that the democratic tradition grants the people the right to decide their own form of government and to take whatever steps are necessary to realize their aims. Naturally, only those who wish to regard the sovereignty of the people as a purely formal concept, which leaves actual rule in the hands of the wealthy classes, will reject this conception But then they cease to be consistent democrats The sovereignty of the people is the most fundamental political concept of the democratic tradition, all others are subordinate to it, and have validity only in relation to it And the dictatorship of the proletariat, describing the class relations within the democratic majority that holds state power, is but the fulfillment of this central concept of democracy

The chief argument against its being democratic in character is that it is synonymous with the suppression of capitalist private property and the exclusion of the capitalists from state power But capitalist private property, as its history has demonstrated, is synonymous with the restriction and suppression of democracy, even while preserving its external forms, and this, the more the democratic masses, headed by the working class, become an active independent political force fighting for their own interests From the very beginning of its struggle against feudalism, capital stood for the

sole rule or dictatorship of the bourgeoisie This, in essence, was the meaning of basing suffrage on property qualifications which were abolished only as a result of the struggle of the people, first of all the working people The fact is that even after the Revolution of July 1830, when the bourgeoisie of France came to unrestricted power, only 217,000 out of 17,000,000 in France at that time were electors Even after the British bourgeoisie won the right to vote in 1832, the masses continued to be disfranchised for a long time And even where electoral rights were finally won by the masses, state power still served primarily to protect the interests of capital For, as such early theorists of bourgeois democracy as Harrington and John Adams recognized, political power can only be the expression of economic power

The idea of the rule of one class, exercising leadership and hegemony over other classes, consequently is not contrary to the democratic tradition even when judged by the practice of the bourgeoisie But then the argument is advanced that there is democracy only when there are *many* parties freely contending against one another Behind the struggle of parties is the struggle of classes, since parties are only the expression of social classes In substance, therefore, this argument declares that only under a social system of conflicting social classes can there be democracy, consequently, that democracy is possible only under capitalism where the means of production are the private property of a wealthy minority And yet, we cannot forget that it is this wealthy minority that has always feared and opposed democracy, and that it is the common people, the laboring masses, who have always fought for it The transfer of state power into the hands of the people to the exclusion of the capitalists, could only mean, therefore, the achievement of conditions in which the state power is at last completely democratic Certainly, from the economic viewpoint, the transfer of the economy of the country from the private monopoly of a minority operating it for their own profit to the social ownership of all the people operating it

for the use of all the people is not only democratic but the only real guarantee of the full realization of democracy

Unquestionably the dictatorship of the proletariat is a complete departure from the conditions of bourgeois society But its achievement is first of all the outcome of the development of this society itself, not a violation of the laws of its development It is a state power whose class character assures its essential democratic character If recognition of the class struggle is within the democratic tradition, as we have seen, then surely recognition of its inevitable outcome is within the democratic tradition, particularly since this outcome is the historical realization of the full sovereignty of the people, the elimination of the contradiction of formal equality before the law based on the actual inequality behind the law To pretend that political sovereignty resides in the people, and then to condemn the people when they pass from the appearance to the reality is hardly a defense of the democratic tradition

6

The most decisive test of the relation of Marxism to the democratic current, as of any other tendency that claims to be democratic, derives from that feature of the democratic tradition which is most enduring—its respect for the worth and dignity of man

The democratic tradition is pre-eminently a tradition of humanism The value of the human being is its cardinal tenet For, in the last analysis, the "Rights of Man," especially freedom and equality, are meaningless unless they are predicated on the recognition of the worth and dignity of the human being For that reason, the love of peace, the desire to preserve the human being, which excludes pacifism, is a principal corollary of this tenet Its appreciation and respect for the dignity and worth of man include, as a further corollary, the hatred of every form of bigotry, of racial and national

chauvinism, of every limitation which degrades the human being, and with it, the encouragement of science, culture, the arts, and all the material and intellectual means of enriching life and elevating the human being

The gigantic development of the modern productive forces provide the basis for the tradition and temper of humanism. This is the solid foundation of every real advance Man's material and intellectual powers of production are of primary, overriding significance in the democratic tradition, their development is crucial to its fulfillment But to recognize the primacy of the growth of the productive forces is to recognize the historical transience of the division of humanity into social classes on the basis of economic status, a division historically outmoded by the advance in the productive forces and scientific knowledge at the command of society The essentially human viewpoint, therefore, which sees people not just as expressions of economic categories and conditions but first of all as human beings presupposes and includes within itself the recognition that a class society is not the end of historical development and that the striving for a classless society, a fully human society, is entirely within, indeed is the highest expression of the democratic tradition

Judged by this criterion, Marxism has the most profound relation to the democratic tradition, in fact, is its most consistent and advanced manifestation Marx began his development towards Marxism from the level of thought attained by the Young Hegelian criticism of religion which, he said, "ends with the doctrine that man is the supreme being of mankind, and therefore with the categorical imperative to overthrow all conditions in which man is a degraded, servile, neglected, contemptible being, conditions which cannot be better described than by the exclamation of a Frenchman on the occasion of a projected dog tax 'Poor dogs, they want to treat you like men!' " [47]

Marx passed beyond this position, *beginning* rather than ending with the doctrine that man is the supreme being for

mankind As a practical democrat concerned concretely with the welfare of his native country, Marx sought and finally found the answer to the question of how man can be emancipated from his state as a "degraded, servile, neglected, contemptible being," a state so distinctly characteristic of German conditions in the 1840's "The only liberation of Germany that is practical or possible," Marx observed, "is a liberation from the standpoint of the theory that declares man to be the supreme being of mankind In Germany no brand of serfdom can be exterminated without extirpating every kind of serfdom "[48] Where Feuerbach's humanism saw man only as a part of nature, Marx learned to see him as a part of society, to find the anatomy of society in its economy with its classes and class relations, and to understand the social and historical conditions of the emancipation of man Marx understood that "just as the savage must struggle with nature for the satisfaction of his needs, for self-preservation and self-reproduction, so too must civilized man, whatever be the form of society, or the methods of production obtaining "[49] He perceived that side by side with man's own evolution his needs increased, but also the forces of production which satisfy these needs And recognizing that the human personality does not develop independently of the material conditions of its existence, he saw in the growth of the material forces of production, of industry and science, the basis for man's complete mastery of his relation to nature and society.

Marx thus discovered the conditions for the full development of the human personality and established as the objective criterion of progress the unfettered development of the productive forces, since it provided the material, and consequently the only real, basis for the highest development of the individual Ricardo had also taken the unhampered development of the productive forces as his guiding principle, and because of this, Marx had considered Ricardo as a scientific economist in contrast to the vulgar apologetics of Malthus[50] But whereas Ricardo applied this principle from

the standpoint of the bourgeoisie, Marx adopted it from the standpoint of the proletariat, the class which by virtue of its position in society has the most to gain from the continuous and unrestricted growth of the productive forces, with this difference, however that in the continuous development of the productive forces, Marx saw the condition for the abolition of classes, of the antagonism between the development of the productive forces and the welfare of human beings, of the antagonism between the development of the capacities of the human species and the higher development of the single individual, in a word, the development of the richness of human nature as its own end

It was this end, the mark of genuine humanism, promoted by the growth of the productive forces, which also guided Marx in his conception of freedom, the heart of the democratic tradition and the aspiration of all progressive humanity Full freedom, Marx taught, begins where work dictated by necessity and external utility ceases But to achieve this it is necessary that "men in their social relationship, the associated producers, should regulate this material exchange with nature in a rational manner and bring it under their united control, instead of being governed by it as by some blind power, it should be carried on with the minimum expenditure of energy and under conditions most adapted to and most worthy of human nature Yet it remains all the same a realm of necessity It is beyond this where that development of human power, which may be called independent purpose, begins, the true realm of freedom, which, however, can only flourish upon the basis of that realm of necessity " [51]

What more cogently sums up and defines the organic relation of Marxism to the democratic tradition?

Epilogue: A Hundred Years of Marxism and Democracy

THE chief object of this study has been to establish the relation between Marxism and democracy in their historical interconnection The examination of the *origin* of Marxism in the general democratic current, to which this study has been restricted, is, however, only the beginning of the story It is the relation of Marxism and democracy during the hundred years between the first appearance of Marxism and the present day that constitutes the actual history of this question Naturally, even a proper summary of this history would require a substantial volume by itself Before laying down this book, however, the reader is entitled to at least a brief outline of the main phases of this history, especially since it is this that provides the test and demonstrates the fundamental world significance of the question.

1 The historical turn in the struggle for democracy signalized by the Revolution of July 1830 registered its next major development in the outbreak and defeat of the European Revolution of 1848 This was a new and larger installment of the bourgeois democratic revolution which had still to be completed in Europe Once again the Revolution first broke out in Paris and quickly spread to Vienna, Milan and Berlin, sweeping the whole of Europe up to the Russian frontier into the democratic movement [1] It was the world economic crisis of 1847 that provided the material basis and

impetus for the Revolution But, as in 1830, so again in 1848, the struggle for democracy against the feudal classes could no longer be waged without the emergence within the anti-feudal camp of a struggle for power between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

At first the workers and bourgeois united against the common foe But the capitalists were interested only in securing power for themselves and not in satisfying the social demands of the workers The Paris Revolution of February which overthrew the oppressive monarchy of Louis Philippe was therefore followed in June by the uprising of the Parisian working class. The bourgeoisie was so shaken that it fled back into the arms of the very monarchist-feudal reaction which had been overthrown, and their example was followed by the bourgeoisie in other countries of Europe.

The Revolution of 1848, however, marked the rise of the modern working class socialist movement For the first time, the workers' parties of all countries advanced the demand for the economic reconstruction of the social order, and with it the abolition of wage slavery and capitalist exploitation, through the appropriation of the means of production by society. True, the proletarian masses, even in Paris, were not clear as to the path to be taken to achieve this, and the movement for it was still largely instinctive and spontaneous. Nevertheless, this demand sharply differentiated the new working class socialism from all other varieties of feudal, bourgeois and petty bourgeois socialism as well as from the confused idea of community of goods which characterized the earlier utopian and spontaneous proletarian communism [2] The most advanced sector of this new working class socialist movement was Marxism whose first great document, the *Communist Manifesto,* written by Marx and Engels on the eve of the 1848 Revolution, scientifically established and brilliantly formulated this demand and outlined the path for its achievement

Marx and Engels participated directly in the revolutionary

mass struggles of 1848-49 in Germany They regarded the triumph of the bourgeois revolution as a condition for the victory of the workers' revolution. But they knew that the German bourgeoisie was a class inclined from the very beginning to betray the people and to compromise with the crowned representatives of the old society And, as a matter of fact, on their return to Germany immediately after the outbreak of the Revolution in March, they found that the power which the people had wrested from the feudalists had passed into the hands of the "traditionally anti-revolutionary" big bourgeoisie which, out of fear of the people, had actually concluded a protective alliance with reaction in order to "terminate" the Revolution The bourgeoisie, as Marx said many years later, "preferred peace with slavery to the mere prospect of a fight for freedom" [3]

The German proletariat had only a vague feeling of the profound contradiction between its interests and those of the bourgeoisie It was still unorganized and was actually incapable of establishing independent organization at this time. It therefore took up its position as the extreme left wing of the bourgeoisie, constituting the most advanced democratic force in the Revolution The daily paper, the *New Rhenish Gazette*, which Marx and Engels immediately established on their return to their native land, operated on the basis of this situation and therefore carried the subtitle "Organ of democracy" But, within the general camp of democracy, it distinctly represented the proletariat in the Revolution Indeed, it was the only paper that represented the standpoint of the proletariat within the democratic movement in Germany at this time

This was in accord with the principle outlined in the *Communist Manifesto* that the Communists fight for the attainment of the immediate aims and momentary interests of the working class, but in the movement of the present, they also represent and take care of the future of that movement Marx and Engels, therefore, were part of the democratic camp as

a whole without giving up their class indentity. In fact, they strove to create a proletarian party, a special class-conscious party within the Revolution, independent of all others. They regarded this as the decisive guarantee of the triumph and further development of the democratic revolution which was endangered by the vacillations and illusions of the other democratic class forces

They stood for a government at that time which would base itself on the revolutionary people and would unhesitatingly suppress all the domestic and foreign enemies of the Revolution Such a democratic government would necessarily open the way for the proletariat to carry the democratic revolution to its conclusion by means of the socialist revolution

The proletarian uprising in France in June 1848 and the alliance of the bourgeoisie with the monarchist-feudal reaction convinced Marx and Engels that the great decisive struggle between capital and labor had finally arrived, and "that it would have to be fought out in a single, long and changeful period of revolution, but that it could only end with the final victory of the proletariat" But ultimately, Marx and Engels had to revise this estimate.

The economic development of the Continent at this time was not ripe for the abolition of capitalist production Indeed, it was after 1848 that a vast industrial expansion began to take place and big industry really began to take root in France, Austria, Hungary, Poland and Russia, with Germany becoming during the next fifty years a major industrial country Just as the economic crisis of 1847 provided the material impetus for the subsequent Revolution, so the industrial prosperity, which began to return gradually after the middle of 1848 and reached its full growth in 1849 and 1850, revitalized European reaction and proved decisive for the defeat of the Revolution [4]

The historical experience of the Revolution of 1848 and the strategy and tactics worked out by Marx and Engels later

proved to be of the utmost importance in the Russian Revolution of 1905 and again in 1917 It was on the basis of a thorough study of Marx' and Engels' work and writings during the period of 1848-49 reinforced by the historic lessons of the Paris Commune of 1871 that Lenin formulated the task of the proletariat in the Russian Revolution of 1905 and established the organic connection and continuity between the bourgeois democratic and the socialist revolution

2 The defeat of the Revolution of 1848 was followed by a decade of reaction in Europe. Meanwhile, across the Atlantic, a titanic struggle was maturing between chattel slavery and the system of wage labor, which culminated in the American Civil War of 1861-65 All the forces of reaction in the United States and Europe rallied behind the slave-owning oligarchy The working people and the democratic forces of the world came to the support of the Government of the United States and President Abraham Lincoln They realized that the victory of the slave-owners would be a terrible blow to progress and would strengthen the power of reaction everywhere for decades to come The workers understood that their own freedom was at stake, they grasped the profound truth, formulated by Marx, that "labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded" [5]

From the first, Marx and Engels appreciated the world significance of the struggle in the United States They were well acquainted with conditions in America, having followed American developments closely, especially during the ten years between 1852 and 1862, when Marx was European correspondent for the New York *Tribune*. They branded the South as an oligarchy which "dared to inscribe, for the first time in the history of the world, slavery on the banner of armed revolt" [6] They realized that the American people were faced with a great historical crisis in which its very existence was at stake, and without losing faith in the ultimate triumph of the North, were nevertheless peeved, on the news of the initial victories of the South, "that a lousy oligarchy

of only half the number of inhabitants has proved itself just as strong as the big, awkward, helpless democracy" [7] Marx castigated the attitude of the official English press which, in the past, "tired the world with their anti-slave-trade philanthropy," but now rushed to the support of the slaveholders He stigmatized the behavior of the British bourgeoisie and contrasted it with the pro-Northern sympathies of the British proletariat "The English middle class (and aristocracy)," Marx declared in 1862, "has *never* more shamelessly disgraced itself than in the great struggle which is taking place on the other side of the Atlantic The English working class, on the other hand, which is suffering most under the Civil War, has never proved itself more heroic and noble All the more is this to be admired when one knows, as I do, all the means which were set in motion here [in London] and in Manchester in order to get it to demonstrate The only large organ that they still had, the newspaper of the scoundrel Reynolds, has been bought up by the Southerners, likewise, their most important lecturers But all in vain" [8]

The British working class played an important role in preventing the aristocratic government of England from throwing Britain into the scales on the side of the slaveowners and thereby assuring the defeat of American democracy Despite the fact that the workers were the chief sufferers because the stoppage of cotton imports from America closed down the British textile industry, they never faltered in their wholehearted support of Lincoln and frustrated the reactionary plans of the British governing circles It was Karl Marx and Frederick Engels who performed an historic service in this connection. As the leading spirits in the International Workingmen's Association, whose headquarters was in London, they exerted an important influence on the British labor movement. The International, which was organized in 1864, as a result of the revival of the labor movement in the early 'sixties, immediately made the Northern cause its own. In an

address written by Marx, it greeted Lincoln on his re-election as President of the United States.

"We congratulate the American people," Marx wrote, "on your re-election by a large majority If resistance to the slave power was the reserved watchword of your first election, the triumphant war-cry of your re-election is 'death to slavery.' From the commencement of the titanic American strife the workingmen of Europe felt instinctively that the star-spangled banner carried the destiny of their class ... When counter-revolution ... maintained slavery to be a beneficent institution, indeed, the only solution of the great problem of the relation of Capital to Labor, and cynically proclaimed property in man the corner stone of the new edifice, then the working classes of Europe understood at once, even before the frantic partisanship of the upper classes for the Confederate gentry had given its dismal warning, that the slaveholders' rebellion was to sound the tocsin for a general holy crusade of property against labor, and that for the men of labor, with their hopes for the future, even their past conquests were at stake in that tremendous conflict on the other side of the Atlantic....

"The workingmen of Europe feel sure that as the American war of Independence initiated a new era of ascendancy for the middle class, so the American anti-slavery war will do for the working classes They consider it an earnest of the epoch to come, that it fell to the lot of Abraham Lincoln, the single-minded son of the working class, to lead his country through the matchless struggle for the rescue of an enchained race and the reconstruction of a social world" [9]

It was not only in England that Marx and his supporters were active in defense of American democracy against the onslaught of reaction. The followers of Marx living in the United States, such as Joseph Weydemeyer who had come to America in 1851, immediately came to the support of the Union, rallied the labor movement to its defense, and answered President Lincoln's call to arms. Weydemeyer and

other Marxists earned officers' commissions and acquitted themselves bravely on the battlefield. The Marxists understood clearly the bourgeois character of American democracy, and they knew that the defeat of the Southern oligarchy would open up new possibilities of expansion and enrichment to the capitalists of the North But they also understood the historical significance of defending democracy, even in its limited form, against every reactionary attempt to overthrow it.

3 Six years after the close of the American Civil War, a new civil war broke out in Paris in which capital and labor were the direct antagonists In the American war, capital and labor had united against the cynical advocates of property in man But even here it was labor and the masses of independent farmers who were the most consistent fighters against chattel slavery. They not only fought to preserve the Union and to deprive the slave oligarchy of power, which was the essential object of Northern capital, they also drove the second American Revolution forward to its logical conclusion, the abolition of the slave system.

In the civil war in France, capital united with the foreign enemy to crush the democratic aspirations of the working class The defeat of Napoleon III and his armies in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 opened the way for a republican revolution But because of the economic and political development of France after 1789, the position of Paris had been such for fifty years that no revolution could occur there without immediately assuming a proletarian character, that is, as Engels said, "without the proletariat, which had bought victory with its blood, advancing its own demands" [10] But once again, as in 1830 and 1848, the bourgeoisie sought to usurp power. Even then, with the Prussians marching on Paris, the workers were ready to tolerate this assumption of power provided it was used for the single purpose of national defense. But to defend Paris, it was necessary to arm the working class. Instead, the bourgeois government, out of fear of the armed

workers, made an underhanded attempt to steal the cannon of the Paris National Guard as part of a plot to capitulate Paris to the enemy When it became evident to the workers that, in the conflict between national duty and class interest, the government did not hesitate to turn into a government of National Defection, the Parisian workers executed a successful uprising For two months the workers held political power, organized in the Paris Commune, and supported by the great bulk of the Parisian middle class, the shopkeepers, tradesmen, and merchants, all, except the wealthy capitalists

The Paris Commune, as Marx declared, "was essentially a working class government, the product of the struggle of the producing against the appropriating class, the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economical emancipation of Labor" The Commune "wanted to make individual property a truth by transforming the means of production, land and capital, now chiefly the means of enslaving and exploiting labor, into mere instruments of free and associated labor." It proceeded to smash the old state machine as an instrument of the oppression of the working class, and to erect a thoroughly democratic government directly by the people [11]

By abolishing the previous state which was an organ of rule by the propertied class, the workers of Paris, supported by all the people, replaced a power which misrepresented them by a power which truly represented them This was shown in the composition, structure and functioning of the Commune It was composed of direct representatives of the workers elected for brief periods and subject to recall at any time should they violate the wishes of their electors These representatives were not a power above their constituents, but, receiving the same moderate salaries as other workers, they were on the same footing as any other citizen While they functioned in the capacity of legislators, adopting laws at the instruction of their constituents, they themselves had to carry out these laws They therefore constituted neither a bureaucracy nor a privileged section of the community The condi-

tions of their functioning, the purposes and interests for which they functioned made the Commune the most consistent and highest form of democracy ever achieved by society up to that time. This really democratic state, this true sovereignty and self-government of the people, was the dictatorship of the proletariat, the transition to the abolition of classes and a classless society.

The establishment of the Commune fully confirmed Marx' and Engels' scientific analysis of social evolution, even though the Commune was predominantly the product of a working class, led not by the party of Marxism at that time but by the Proudhonists and Blanquists who were far from possessing the scientific insight of Marxism.

But the same bourgeoisie which had not shrunk from national treason, intriguing with the enemy for the surrender of Paris and all France to Prussia, did not hesitate to initiate a civil war with the help of Prussia against the republic of Paris. They succeeded in crushing the Paris Commune with a ferocity and a reign of terror which made the blood baths of 1830 and 1848 insignificant by comparison.

The Commune had given the world its first example of proletarian democracy in power. It provided great historical lessons regarding the role and character of the state, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. It confirmed the general conclusions originally outlined by Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848, but it also established beyond doubt that the working class cannot win the battle for full democracy by simply laying hold of the ready-made state machinery and wielding it for its own purpose, that a people's revolution cannot merely transfer the bureaucratic and military machinery from the exploiting class to the exploited class, but must break it up. The savagery with which the bourgeoisie suppressed the Commune, to the wild plaudits and relief of the bourgeoisie the world over, provided a bloody demonstration that the state, regardless of its form, is only an instrument for the maintenance of class rule.

The experience of the Commune and the logic of its unavoidable measures during its brief existence also convinced the workers of France that Marxism provided the only basis for the struggle for socialism After the defeat of the Commune, therefore, the Proudhonist and Blanquist schools lost their dominant influence in French working class circles and Marx' theory became pre-eminent.

4. The years between the Revolution of 1848 and the Paris Commune of 1871 constituted a distinct period in the economic and political development of capitalist society, the period during which the bourgeois democratic revolution matured and came to a close in the West The new period which opened up in 1872 and lasted until 1904 corresponded to the emergence of a new stage in the economic development of capitalism. Industrial capitalism, the epoch of free competition which had received its most intense development between 1848 and 1871, was giving way to monopoly capital, imperialism The period from 1872 to 1904 was distinguished from the preceding period by its "peaceful" character, by the absence of revolutions "The West," as Lenin pointed out, "has finished with bourgeois revolutions. The East has not yet grown ripe for them The West enters into a phase of 'peaceful' preparation for the epoch of future transformations. Socialist parties, proletarian in essence, are formed everywhere, parties which learn to use bourgeois parliamentarism, to establish their own daily press, their educational institutions, their trade unions and their co-operatives. The teaching of Marx gains a complete victory and *expands in breadth* The process of selection and gathering of the forces of the proletariat and its preparation for the battles ahead proceed slowly but steadily." [12]

Imperialism, which developed fully between 1898 and 1914, was preparing for a titanic struggle to divide the world. The approach of this world struggle was heralded by the Spanish-American War of 1898, the Anglo-Boer War of 1900-02, the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05. Everywhere, despite the

maintenance of a "parliamentary truce" with the mass socialist movements, the new monopoly capitalist class was in full control of state power. During the 1890's, reflecting these developments and especially the aristocracy of labor which grew up in the leading imperialist countries and enjoyed a relatively favored position based on the misery of the bulk of the working class and the super-exploitation of the colonial masses—a Right opportunist wing grew up in the Marxist parties which sought to revise the principles of Marxism and to transform the international socialist movement into a pure-and-simple reform movement. The opportunists put forward illusions regarding the nature of bourgeois democracy, advancing the arguments of the liberal bourgeoisie and insisting that the workers would achieve full democracy through the preservation of the capitalist state and a gradual transition to socialism Instead of seeing that the growth of parliamentarism did not abolish the conditions or the necessity of class struggle and only involved larger masses in the struggle, the revisionists sought to present the current achievements of the socialist movement as evidence of the triumph of democracy They denied the sharpening of capitalist contradictions and tried to divert the proletariat from the maturing socialist revolution.

The only historical answer to imperialism, the final, decaying stage of capitalism, was a higher form of democracy socialism based on the political power of the working class in alliance with the masses of peasantry and urban poor But the revisionists refused to see that the preservation of democracy and its extension to a higher form depended on the development of the class struggle to its historical conclusion Europe was ready for socialism, and the development of capitalism was preparing a new period of wars and revolutions, and the only effect of opportunism in the Marxist movement was to disarm the workers ideologically and to prepare them for defeat when the inevitable crisis of capitalism actually arrived.

The first signal of this crisis was the 1905 Revolution in Russia. A few years later, democratic revolutions broke out in

Turkey, China and Persia. In 1914, the outbreak of the first World War was followed by the Socialist Revolution in Russia and the establishment of the first Workers' and Farmers' Republic The disintegration of the socialist movement by opportunism led to the defeat of the revolution in the West Only in Russia, because of the consistent struggle which the Bolsheviks had waged against opportunism, and their complete mastery of revolutionary Marxism which was further developed by Lenin, did the proletarian revolution triumph. It was in the profoundest sense the historical triumph of Marxism-Leninism This triumph revealed the world significance of Lenin's contribution to the development of Marxism "It may be said without fear of exaggeration that since the death of Engels the master theoretician Lenin, and after Lenin, Stalin and the other disciples of Lenin, have been the only Marxists who have advanced the Marxist theory and who have enriched it with new experience in the new conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat

"And just because Lenin and the Leninists have advanced the Marxist theory, Leninism is a further development of Marxism, it is Marxism in the new conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat, Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, Marxism of the epoch of the victory of Socialism on one-sixth of the earth's surface

"The Bolshevik Party could not have won in October 1917 if its foremost men had not mastered the theory of Marxism, if they had not learned to regard this theory as a guide to action, if they had not learned to advance the Marxist theory by enriching it with the new experience of the class struggle of the proletariat" [13]

5 The Bolshevik Revolution in Russia opened a new era in history The existence of the Soviet Union henceforth decisively influenced and affected the struggle for democracy in the world All those who upheld genuine democracy rallied around it, all others opposed it Bourgeois democracy could no longer represent itself as the highest realization of

democracy Its limitations and its class essence now stood out more glaringly than ever because of the existence of its contrast in the socialist democracy of the Soviet Union Indeed, bourgeois democracy had to reveal its true capitalist character in its attitude and behavior towards the proletarian democracy of Russia

The monopolist bourgeoisie, a thousandfold more powerful than the bourgeoisie which was terrified by the Paris Commune, was even more determined than its predecessors to keep the people from power To achieve this, it had to conspire against the existence of democracy even in its most limited and bourgeois form The growth of socialist power in Russia, despite imperialist intervention and intrigues, and the unprecedented economic crisis of 1929-33 which disorganized the entire capitalist world and brought it to the brink of disaster, terrified the imperialist bourgeoisie beyond all measure Fearful of its doom at the hands of the people, a doom which the consequences of imperialist rivalries made all the more inexorable, it sought refuge in open fascist, terrorist dictatorship and war The trial of the Nazi war criminals at Nuremburg towards the end of 1945 and the beginning of 1946 provided documentary evidence proving that the German capitalist class organized and financed fascism in Germany. The imperialists were determined to prevent the experience of 1917 to 1923 from ever again threatening their rule Even where the forms of bourgeois democracy were more or less preserved, as in England and the United States, the big capitalists helped to finance and encourage the rise of fascism in Germany, in order to prevent that country from going socialist and to prepare it as a spearhead for war against the Soviet Union

Meanwhile, there was a flourishing and development of genuine democracy only in the Soviet Union This was expressed in the Stalin constitution of 1936 which registered the achievement of full democracy in practice, guaranteeing the right to work, economic security, education and leisure,

and freedom from exploitation and national and racial inequality In contrast to the capitalist countries where these conditions for the realization of full democracy are absent, and where those democratic rights that do exist are essentially formal and only nominal for the masses, Soviet democracy actually assured the material and cultural elevation of the masses, the development of the individual and the dignity of man.

The growth of reaction and fascism after 1933 signalized the preparation of a new world war In 1936, fascism made its first test of strength in Spain By 1939, backed by the anti-Soviet policies of the representatives of monopoly capital, the Second World War broke out The defeat of fascist Germany, Italy and Japan together with their satellites by the Anglo-American-Soviet Coalition supported by the anti-fascist peoples of the world constituted a great historical triumph for democracy and progress It created the conditions for the completion of the bourgeois democratic revolution in those countries where feudal remnants had continued to dominate, and the complete elimination of monopoly capital, the chief source of reaction and fascism, in a whole number of countries in Europe But it did not destroy the power of monopoly capital in the biggest imperialist countries of the world, the United States and Great Britain

The leading role which the United States played in building up world reaction showed the great historical change which American democracy had undergone since the days of Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln Up to the end of the Civil War the American Republic had been the center of world democracy The development of industrial capitalism after the Civil War had prepared the ground for the rise of giant trusts and corporations which dominated the economic and political life of the country The working class and the lower middle classes of city and countryside met the intensified exploitation and domination by the big monopolists with mass struggles which, at the end of the last century, assumed the

form of an alliance of workers and poor farmers known as the Populist movement The people, however, were unable to prevent the bourgeoisie from taking the United States into the first imperialist World War, from which it emerged as the most powerful imperialist country on the globe But the economic crisis of 1929 laid the basis for the rise of new democratic strength of the masses Although they were unable to shake the power of monopoly capital, they were able, between 1932 and 1944, the period of Franklin D Roosevelt's presidency, to register important democratic gains, especially in the organization of labor, and to influence legislation and government policy. The end of the Second World War opened a new stage in the struggle for democracy in the United States, with monopoly capital tightening its grip on state power, the government and government policy, and initiating an offensive against labor and the people

The struggle to destroy the last remnants of fascism, to strengthen and build up the new democracies which arose out of the war against fascism, to open the path of freedom and democratic development to hundreds of millions of people in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, to save the world from new horrors of reaction and war, and to assure the peaceful development of socialism in the great Soviet Union—these are the stupendous tasks which history has placed before the present generation of humanity They are tasks which can only be solved in the struggle against monopoly capital, because it is monopoly capital which is the foe of democracy and progress And in this struggle, Marxism will ever be found in the forefront because it is the embodiment and expression of the progressive interests and consistently democratic aspirations of the masses of mankind.

REFERENCE NOTES

CHAPTER I

1 Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party* International Publishers, New York, p 10
2 F Engels, "The State of Germany" *Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe* (Henceforth referred to as *MEGA*) *Erste Abteilung, Band* 4, p 493
3. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Revolution in Spain* International Publishers, New York, 1939, pp 25-26
4 John Lothrop Motley, *Rise of the Dutch Republic* London, 1903 Vol III, p 582, also *MEGA*, I/7, p 136
5 K Marx, *Capital* Charles H Kerr, Chicago, 1921, Vol I, p 826
6 Marx, "The English Revolution" In *Selected Essays,* International Publishers, New York, 1926
7 Thomas B Macaulay, *Critical, Historical and Miscellaneous Essays,* New York, 1860, Vol I, p 233
8 Eduard Bernstein, *Kommunistische und demokratisch-sozialistische Stromungen wahrend der englischen Revolution des 17 Jahrhunderts,* Stuttgart, 1895
9. Cited by John Adams, *The Works of John Adams,* Boston, 1851, Vol IV, pp 421-431
10 *Ibid*
11 Henry Jones Ford, *The Rise and Growth of American Politics,* New York, 1900, p 27
12 Sir Thomas E May, *Democracy in Europe,* London, 1877, Vol II, pp 419-420
13 *Ibid*
14 George L Scherger, *The Evolution of Modern Liberty,* New York, 1904, pp 135-137
15 Eduard Bernstein, *op cit*
16 *Ibid*
17 H J Ford, *op cit*, p 28
18 Karl Marx, *Theorien uber den Mehrwert,* Stuttgart, 1905, I *Band,* p 19

CHAPTER II

1 Scherger, *op cit*, pp 142-143
2 Cited by H J Ford, *op cit*, pp 62-63
3 H J Ford, *op cit*, pp 17-18
For British influence on eighteenth century revolutionary thought see F Engels' "Reform Movement in France," *The Northern Star,* Dec 18, 1847, reprinted in *MEGA*, I/6, pp 366-367, also, Marx' "The English Revolution," *Selected Essays* International Publishers, New York, 1926

4 H J Ford, *op cit*, pp 62-63
5 *Ibid*, p 4
6 *Ibid*, p 10
7 *Ibid*, p 10
8 Philip Foner, *History of Labor in the United States* International Publishers, New York, 1946 Chapter 2
9 John S C Abbott, *George Washington*, New York, 1905, p 215
10 Abbott, *op cit*, p 216
11 Abbott, *op cit*, p 245
12 Abbott, *op cit*, p 239
13 Abbott, *op cit*, p 250
14 Foner, *op cit*, chapter 2
15 F Engels, *Anti-Duhring* International Publishers, New York, p 191.
16 Abbott, *op cit*, p 272
17 Foner, *op cit*
18 Evarts Boutell Greene, *The Revolutionary Generation 1763-1790*, New York, 1943, pp 328-329
19 H J Ford, *op cit*, p 59, also E B Greene, *op cit*, p 315
20 H J Ford, *op cit*, p 59
21 E B Greene, *op cit*, p 315
22. Cited in *Thomas Jefferson, Selections from his Writings* Edited with an Introduction by Philip S Foner, International Publishers, New York, 1943, p 19
23 *Diaries and Letters*, Vol I, p 141
24. Cited by A Aulard, *The French Revolution 1789-1804*, London, 1910, Vol I, pp 88-89
25. H J Ford, *op cit*, pp 61-63
26 *Ibid*
27 H J Ford, *op cit*, p 67
28 *Ibid*, pp 69-70
29 E B Greene, *op cit*, p 309
30 H J Ford, *op cit* pp 69-70
31 William E Dodd, "The Emergence of the First Social Order in the United States," *The American Historical Review*, Vol XL, No 2, January 1935, pp 217-231
32. *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States*, 4th Edition, Boston, 1873, Vol I, p 121, cited in Scherger, *op cit*, pp 166-167
33 Scherger, *op cit*, p 168
34. William Warren Sweet, *Revivalism in America*, New York, 1944, pp 22-23, 40-43
35 James Schouler, *Thomas Jefferson* New York, 1905, p 156
36 Foner, Introduction to *Thomas Jefferson, Selections from his Writings*, p 22
37 *Ibid*, p 23
38 Schouler, *op cit*, p 157.
39 *Ibid*, p 163
40 *Ibid*, p 165
41 Manning J Dauer, "The Political Economy of John Adams," *Political Science Quarterly*, Columbia University, Vol LVI, No 4, December 1941, pp 545-572

42 E P Link, *Democratic-Republican Societies, 1790-1800*, New York, 1942
43 Schouler, *op cit*, pp 177-178, 180

CHAPTER III

1 Van Wyck Brooks, *The World of Washington Irving*, Philadelphia, 1944, p 150, also Charles Sumner, *Prophetic Voices Concerning America*, 1874, pp 54, 62
2 Scherger, *op cit*, p 207 ff
3 Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p 808
4 Scherger, *op cit*, p 207 ff, also *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* Edited by H A Washington, New York, 1859, Vol V, p 69
5 Franklin's Letters, cited by A Aulard, *The French Revolution, A Political History 1789-1804*, London, 1910, Vol I, pp 112-115
6 A Aulard, *op cit*, Vol I, pp 118-126
7 Jean Jaures, *Histoire Socialiste de la Revolution Francaise*, Vol I, p 97 ff, also *Marxist Study Courses History of the Working Class The Great French Revolution*, International Publishers
8 *Marxist Study Courses op cit*, also Samuel Bernstein, "Babeuf and Babeuvism," *Science and Society*, Vol II, No. 1, 1937, pp 32-34
9 Cited in Max Beer, *Social Struggles and Thought 1750-1860*, International Publishers, New York, 1929, pp 55-56
10 *Marxist Study Courses op cit*
11. G Bourgin, *Babeuf et le Babouvism, Cahiers de la Revolution Francaise*, No 1, Faculté des Lettres, en Sorbonne, also Samuel Bernstein
12 Monroe to Edmund Randolph, Paris, April 14, 1795, *The Writings of James Monroe*, edited by S M Hamilton, Vol II, 1794-1796, New York, 1899, pp 248-249
13 Alfred Espinas, *La Philosophie sociale du XVIIIe Siècle et la Revolution*, Paris, 1898, pp 227-228
14 Monroe to Randolph, June 14, 1795, *op cit*, p 273
15 *Ibid*, pp 293-294
16 *Memoirs of the Administrations of Washington and John Adams, Edited from the Papers of Oliver Wolcott, Secretary of the Treasury*, by George Gibbs, 2 vols, Vol I, New York, 1846, pp 203, 213
17 *Ibid*, p 216
18 Monroe, *op cit*, p 364
19 Espinas, *op cit*, pp 235-236
20 Monroe, *op cit*, p 365
21 Monroe, *op cit*, p 409
22 Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Die Heilige Familie, MEGA*, I/3, p 294
23. Samuel Bernstein, *op cit*, p 49
24. Ernest Belfort Bax, *The Last Episode of the French Revolution, being a History of Gracchus Babeuf and the Conspiracy of the Equals*, London, 1911, pp 67-68
25 Samuel Bernstein, *op cit*, p 51.
26 *Ibid*, p 53
27. *Ibid*, p 53
28. *Ibid*, p 54

29 *Ibid*, pp 54-55
30 *Ibid*, p 39
31 Samuel Bernstein, "Babeuf and Babeuvism," *Science and Society*, Vol. II, No 2, Spring 1938, p 175
32 Karl Marx, *MEGA*, I/4, pp 458-459
33 Karl Marx, "*Das Burgertum und die Kontrerevolution*," *MEGA*, I/7, pp 493-494

CHAPTER IV

1 From an anonymous German critic of the 1790's quoted by the *City Gazette* of Charleston, cited by Link, *op cit*, pp 42-43
2 F Engels, "The State of Germany," October 25, 1845, *MEGA*, I/4, p 484-486
3 V I Lenin, "On the Junius Pamphlet," August 1916, English translation in *The Labour Monthly* (London), Vol 17, No 1, January 1935. p 50
4 F Engels, "*Die Lage Englands Das achtzehnte Jahrhundert*," August 31, 1844, *MEGA*, I/4, p 295, also *MEGA*, I/7, p 429
5 Thomas Jefferson to John Adams, August 10, 1815, *Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, edited by H A Washington, 9 vols, 1854, Vol VI, pp 490-491
6 Letter to Henry Innes, Esq, January 23, 1800, *op cit*, Vol IV, pp 315-316
7 Letter to Governor Langdon, March 5, 1810, *op cit*, Vol V, p 513
8 Letter to Thomas Lieper, January 1, 1814, *op cit*, Vol VI, p 284
9 *Ibid*, p 283
10 Letter to John Adams, July 5, 1814, *op cit*, Vol VI, p 352
11 Letter to Benjamin Austin, Esq, February 9, 1816, *op cit*, Vol VI, pp 553-554
12. Letter to Mr Correa, June 28, 1815, *op cit*, Vol VI, p 480
13 Letter to Mr Lieper, June 12, 1815, *op cit*, Vol VI, pp 463-464
14 Letter to John Adams, February 25, 1823, *op cit*, Vol VII, p 275
15 "Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the French Revolution of 1789," *International Literature*, No 7, 1939, p 22
16 John Clark Ridpath, *United States, A History*, 1891, pp 392-393
17 William Graham Sumner, *Alexander Hamilton*, New York, 1905, pp 243-244
18 *Ibid*
19 Ridpath, *op cit*, p 412
20 Gouverneur Morris to Kingsberry, June 22, 1815, cited by Elizabeth Brook, "Federalist Jeremiahs," *American Historical Review*, Vol XLIII, No 1, October 1937, pp 74-78
21. *Life, Letters and Journals of George Ticknor*, Boston, 1876, Vol II, pp 12-14
22 F B Artz, *Reaction and Revolution 1814-1832*, New York, 1934, pp. 63-64
23. F Engels, "The State of Germany," Letter No. III to *The Northern Star*, April 4, 1846, *MEGA*, I/4, p 492
24 Anatole G Mazour, *The First Russian Revolution 1825 The Decembrist*

Movement, Its Origins, Development and Significance University of California Press, Berkeley, California, 1937

25 C W Crawley, *The Question of Greek Independence A Study of British Policy in the Near East,* 1821-1833 Cambridge University Press, London, 1930, p 47

26 Samuel G Howe, *An Historical Sketch of the Greek Revolution,* New York, 1828, pp 360-369

27 Crawley, *op cit*, p 47

28 Howe, *op cit*, pp 369-370

29 Correspondence to *The Northern Star,* January 8, 1848, *MEGA,* I/6, p 378

30 Parke Godwin, *A Biography of William Cullen Bryant,* 2 vols, New York, 1883, Vol I, p 260, also Eugene N Curtis, "American Opinion of the French Nineteenth Century Revolutions," *American Historical Review,* Vol XXIX, No 2, January 1924, pp 249-270

31 George Wilson Pierson, *Tocqueville and Beaumont in America,* New York, Oxford University Press, 1938, p 371

32 F Engels, *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific,* International Publishers

33 *The Life of Robert Owen* by himself With an Introduction by M Beer, New York, 1920, p 263

34 *Ibid*, p 213

35 F Engels, "The State of Germany," Letter III to *The Northern Star,* April 4, 1846, *MEGA,* I/4, pp 493-494

CHAPTER V

1 F B Artz, *op cit*, p 204

2 E Tarle, "*Der Lyoner Arbeiteraufstand,*" *Marx-Engels Archiv,* Vol II, Moscow, 1927, pp 100-101

3 *Ibid*

4 *MEGA,* I/4, pp 463-464

5 Louis Blanc, *History of Ten Years 1830-40, or France Under Louis Philippe,* translated by Walter K Kelly, in two volumes, Philadelphia, 1848, Vol II, pp 245 ff

6 *Ibid*

7 For the French aspect of this struggle see Louis Blanc, *op cit*, Vol II, p 315

8 Octave Festy, *Le Mouvement Ouvrier au Début de la Monarchie de Juillet* 1830-34, Paris, 1908, pp 3-5, for a popular account see Neil Stewart, *Blanqui,* London, 1939

9 F Engels, "Progress of Social Reform on the Continent," No 1—France, November 4, 1843, *MEGA,* I/2, p 439

10 *Ibid*

11 Neil Stewart, *op cit*, pp 39-42

12 Lewis Cass, *France, Its King, Court and Government,* New York, 1840, pp 35-36

13 *Die Heilige Familie, MEGA* I/3, p 308

14 Paul Louis, *Geschichte des Sozialismus in Frankreich,* Stuttgart, 1908, p 64-84

15 Edward Wakefield, *England and America,* London, 1833, p 44

16 Theodore Rothstein, *From Chartism to Labourism,* International Publishers, New York, 1929, pp 96-105
17 Hermann Schlueter, *Die Chartistenbewegung,* New York, 1916
18 *Ibid*
19 Rothstein, *op cit;* also *Life and Struggles of William Lovett,* New York, 1920, Vol I, pp 132-133, 136, 162, 170, 179-180, Vol II, p 328
20. Marx-Engels, *The German Ideology,* International Publishers, pp 122-123
21. Thomas Cooper, *Lectures on the Elements of Political Economy,* Second edition, 1831, Columbia, pp 364-365
22. *Ibid*
23. Mary Beard, *A Short History of the American Labor Movement,* New York, 1920, pp 36-37
24. Richard T Ely, *The Labor Movement in America,* New York, 1886, pp 42-43
25 Marx and Engels, *Neue Rheinische Revue,* London, Hamburg and New York, 1850, Review of the Month, p 145, also John R Commons *et al, History of Labor in the United States,* Vol I, pp 455-456
26 J D Richardson, *Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1907,* Washington, 1908, Vol II, p 590
27 Arthur M Schlesinger, Jr, *The Age of Jackson,* Boston, 1945, Chapters VII-IX
28 Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*
29 Ely, *op cit,* p 20
30 Ralph Waldo Emerson, "The Young American," a Lecture read before the Mercantile Library Association in Boston, February 7, 1844

CHAPTER VI

1 Friedrich Engels, "*Der Status quo in Deutschland,*" March 1847, *MEGA,* I/6, pp 236-237
2 Franz Mehring, *Deutsche Geschichte,* Berlin, 1910, pp 102-106
3 Friedrich Engels, "The Prussian Constitution," *The Northern Star,* March 6, 1847, *MEGA,* I/6, p 254
4 Franz Mehring, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie,* I Bd, Stuttgart, 1921, pp 79-85
5 Friedrich Engels, "The State of Germany," *The Northern Star,* April, 4, 1846, *MEGA,* I/4, pp 494-497
6 Friedrich Engels, "Germany and Switzerland," *The New Moral World,* Vol V, 3rd Series, November 18, 1843, *MEGA,* I/2, pp 443-449
7 Letters to Rosenkranz, April 1842, *Arnold Ruge's Briefwechsel und Tagebuchblatter aus den Jahren 1825-1880,* hrsg von Paul Nerrlich, I Bd, Berlin, 1886, p 271
See also Auguste Cornu, *Karl Marx, l'Homme et l'Oeuvre,* Paris, 1934, p 138 fn
8 Gustav Mayer, "*Die Anfange des politischen Radikalismus in Vormarzlichen Preussen,*" *Zeitschrift fur Politik, hrsg von Dr Richard Schmidt und Dr. Adolf Grabowsky, Bd* 6, Berlin, 1913, pp 1-113
9 *Ibid*
10. Friedrich Engels, "Germany and Switzerland," *The New Moral World,* November 18, 1843, *MEGA,* I/2, pp 443-449

11 Auguste Cornu, *Moses Hess et La Gauche Hegelienne*, Paris, 1934
12 Gustav Mayer, *Friedrich Engels in seiner Frühzeit, 1820 bis 1851*, Berlin, 1920, pp. 114-115
13 Auguste Cornu, *op cit*
14 Friedrich Engels, "Germany and Switzerland," *The New Moral World*, November 18, 1843, *MEGA*, I/2, pp 443-449
15 *Ibid*
16 Marx to Ruge, November 30, 1842, *MEGA*, I/1/2, pp 285-287
17. Gustav Mayer, "*Anfange des vormarzlichen Radikalismus*" pp 73 ff

CHAPTER VII

1 Karl Marx, Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Kerr & Co, Chicago, 1918 p 10
2 Auguste Cornu, *Karl Marx, l'Homme et l'Oeuvre*, Paris, 1934, pp 209-210
3 *MEGA*, I/1/2, p 308
4 Karl Marx, "A Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right," *Selected Essays*, translated by H J Stenning, International Publishers, New York, 1926, p 24 Actually, this article is Marx' "Introduction" to his "Critique of Hegel's Philosophy" The "Critique" itself is not included in the *Selected Essays*
5 Montesquieu, *De l'Esprit des Lois, Nouvelle ed*, Paris, 1868, p 3
6 Jean Jacques Rousseau, *Du Contrat Social*, Chapter VI
7 Marx to Engels, September 25, 1857, *MEGA*, III/2, pp 228-229
8 Karl Marx, "A Criticism of the Philosophy of Right," *op cit*, p 25
9 *Ibid*, p 30.
10 *Ibid*, p 26.
11 Karl Marx, "On the Jewish Question," *Selected Essays*, International Publishers, New York, 1926, p 58
12 *Ibid*, p 59
13 *Ibid*, pp 50-52.
14 *Ibid*, p 58
15 *Ibid*, pp 82, 84-85
16 Karl Marx, *Selected Essays*, International Publishers, New York, 1926, p 36
17 *Ibid*, p 39
18. Karl Marx, Preface to the *Critique of Political Economy*, Chicago, 1918, p 11
19. Friedrich Engels, "Karl Marx" Karl Marx, *Selected Works*, International Publishers, Vol I, pp 12-13
20 Friedrich Engels, "*Die Lage Englands. Carlyle's Past and Present*," *MEGA*, I/2, pp 429-430
21 *MEGA*, I/4, pp 333-334.
22. *Ibid*, p 335-348
23 *Ibid*, p 279
24 *Ibid*, pp 475-497
25 Friedrich Engels, "*Das Fest der Nationen in London*," November-December, 1845, *MEGA*, I/4, pp 457-471

CHAPTER VIII

1 F Engels, "*Die Lage Englands, Die englische Konstitution*," *Vorwarts*, September 18, 1844 *MEGA*, I/4, pp 312-313
2 *K Marx, Die Bourgeoisie und die Kontrerevolution*, December 16, 1848, *MEGA*, I/7, p 496
3 F Engels, "The Communists and Karl Heinzen," October 3, 1847, *MEGA*, I/6, pp 285-286
4 K Marx, "Moralizing Criticism and Critical Morality," *Selected Essays*, International Publishers, New York, 1926, pp 140-141
5 K Marx, "On the Jewish Question," *Selected Essays*, p 73
6 Engels to Bernstein, March 24, 1884, *Marx-Engels Selected Correspondence*, International Publishers, New York, 1935, p 435
7 Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism*, New York, 1944, p 228
8. Henry Safford King, *Echoes of the American Revolution in German Literature*, University of California Press, 1929, pp 68-73
See also Hans Kohn, *op cit*
9 William B Guthrie, *Socialism Before the French Revolution*, New York, 1907, pp 239-240
10. K Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, p 93
11 Marx-Engels, *Deutsche Ideologie, MEGA*, I/5, p 507
12 *Ibid* p 508
13 Engels to Conrad Schmidt, October 27, 1890, *Selected Correspondence*, p 483
14 K Schmuckle, "*Zur Geschichte der politischen Theorien*," *Marx-Engels Archiv*, 1927, Bd II, p 533
15 Guthrie, *op cit*, pp 245, 247
16 *Ibid*, p 246
17 *Ibid*, pp 245-246
18 K Marx, "On the Jewish Question," *op cit*, p 54
19 *Ibid*
20 James P Lichtenberger, *Development of Social Theory*, New York, 1923, p 197
21 *Ibid*, p 198
22 *Ibid*, p 200
23 Jeremy Bentham, *On the Liberty of the Press and Public Discussion*, London, 1821, Letter II, p 23
24 A Landy, "The Right of Revolution—An American Revolutionary Tradition," *The Communist*, 1929, pp 360-368
25 Arthur C Cole, "The South and the Right of Secession in the Early Fifties," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, December 1914, pp 376-399
26. *The Correspondence of John Lothrop Motley*, edited by George William Curtis, Vol. I, New York, 1889, p 372
27. J L Motley, "The Causes of the American Civil War," A Letter to the London *Times*, New York, 1861, pp 13-15
28 Ralph Waldo Emerson, *English Traits, Harvard Classics*, New York, 1909, Vol V, p 355
29 Edward Everett, *The Great Issues Now Before the Country*, New York, 1861, p 24
30 *The Speeches of Wendell Phillips*, Vol I, Boston, 1864, p 410

31. Engels to Bebel, November 18, 1884, in *Marx-Engels Selected Correspondence,* p 427
32 Engels to Bernstein, May 22, 1886, *Die Briefe von Friedrich Engels an Eduard Bernstein,* Berlin, 1925, pp 179-180
33. F Engels, "Introduction to *The Class Struggles in France,*" Karl Marx, *Selected Works,* Vol II, p 188
34 Marx-Engels, *Briefe an A Bebel, W Liebknecht, K Kautsky und andere, Moscow,* 1933, pp 516-517
35 A M Schlesinger, *New Viewpoints in American History,* New York, 1926, p 48
36 Manning J Dauer, "The Political Economy of John Adams," in *Political Science Quarterly,* December 1941, pp 545-57
37 *Ibid*
38 Marx to Weydemeyer, March 5, 1852, *Marx-Engels Selected Correspondence,* p 57
39 K Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy,* Chas H Kerr, Chicago, p 129
40 Marx to Engels, March 5, 1869, *Marx-Engels Selected Correspondence,* p 259
41 Engels to Bebel, March 18-28, 1875, *Marx-Engels Selected Correspondence,* p 337
42 *Ibid*
43 Marx to Weydemeyer, March 5, 1852, *op cit*
44 F Engels, "The Program of the Blanquist Fugitives from the Paris Commune," *Der Volksstaat,* No 73, 1874, translated in *International Socialist Review,* Chicago, August 1908, p 100
45. K Marx, *The Civil War in France, Karl Marx, Selected Works,* Vol II, pp 446-466
46. V I Lenin, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination," V I Lenin, *Selected Works,* Vol V, p 268
47 K Marx, "Introduction to A Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right," *op cit,* pp 26-27
48 *Ibid,* pp 27, 39
49 K Marx, *Capital,* Vol III, Chas H Kerr, Chicago, 1909, pp 954-955
50 K Marx, *Theorien uber den Mehrwert,* II/1 David Ricardo, Berlin, 1923, pp 308-310
See also K Marx, *Capital,* Vol I, p 93 fn 1
51 K Marx, *Capital,* Vol III, pp 954-955

EPILOGUE

1 F Engels, "Introduction to the *Class Struggles in France,*" Karl Marx, *Selected Works,* Vol II, p 174
2 *Ibid,* p 173
3 V I Lenin, "Karl Marx," V I Lenin, *Selected Works,* Vol XI, p 40
4 F Engels, "Introduction to the *Class Struggles in France,*" *op cit,* Vol II, p 171-172
5 K Marx, *Capital,* Vol I, p 329
6. *Address to Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America,* December 23, 1864 See K Marx and F Engels, *The Civil War in the United States,* International Publishers, New York
7 Engels to Marx, November 15, 1862, *MEGA,* III/3, pp 108-110

8. Marx to Lassalle, April 28, 1862, *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Lassalle und Marx*, hrsg von Gustav Mayer, Berlin, 1922, p 388
9 *Address to Abraham Lincoln, op cit*
10 Engels, "Introduction to *The Civil War in France*," Karl Marx, *Selected Works*, Vol II p 448
11 Marx, *The Civil War in France, op. cit*, Vol. II, p. 504.
12. V I Lenin, "The Historical Destiny of the Teaching of Karl Marx," *Marx-Engels-Marxism*, International Publishers, New York, 1935, p 57.
13 *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (Bolsheviks), International Publishers, New York, 1939, p 358

INDEX

SUGGESTED READINGS

For the reader who may wish to extend and deepen his study of Marxism and democracy, we suggest the following additional readings, which deal either in whole or in part with this subject.

I HISTORY

1 General

Anna Rochester, *The Nature of Capitalism*
Frederick Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*

2 The United States

Herbert M Morais, *The Struggle for American Freedom The First Two Hundred Years*
Francis Franklin, *The Rise of the American Nation*
Jack Hardy, *The First American Revolution*
Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Civil War in the United States*
Philip S Foner, *History of the American Labor Movement*

3 England

Frederick Engels, *Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844*
Jurgen Kuczynski, *Labor Conditions in Great Britain 1750 to the Present*
T A Jackson, *Trials of British Freedom*
E Rickward and J Lindsay, Editors, *A Handbook of Freedom*

4. France

Karl Marx, *The Class Struggles in France, 1848-1850*
Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*
Karl Marx, *The Civil War in France*
Karl Marx, *Letters to Kugelmann*
Diderot Interpreter of Nature, edited with an introduction by Jonathan Kemp
Georges Jacques Danton Speeches
Jean Paul Marat Speeches
Maximilien Robespierre Speeches

5. GERMANY

Gerhart Eisler, Albert Norden, and Albert Schreiner, *The Lesson of Germany: A Guide to Her History*
Georgi Dimitroff, *Letters from Prison*
Frederick Engels, *Germany Revolution and Counter-Revolution*
Frederick Engels, *The Peasant War in Germany*

6. THE SOVIET UNION

Joseph Stalin and others, *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*
Joseph Stalin, *The October Revolution*

7. SPAIN

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Revolution in Spain*

II THEORY

V I Lenin, *Selected Works*, 12 volumes
Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, 2 vols
Karl Marx, *Capital*, Volume I
Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Selected Correspondence*
Frederick Engels, *Herr Duhring's Revolution in Science (Anti-Duhring)*
Frederick Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*
Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The German Ideology*
Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question*
Joseph Stalin, *Selected Writings*
Georgi Dimitroff, *The United Front*
Karl Marx, *Critique of Gotha Programme*
Karl Marx, *Founding of the First International*
Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*
Frederick Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach and the Outcome of Classical German Philosophy*
Frederick Engels, *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*
V I Lenin, *Marx-Engels-Marxism*
V I Lenin, *The State and Revolution*
V I Lenin, *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*

All titles listed above are publications of International Publishers