

THE MAKING OF THE MANIFESTO

Rob Beamish

INTRODUCTION

The anonymous, 23 page, Manifest *der Kommunistischen Partei* was rushed off the presses in London in the latter part of February 1848 by the central committee of the Communist League but still arrived in Berlin, Cologne, Königsberg and other parts of Prussia too late to play a major role in the revolutionary activities unfolding later the next month.' Nevertheless, compact, cogent, and compelling in its imagery and rhetoric, the Communist *Manifesto* (as its title became after the 1872 Leipzig edition), was destined to be the founding document of a longer-term revolution whose ultimate fate is, contrary to today's right-wing orthodoxy, by no means resolved.

Surprisingly, Marx's and Engels' published accounts of the Manifesto tend to obscure what they achieved in the pamphlet, above all because they ignore the important controversies and conflicts that led up to it. Thus, for example, in the preface to the 1872 German edition, Marx and Engels presented the contentious and, at times, confrontational history leading up to the writing of the *Manifesto* in the following manner.

The Communist League, an international association of workers, which could of course be only a secret one, under the conditions obtaining at the time, commissioned us, the undersigned, at the Congress held in London in November, 1847, to write for publication a detailed theoretical and practical programme of the Party. Such was the origin of the following *Manifesto*, the manuscript of which travelled to London to be printed a few weeks before the February Revolution.²

While Marx's recollection included in *Herr Vogt*, and Engels' longer 1885 account, are more informative, they too are still silent on a number of important issues related to the history of the Communist League and, more important, the historical, political, and intellectual context within which the *Manifesto* was developed and written.³ In the Preface to the 1888 edition (which echoes his preface statement to the

1883 edition), Engels wrote the following:

The Manifesto being our joint production, I consider myself bound to state that the **fundamental** proposition which forms its nucleus belongs to Marx. That proposition is: That in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organisation necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolutions in which, nowadays, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class – the proletariat – cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and **ruling** class – the bourgeoisie – without, at the same time, and once and for all emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinction and class struggles.'

To a certain extent Engels' statement is true (although it tends somewhat to exaggerate the role that he himself played in actually writing the Manifesto), but it presents at least two problems. First, Engels' statement reflects Marx's 1859 Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* more than it does the text of the Manifesto, although there are certainly phrases and sections of the *Manifesto* that sound strikingly like the Preface (both highly compressed texts).

Second, and more important, it directs the reader's attention to selected themes and issues in the *Manifesto* while ignoring others. The Manifesto is one of the high-water points in Marx's life because four crucial currents converged in its production: (a) it was written on the basis of a fundamental resolution to the major epistemological and theoretical issues Marx had been struggling with since 1836; (b) it represents the victory of Marx's intellectual vision in the political arena – his triumph as the intellectual and inspirational leader of the Communist League (and hence also of his critique of other forms of socialism – Part III of the Manifesto); (c) Marx's astute use of rhetoric and imagery enhances the important subjective side of Marx's revolutionary perspective (class **struggle** involves class consciousness and the Manifesto was to provide workers with 'a deeper, conscious understanding of their reality, of their role in history, and to inspire them to take appropriate action given Marx's analysis of the situation); (d) Marx's relationship with Engels – Marx owed a major debt to Engels in reaching the intellectual stage he was at when he wrote the Manifesto, but there were also differences and the relationship between

the *Manifesto* and Engels' earlier 'Basic Principles of Communism' needs to be better understood than it has tended to be in the past.

Fortunately, by turning to Marx's and Engels' correspondence, their writing projects from 1841 through to February 1848, and some later scholarly work, we can construct a more illuminating account that not only shows the theoretical, political, and strategic debates, conflicts and, eventually, animosities out of which the *Manifesto* emerged, but also permits one to appreciate the full extent to which the form and content of the *Manifesto* are the result of intense intellectual and political battles fought by Marx, Engels, and their supporters as they tried to direct and lead the fledgling communist movement of the 1840s. The *Manifesto* was ultimately a collective effort of people who were trying to understand the prevailing social conditions so they could change them; to see this more precisely allows us to demystify and 'de-reify' it as a source of eternal truths, and return it to its proper place in the annals of the struggle for socialism as one of many documents – a key one to be sure – constructed within, and thus influenced by, a particular set of historical circumstances.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

It was France, in general, and Paris in particular from which communist and socialist ideas were transmitted into Germany⁵ In addition, because industrial workers constituted only a small portion of the population – and, as ex-artisans, they tended to long more for a nostalgic past than a socialist or communist future – the critique of capitalist social relations appealed more to members of the intellectual elite in Germany than to the industrial workers.⁶ As a result, the spread of ideas tended to take place through written exchanges in books, periodicals, newspapers, and circulars, and debate within associations and discussion groups, rather than emanating from the shop floor.⁷

For these reasons, it is not surprising that the *Manifesto* was commissioned and produced by an association – the Communist League – that had descended from the 'League of the Outlawed (*Bund der Geächteten*),' comprised mainly of German artisans who had settled in Paris following an abortive uprising in Frankfurt in 1833.⁸ Inside the conspiratorial atmosphere existing in Paris during the late 1830s, a group with a more proletarian orientation broke away from the League of the Outlawed in 1836 to form the 'League of the Just (*Bund der Gerechten*)' which sought to 'free Germany from the yoke of abhorrent oppression, end the enslavement of humanity, and realize the funda-

mental rights of **man**.⁹ Although the new League's members shared certain basic ideas, **they** embraced a wide variety of socialist or communist beliefs and positions – Moses Hess, **Wilhelm** Weitling, Charles Fourier, Joseph-Pierre Proudhon, Auguste Blanqui, Etienne Cabet, Robert Owen, Ludwig Feuerbach, and the **Left-Hegelians** all had their adherents and advocates – and there was considerable debate, tension and confrontation among members as the League tried to work out a unified outlook and **programme**.¹⁰ In 1838, for example, the League commissioned Weitling's *Mankind As It Is and As It Ought To Be*, which served as the League's first coherent theoretical statement and acted in the early years as a programme and a confession of faith, more or less as a "Communist Manifesto".¹¹ But the influence of the French communists such as Blanqui and his *Société des Saisons* (1837–39) also exerted a strong, competing influence, while the French Utopian Socialists also continued to press their position. In the aftermath of a failed Blanquist uprising on May 12, 1839, many of the League's members were expelled from France – mostly to London – and any gains that had been made in the development of a uniform outlook were brought to a temporary close.

Arriving in London, the majority of those who had belonged to the League of the Just in Paris now joined, along with numerous other German workers and artisans, the 'German Workers' Educational Society,' founded on February 7, 1840, while simultaneously reconstituting the League inside the Society in a semi-clandestine fashion. Carl Schapper, **Heinrich** Bauer, and Joseph Moll assumed the leadership of this 'London branch' of the League, with Schapper looking after organization in London, Moll renewing contacts with members in France, and Bauer establishing contacts with the Swiss members who had coalesced around the leadership of **Weitling**. The next few years were marked by intense debates over the Fourier-inspired ideas of Cabet, and the adoption and later rejection of Weitling's and Hermann **Kriege's** beliefs that 'the greatest deeds are accomplished by the emotions that move the masses.' Equally significant were growing contacts with British trade unions, the Owenites, and the Chartists.

Within the British left at that time there were two movements of particular note. One was the general appeal of the 'London Working Men's Association' for increased international solidarity, which led William Lovett to found 'The Democratic Friends of all Nations' under the **slogan** 'All Men are Brethren.' But while Lovett was trying to draw the workers together through an appeal for international harmony, George Julian Harney, secretary to the republican and

worker-oriented 'Democratic Association,' established a more radical group in 1846 - 'The Fraternal Democrats' - which called 'to all oppressed classes of every land . . . to unite themselves for the triumph of their common cause.' "'Divide and rule" is the motto of the oppressor,' Harney's group proclaimed; "'Unite yourselves for victory" should be **ours**.'¹² Harney's Fraternal Democrats brought the **left** wing of the Chartists together with the revolutionary-oriented emigres from the continent (including the League of the Just) although it remained a very loose association of like-minded individuals and did not consolidate itself into a formal group.

In view of its increased contact with Harney's and Lovett's groups, the German Workers' Educational Society also adopted the slogan '*Alle Menschen sind Brüder*' and placed central importance on the **goal** of emancipating the international **proletariat**.¹³ Equally important, thanks to the increasingly international orientation of the German Workers' Educational Society, the Central Committee of the London-based branch of the League of the Just, operative within the Society, was able to eclipse the importance of the groups in Paris, Switzerland, and Germany and assume the main leadership role for the League as a whole.

Thus, between 1834 and 1846, the German communist movement had consolidated itself as an international **organization**, with its leadership in London, acting through the openly constituted German Educational Worker's Association and the smaller, semi-clandestine and more radical, League of the Just, and in association with the Democratic Friends of all Nations and Fraternal Democrats. Although the movement had originally been strongly influenced by the French revolutionary perspectives advocated by Blanqui and Barbès, as well as the imagery of Weitling, this had been tempered by contact with the British trade unions, the Owenites and the Chartists. By 1846, while the movement was still in search of a unified political and theoretical position on which it could base its activities, it had made great strides in consolidating itself and making common cause with the rest of the international **proletariat**.¹⁴ It was at this point that the movement actively sought **Marx's** inclusion in its membership.

MARX'S DEVELOPMENT FROM 1836-1846

If the League of the Just underwent significant changes from 1834 to 1846, they pale in comparison to the transformation that **Marx's** ideas underwent in the same **period**.¹⁵ Switching from the University of

Bonn to the University of Berlin in 1836, Marx took Eduard Gans' course in jurisprudence, which led him to seriously address Gans' liberal Hegelian world view and its implications. The result was the first major turn in Marx's intellectual life – an immersion in Hegel's philosophy and active involvement with the so-called Left-Hegelians, whose ideas were taken in a historical-materialist direction by Ludwig Feuerbach in *The Essence of Christianity* (and then more fully in his *Provisional Theses for the Reform of Philosophy*), and in another direction by Bruno Bauer and other members of the 'Doctors' Club' who focused on the phenomenological development of self-consciousness – a direction which ultimately led to the 'true' socialism that Marx would reject and criticize vehemently in the mid-1840s.¹⁸

After receiving his doctoral degree from the University of Jena in April 1841, Marx worked with Bauer in Bonn to develop the *Atheistic Archives*, failed to get an anticipated university position, and was forced to return to Trier in December due to his father-in-law's grave illness.¹⁹ While in Trier, Marx began what would become a two-year association with Arnold Ruge when he submitted an article entitled 'Comments on the Latest Prussian Censorship Instruction' for publication in Ruge's *Deutsche Jahrbücher*.²⁰

In April 1842, Marx's intellectual orientation came to its second turning-point when he moved to Cologne and became involved with the city's liberal opposition movement and the *Rheinische Zeitung*. As the newspaper's editor, Marx found himself '... in the embarrassing position of having to discuss what is known as material interests' as well as being occupied 'with economic questions.'²¹ In addition, as his journalistic involvement with concrete issues grew, Marx became increasingly disenchanted with the Left-Hegelians' abstract ruminations about communism and atheism and formally broke from them in his article 'Henvegh's and Ruge's Relation to "The Free"'.²² Before the year was over Marx also found himself dealing with the 'echo of French socialism and communism, slightly tinged by philosophy' expressed by some contributors to the paper, forcing him to read, among other writings, Proudhon's *Qu'est ce que la propriété?*, Théodore Dézamy's *Calomnies et politique de M. Cabet*, as well as Pierre Leroux and Considérant in his effort to thoroughly assess the communists' position.²³

By the end of 1842, the Prussian government had become increasingly apprehensive about the *Rheinische Zeitung* and, on January 21, 1843, scheduled the paper's closure for March 31 although Marx, ready to start up a new project with Ruge – the *Deutsch-Französische*

THE SOCIALIST REGISTER 1998

Jahrbücher – resigned as editor on March 18.²² Three further developments in Marx's life now followed closely upon one another. First, convinced that Germany would not permit the freedom of expression he required, Marx moved to Paris, where he came to know most of the leaders in the French workers' movement, established contact with the Paris branch of the League of the Just, immersed himself in the French socialists' and communists' animated debates, and, most important, saw at first hand the living and working conditions of the German immigrant workers in Paris as well as the spirit of solidarity that characterised their associations and meetings.²³

Second, in early March 1843, Marx read Feuerbach's newly published 'Provisional Theses on the Reform of Philosophy' and found in them a key to the genuine transcendence of Hegel's philosophy. Between March and August 1843, Marx used Feuerbach's work as his departure point for a thoroughgoing critique of paragraphs 261–313 of Hegel's *Philosophy of Right*.²⁴ Third, his work with Ruge on the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* brought him into contact with theoretical work – Engels' *Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy*, and Hess's work on the essence of money – that would lead him to draw together the insights he had derived from Feuerbach's critique of Hegelian philosophy, the material experiences of the French working class, and the material-economic questions he had first confronted at the *Rheinische Zeitung*.²⁵

In the 'Introduction,' to his 'Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right,' Marx adopted the language of class struggle and identified the proletariat as the key agent in the creation of significant social change.²⁶ 'Where then,' Marx wrote in a text that was still aimed at a progressive, educated, philosophically-oriented German readership, 'is the positive possibility of a German emancipation?'

Answer: In the formation [*Bildung*] of a class with radical chains, a class of bourgeois society which is no class of bourgeois society, an estate which is the dissolution of all estates, a sphere which possesses a universal character by its universal suffering and claims no particular right because no particular wrong but wrong generally is perpetrated against it; which can no longer invoke an historical but only a human title; which does not stand in any one-sided opposition [*Gegensatz*] to the consequences but in an all-round opposition to the premises of the essence of the German state [*Staatswesens*]; a sphere, finally, which cannot emancipate itself without emancipating itself from all other spheres of society thereby emancipating all the other spheres of society, which, in a word, is the total sacrifice [*völlig Verlust*] of mankind, thus which can gain for itself only through the full recovery of mankind. This dissolution of society as a particular estate is the proletariat.²⁷

Having reached this preliminary level of synthesis and **identifying** the crucial role of the **proletariat** in the project of human emancipation, Marx immersed himself in the study of political **economy**.²⁸ Between April and August 1844, he assembled a draft of the results of that work – the so-called Paris Manuscripts – including a preface which indicated the scope of the undertaking he envisaged. In a plan formulated in similar terms in 1858, Marx proposed to move from his critique of political economy to produce separate critiques of the state, law, ethics, and civil life as well as a concluding pamphlet that would show their interconnection to political **economy**.²⁹

While the Paris Manuscripts are a rich source of insight into **Marx's** ideas and their development, what is most significant in this particular context is the degree to which Marx, in a very short period of time, determined that a critical understanding of the political economy of capitalist society was vitally important for the prospects of socialism. Indeed, by February 1, 1845, Marx was so confident about the importance of his Feuerbachian-Hegelian inspired critique of political economy and his ability to produce it that he signed a contract with Carl F. J. Leske to publish a two volume study – *Kritik der Politik und National-Ökonomie*.³⁰

Two further events of note must be added to this picture of **Marx's** intellectual development at this time. First, although Marx and **Engels** had had a rather cool encounter in November 1842, when they met again in Paris between August 28 and September 6, 1844, they found themselves in full agreement on a host of issues and positions.³¹ Second, on January 25, 1845, Marx was expelled from Paris and moved to Brussels. Not long after arriving in Brussels, stimulated perhaps by Max Stirner's *Ego and His Own* (in which Marx and **Engels** are portrayed as communist disciples of Feuerbach), perhaps by word of Bauer's forthcoming reply to the *Holy Family* – 'Characteristics of Ludwig Feuerbach' – and certainly by his own continued reflections on how to best present his critique of political economy to the public, Marx returned to a critical reflection upon Feuerbach's materialism. In March 1845, just before **Engels** also arrived in Brussels, Marx drafted his eleven 'Theses on Feuerbach' which served as the basis for the full elaboration of their emerging historical and materialist position which Marx and **Engels** spent from September 1845 to April 1846 developing into a two volume study, *The German Ideology*.³²

MARX AND THE LEAGUE OF THE JUST

Marx's arrival in Brussels placed him in the centre of a strong socialist community – Moses Hess and Engels were his neighbours, while Hermann Kriege (a disciple of Weitling), Wilhelm Wolff, George Weerth and other socialists lived nearby. Electing to take advantage of the city's location in the middle of the Paris-London-Colognetriangle, its free atmosphere, and the presence of so many socialists with European contacts, Marx, Engels and a close friend, Philippe Gigot, founded a 'Communist Correspondence Committee' which would put European communists in touch with one another.³³ While encountering some difficulty at the outset, Correspondence Committees were established in several European centres and began to exchange circulars. It was in this way that Marx, in the spring of 1846, first established contact with Schapper, Moll, and Bauer and the League of the Just in London.³⁴

The relationship did not begin smoothly, however. At a March 1846 meeting of the Brussels Committee, Marx, in the presence of Weitling, launched into a stinging critique of the latter's 'Craft Workers' Communism' and of the German 'true socialists.' According to Paul Annenkov, '[Marx's] sarcastic speech boiled down to this:'

to rouse the population without giving them any firm, well-thought-out reasons for their activity would be simply to deceive them. . . . To call to the workers without any strictly scientific ideas or constructive doctrine, especially in Germany, was equivalent to vain dishonest play at preaching which assumes an inspired prophet on the one side and on the other only gaping asses.³⁵

In a similar fashion, Marx and the Brussels Correspondence Committee prepared and distributed a lithograph circular that denounced the communism of his socialist neighbour Kriege and his planned Phalanstery in America.³⁶

On June 6, 1846, in response to a letter in which Marx had invited the League of the Just to establish a Communist Correspondence Committee in London, he received a reply praising the idea of enhancing communication among communists and also indicating that, like Marx, the London communists had rejected ideas of revolution through conspiracy or, 'à la Weitling,' through spiritual inspiration. On the other hand, the Londoners felt that Marx's vehement denunciations of both Weitling and Kriege were counter-productive; the goal of the League of the Just and the London Correspondence Committee, which they would found, was to encourage and facilitate the exchange of ideas, not destroy it.³⁷

Eleven days later **Schapper**, Moll and Bauer wrote to Mam giving more details of their association and indicating where there was, and where there might not be, agreement with him. But the crux of their letter was the following:

We believe that all these different orientations [to communism articulated above] must be expressed and that only through a communist congress, where all the orientations are represented in a cold-blooded and brotherly discussion, can unity be brought to our propaganda. . . . If people from all the communist positions were sent, if intellectuals and workers from all lands met together, then there is no doubt that a lot of barriers, which still stand in the way, would fall. In this congress all of the different orientations and types of communism would be discussed peacefully and without bitterness and the truth would certainly come through and win the day.³⁸

A letter from Harney to Marx three days later indicated that the Brussels Committee's correspondence with the London Committee had clarified the major misunderstandings that had existed and that they '[had] received the adhesion of the London friends:' Harney then added, 'of course after this I cannot hesitate to afford you every assistance in my power.'" Toward the end of January 1847 the tie was strengthened when Moll went to Brussels on behalf of the League of the Just to encourage Marx to join the **League**.⁴⁰ Mam was attracted to the idea that he could play a **significant** role in a workers' organization but he made his membership conditional upon the removal from the League's statutes of anything that encouraged a 'superstitious attitude' to authority, and on the League's commitment to publishing a manifesto of its position. Moll **agreed** with the principles behind **Marx's** conditions, although he noted that there could be some resistance to **Marx's** ideas within the **League** and it would be his task to convince members at the congress to adopt **them**.⁴¹

Transforming the League of the Just into a more formal association which would advance the interests of the international workers' movement was the logical outcome of the League's activities from its inception. That final step began when the League convened its first international congress in London from June 2nd to 9th, 1847. **Engels** attended as the representative of the Paris Communist Correspondence Committee and Wilhelm Wolff, in view of **Marx's** financial problems, represented the Brussels Committee.

Until **Andréas's** 1968 discovery of several key documents, it was thought that this first congress had accomplished little more than a name change to the Communist League, the adoption of the new

slogan '*Proletarier aller Lander vereinigt Euch!* (Workers of all Countries, Unite!)' and agreement that the London Committee would draft a new programme and set of rules after the congress.⁴² But we now know from the League's first two circulars and their associated documents that drafts for a new set of rules and a programme statement – in the form of a 'Communist Confession of Faith (*Glaubensbekenntnis*)' – were completed before the congress ended.⁴³ These were then circulated for consideration so that they could be revised and adopted at a second congress scheduled for November 29, 1847.

Before these documents became available, most discussions of the history of the Manifesto had used Engels' November 23–24 1847 letter to Marx in Brussels for insight into the drafting of the text. This has meant that certain differences and tensions still existing in the League were overlooked, thereby diminishing Engels' and Marx's accomplishments in shaping the League's orientation, minimizing Marx's achievement in receiving the task of writing the Manifesto and underestimating the leadership role he assumed in the Communist League on the eve of the 1848 Revolution.

Just prior to the second congress of the Communist League (on 23/24 November), Engels sent Marx the following from Paris.

Give a little thought to the Confession of Faith [*Glaubensbekenntnis*]. I think we would do best to abandon the catechetical form and call the thing Communist *Manifesto*. Since a certain amount of history has to be narrated in it, the form hitherto adopted is quite unsuitable. I shall be bringing with me the one from here, which I did; it is in simple narrative form, but wretchedly worded, in a tearing hurry.⁴⁴

Earlier accounts have confused 'the Confession of Faith' with Engels' October 1847 'Basic Principles of Communism (*Grundsätze des Kommunismus*),' which is a different document – the one put together 'in a tearing hurry' that he was taking with him to the second congress.⁴⁵ The distinction is important for several reasons. First, by reading the original June 1847 'Confession of Faith,' one can see how successful Engels had already been in influencing the content of the League's programme statement, while also recognizing that he had not been totally successful in shaping some of its key aspects.⁴⁶ Second, a lot was at stake since the League's request that the various communities and circles should debate and propose revisions to the 'Confession of Faith' was not an idle suggestion, nor was it treated that way.⁴⁷ Prior to Engels' return to Paris in mid-October Moses Hess, in particular,

drafted and submitted for authorization to the Paris circle a significantly revised 'Confession' which was undoubtedly much more consistent with his Utopian-infused vision of communism than the materialist position Engels had advocated at the first congress.⁴⁸ One can appreciate that Engels' desire to discard the catechetical form and change the name to something that would be more easily identified with his and Marx's position, rather than Hess's and the Fourierist positions within the League, was a matter of the most basic principles that would guide the League.⁴⁹ This last point is worth following a bit further.

In 1844, Hess had published in the Paris *Vorwärts* a 'Communist Confession in Questions and Answers [*Kommunistisches Bekenntnis in Fragen und Antworten*].'⁵⁰ While the draft 'Communist Confession of Faith' of June 1847 does not directly duplicate Hess's 'Confession,' there is little doubt that Hess's document played a central role in the drafting of the 1847 'Confession of Faith.' For example, the answer to one of the 1847 draft's most important questions – 'What is the aim of the communists?' – is completely consistent with that of Hess and other Utopian Socialists and quite far removed from the position of Marx and Engels. The answer – '[t]o organize society in such a way that each of its members can develop and utilize all his potentialities and powers in full freedom without jeopardizing the foundations of this society' – directly captures the essence of the main theme in Hess's 'Confession' – especially questions 20 to 40.⁵¹ By constituting the answer to this key question, Hess's 'Confession' – which was Fourierist in tone and claimed that the loss of freedom and the separation of humankind from its natural capacities through the presence of a cash-based social system (recalling Hess's 'Essence of Money') was the central problem of existing social arrangements – strategically influenced the rest of the agenda in the League's initial programme statement.

As a result of the influence of Hess's document, the goal of the communists in the 1847 draft 'Confession' was the abolition of private property, 'replacing it by the community of goods.'⁵² But while Hess's 'Confession' appears to have played a dominant influence in the 1847 draft 'Confession,' its domination was tempered by Engels' successes. For example, Hess's document includes questions and answers about marriage. These may initially appear to be a rather unconventional inclusion in a draft programme until one remembers the centrality of sexual relationships in many of Fourier's utopian-socialist writings. The theme was included in the June 1847 'Confession,' as well as the

later Manifesto, probably because of the influence of Hess's 'Confession' but also because the goals of socialism had been, in the minds of many, closely associated with Fourier's writings and thus with the idea of the creation of a 'community of women.'

Hess's argument in his 'Confession' followed Fourier – it is the existing property relations that prevent men and women from expressing their sexual relationships naturally; real marriage will only exist when genuine freedom exists in all social relationships. But the implications of this theme as it was tied to the 'community of goods' by Hess, was not consistent with the values and vision of the membership of the Communist League – quite the **opposite**.³³ As a result, in response to the question, 'Will the community of women not be proclaimed at the same time as the community of goods?' the 1847 draft 'Confession' noted, 'Not at all.' 'We shall interfere with the private relationship between husband and wife, and the family in general, only in so far as the new order of society would be hampered by the preservation of the existing **forms**.'³⁴ And while there does not appear to be a copy of Hess's proposed revisions to the 'Confession,' one can be sure that he would have wanted to reduce or eliminate the discussion of the proletariat and replace it with a statement about humankind's natural powers and their expression through freedom of action; one can also understand how such revisions would have moved **Engels** to decide that some significant changes were needed to the 1847 draft '**Confession**.'³⁵

Upon his return to Paris **Engels** outmanoeuvred Hess by going through Hess's draft in detail. One can imagine the response from an audience of workers as the committed materialist **Engels**, went through Hess's proposal. 'I dealt with this point by point,' **Engels** wrote to Mam,

and was not yet half way through when the lads declared themselves *satisfaits*. *Completely unopposed, I got them to entrust me with the task of drafting a new one [i.e. Engels' 'Basic Principles of Communism'] which would be discussed next Friday by the district and will be sent to London behind the backs of the communities [Engels' emphases].*³⁶

At about the same time **Engels** had been battling with Hess the Central Authority of the Brussels' Circle received a letter from the League's Central Committee in London emphasizing how important it was for Marx to attend the next congress.³⁷ On November 27, therefore, Marx began his journey to London via Ostend, where he met **Engels** and the Belgian communist Victor Tedesco, to take an active role in the second

ROB BEAMISH

Congress of the Communist League.³⁸

PRODUCING THE MANIFESTO

During the second congress – November 29 to December 10, 1847 – one can be certain that the League's new rules and the content of its programme statement were thoroughly debated. Marx's and Engels' success in carrying the congress is clearly evident in the League's newly-stated aim. The June draft 'Rules of the Communist League' had declared that 'the League aims at the emancipation of humanity by spreading the theory of the community of property and its speediest possible practical introduction.' The Rules adopted at the end of November show a fundamentally revised aim: 'The aim of the League is the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the rule of the proletariat, the abolition of the old bourgeois society which rests on the antagonism of classes, and the foundation of a new society without classes and without private property.'³⁹ But although agreement had been reached, there was not enough time for the League to prepare a final version of its programme statement. This task was assigned to Marx.

Marx arrived back in Brussels by mid-December but did not turn his attention immediately to drafting the *Manifesto*. Instead, he spent the rest of the month delivering lectures on wage-labour to the German Workers' Educational Association.⁴⁰ Engels arrived in Brussels on December 17 but was in Paris four days later – where he stayed until the end of January – leaving Marx to write the *Manifesto* alone.⁴¹

On January 26, 1848, the following communication from Schapper, Bauer and Moll – 'In the name of and by order of the Central Committee' – arrived in Brussels.

The Central Committee charges its regional committee in Brussels to communicate with Citizen Marx, and to tell him that if the Manifesto of the Communist Party, the writing of which he undertook to do at the recent congress, does not reach London by February 1st of the current year, further measures will have to be taken against him. In the event of Citizen Marx not fulfilling his task, the Central Committee requests the immediate return of the documents placed at Citizen Marx's disposal.'

Marx, exercising his significant talents of synthesis, polemic, and rhetoric, pressed forward with his draft of the text. The *Manifesto*; opening salvo (which is improved rhetorically in the 1888 English translation) '*Ein Gespenst geht um in Europa – das Gespenst des Kommunismus*' was apparently derived from Wilhelm Schulz's article

on Communism contained in an 1846 *Statistik*.⁶⁴ Schulz wrote, '*Seit wenigen Jahren ist in Deutschland vom Kommunismus die Rede, und schon ist er zum drohenden Gespenst geworden, vor dem die Einen sich fürchten, und womit die Andern Furcht einzujagen suchen* (For a few years in Germany there is talk of Communism, and already it has become a threatening spectre for those who fear it and with which others seek to create fear).'⁶⁵ This set the stage for the Communist League's programme statement in a far more dramatic fashion than any of the earlier 'confessions of faith' had ever managed. It also allowed Marx to move directly into his first dominant theme – '[t]he history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggles' – and introduce the dramatic history that Engels had suggested and attempted to incorporate to a certain extent in his 'Basic Principles of Communism'. In Parts I and II of the pamphlet, as Andréas shows in considerable detail and Ryazanoff indicates in a different manner, Marx drew from ideas generally contained in his earlier writings although he relied particularly heavily upon their formulation in *The Poverty of Philosophy*, *The German Ideology*, *The Holy Family*, the notes to *Wage-Labour and Capital*, as well as Engels' texts 'The Status Quo in Germany,' *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, and 'The Basic Principles of Communism.'⁶⁶

Parts III and IV of the *Manifesto* indicate the extent to which the pamphlet was not simply a rallying cry for the workers of the world or a positive statement of the Communist League's position but also one that had emerged from a thorough debate about different socialist strategies and theories. Having established its position, the programme statement directly challenged those who might challenge its leadership of the international workers' movement. In these parts of the *Manifesto*, Marx drew upon the 'documents placed at Citizen Marx's disposal' by the Central Committee, being particularly careful to answer questions posed in a November 1846 circular, while also amplifying upon the critique of other schools and systems of socialism presented in a February 1847 circular, and in a September 1847 trial number of the *Communist Journal*.⁶⁶

The first edition of the *Manifesto* was an anonymous pamphlet of 23 pages that went through four printings; with the first printing serving as the basis for the text that appeared in serial form in the *Deutsche Londoner Zeitung* from March 3 to July 28, 1848.⁶⁷ The second edition was a 30-page anonymous pamphlet, most likely published in April or May 1848 and this, along with an 1866 edition, served as the basis for all future editions of the *Manifesto*. It is interesting to note that

ROB BEAMISH

although the preamble to the *Manifesto* stated that it would soon appear in English, French, German, Italian, Flemish and Danish, with the exception of a Swedish translation in 1849, no translation was published in 1848–49.⁶ Eventually published in more than 35 languages, in some 544 editions that appeared between 1848 and 1918 alone, and dispersed throughout the world, the *Manifesto* has carried the Communist League's message well beyond the wildest dreams of its most optimistic adherents.

CONCLUSION

What the inside story of the making of the *Communist Manifesto* shows is that while the document was drafted in its final form by Karl Marx, and the final credit for its organization and rhetorical style is due to him, the content and message of the *Manifesto* were really the product of an extended, intense, but open debate among committed communist-internationalists as they sought to define their programme and understand the world they wanted to change. Moreover, the *Manifesto* was a document that was produced within the context of a political struggle by people who were directly embroiled in it. It is not a canon of eternal truths; it is a product of open debate and a search for solutions to the major problems confronting the working class of 1847–48. The situation of the socialist movement today is not entirely different from the one it faced in 1847. Once again, it will not be by abstract analysis alone, but by the synthesis of theory with the thinking and practice of people engaged in efforts to enhance the world, that effective new orientations will be given to contemporary struggles.

NOTES

1. While the first printing of the *Manifesto* was completed in London by mid to late February 1848, it was not until March 20 that a thousand copies from London arrived in Paris and these did not systematically make their way into Germany for at least another 10 days; see *Karl Marx: Chronik seines Lebens in Einzeldaten*, compiled by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute Moscow, Berlin: Makol Verlag, n.d., pp. 48–49; *Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels: Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe* (hereafter *MEGA*), Pt. I, Vol. 6, edited by D. Ryazanoff and V. Adoratski, Berlin: Marx-Engels Verlag, p. 683.
2. *Communist Manifesto: Socialist Landmark*, an appreciation, together with the original text and prefaces, written for the Labour Party by Harold Laski, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1948, p. 101. See also the preface to the 1888 edition (*ibid!*, p. 112).

THE SOCIALIST REGISTER 1998

3. See, in particular, Karl Marx, *Herr Vogt*, in *Marx/Engels Collected Works* (hereafter *MECW*), Vol. 17, New York: International Publishers, pp. 78–81; Friedrich Engels, 'On the History of the Communist League,' *Karl Marx/Friedrich Enghel: Selected Works* (hereafter *MESW*), Vol. 2, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1970, pp. 173–83.
4. *Communist Manifesto: Socialist Landmark*, *op. cit.*, p. 116. See virtually the same paragraph in Engels' preface to the German edition of 1883 (p. 105).
5. Kägi (*Genesis des historischen Materialismus*, Vienna, 1965, p. 157ff), documents the high level of activity in Paris at the time making it the undisputed centre of socialist thought.
6. See David McLellan, *Karl Marx: His Life and Thought*, London: Macmillan Press, 1973, pp. 1–16; Wolfgang Monke, 'Introduction,' *Moses Hess Philosophische und sozialistische Schriften 1837–1850*, Vaduz/Liechtenstein: Topos Verlag, 1980, pp. xii–xvii; Ernst Schraepler, 'Der Bund der Gerechten: Seine Tätigkeit in London 1840–1847,' *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, II, 1962, p. 5.
7. As a result, three of the early, indigenous sources of German socialist thought that exercised significant influence were Moses Hess's *The Sacred History of Mankind* (1837), Wilhelm Weitling's *Mankind As It Is and As It Ought To Be* (1839), and Lorenz von Stein's *The Socialism and Communism of Present Day France* (1842).
8. The material presented in this section is largely drawn from E. Schraepler, 'Der Bund der Gerechten,' *op. cit.*. See also D. McLellan, *Karl Marx*, *op. cit.*; F. Bender, 'Introduction,' *The Communist Manifesto*, edited by F. Bender, New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1988, p. 10; Friedrich Engels, 'Zur Geschichte des Bundes der Kommunisten,' *Karl Marx/Friedrich Enghel Werke* (hereafter *MEW*, Vol. 21, edited by the Institute for Marxism-Leninism and the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party, Berlin: Dietz Verlag, p. 206.
9. See E. Schraepler, 'Der Bund der Gerechten,' *op. cit.*, p. 6.
10. See, for example, the letter from Carl Schapper, Joseph Moll and Heinrich Bauer to Marx, 17 VII 1846, in the new *Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels Gesamtausgabe* (hereafter *MEGA2*), Pt. III, Vol. 2, edited by the Institute for Marxism-Leninism and the Central Committees of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Berlin: Dietz Verlag, pp. 250–55.
11. E. Schraepler, 'Der Bund der Gerechten,' *op. cit.*, p. 613.
12. The quotation is from *ibid.*, p. 19; on the League's position with Weitling, see Carl Schapper *et al.* to Marx, 6 VI 1846, *MEGA2*, Pt. III, Vol. 2, p. 220.
13. See Max Nettlau, 'Londoner deutsche kommunistische Diskussionen, 1845,' *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung*, x, 1925, pp. 360–381.
14. See, for example, the Communist Correspondence Committee in London to the Communist Correspondence Committee in Brussels, 11 XI 1846, *MEGA2*, Pt. III, Vol. 2, pp. 317–20.
15. Because this period of Marx's life has been so well documented, I will restrict myself to highlighting only the most important issues that relate to the history of the *Manifesto*. Among numerous potential sources, see, for example, Karl Marx, 'Preface' *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, in *MECW*, Vol. 29, pp. 261–3; David McLellan, *Mam Before Marxism*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1972; Helmut Reichelt, 'Introduction,' *Texte zur materialistischen Geschichtsauffassung*, Frankfurt/M: Verlag Ullstein, 1975, pp. 9–85; D. McLellan, *Karl Mam*, *op. cit.*, pp. 16–40; Franz Mehring, *Karl Marx*, translated by E.

ROB BEAMISH

- Fitzgerald, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1936; Bob Jessop and Charlie Malcolm-Brown (Editors), *Karl Marx's Social and Political Thought*, Vol. 1 (Marx's Life and Theoretical Development), New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, 1990.
16. On Marx's immersion in Hegel, see Karl to Heinrich Marx, 10–11 XI 1837, *MECW*, Vol. 1, pp. 12–15, 18–20.
 17. Some of the work Marx accomplished in Bonn can be seen in *MEGA2*, Pt. IV, Vol. 1, pp. 293–376.
 18. See Marx to Ruge, 10 II 1842, *MEW*; Vol. 27, p. 395. In view of the style Marx later employed in the *Manifesto*, it is worth noting McLellan's (*Karl Marx, op. cit.*, p. 44) comments that the article is a '... masterpiece of polemical exegesis, demonstrating the great pamphleteering talent in the style of Boerne that [Marx] was to exhibit throughout his life. All his articles of the Young Hegelian period ... were written in an extremely vivid style: his radical and uncompromising approach, his love of polarisation, his method of dealing with opponents' views by *reductio ad absurdum*, all led him to write very antithetically. Slogan, climax, anaphora, parallelism, antithesis and chiasmus (especially the latter two) were all employed by Marx.'
 19. Karl Marx, 'Preface' *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, in *MECW*; Vol. 29, pp. 261–2. The articles to which Marx was referring were 'Proceedings of the Sixth Rhine Province Assembly,' 'Polemical Articles Against the *Allgemeine Zeitung*,' 'Justification of the Correspondent from Mosel;' see *MECW*, Vol. 1, pp. 132–81, 359–60, 332–58.
 20. See *Karl Mam: Chronik, op. cit.*, p. 14; *MEGA*, Pt. I, Vol. 1, p. 309; Marx to Ruge, 30 XI 1842, *The Letters of Karl Marx*, selected and edited by Saul Padover, Englewood Cliffs New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1979, pp. 19–21.
 21. See *Karl Marx: Chronik, op. cit.*, p. 13; *MEGA*, Pt. I, Vol. 1, pp. 263, 314, 573–4.
 22. See *Karl Mam: Chronik, op. cit.*, p. 17. See also Marx to Ruge, 25 I 1843, concerning the closing of the paper; Marx to Ruge, 13 III 1843, concerning the *Jahrbücher* as well as Marx's invitation to Feuerbach to take part in the project (*The Letters of Karl Mam, op. cit.*, pp. 21–3, 23–4, 32–4).
 23. See Marx to Feuerbach, 11 VIII 1844, *ibid.*, pp. 34–7.
 24. Karl Marx, 'Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law,' *MECW*, Vol. 3, pp. 3–129.
 25. On the influence Hess's 'On the Essence of Money' may have had on Marx, see W. Monke, *Moses Hess: Philosophische und sozialistische Schriften, 1837–50, op. cit.*, p. lxix; see the draft text pp. 329–359.
 26. The 1843 'Critique' is a pivotal document in Marx's intellectual development in the way he brought his reading of Feuerbach's *Provisional Theses* to bear on (a) his concrete experiences among the French socialists and the emigre working class in Paris and (b) his readings on the historical development of France, Germany and England; see *MEGA2*, Pt. IV, Vol. 2, pp. 9–281.
 27. Karl Marx, 'Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law: Introduction,' *MECW*, Vol. 3, p. 186 – I have revised the translation to more accurately reflect the German (*MEGA*, Pt. I, Vol. 1, pp. 619–20). See also Marx's comments in 'Critical Notes on the Article by a Prussian,' (*MECW*, Vol. 3, p. 202) – especially 'A philosophical people can find its corresponding practice only in socialism, hence it is only in the *proletariat* that it can find the dynamic element of its emancipation.'

THE SOCIALIST REGISTER 1998

28. The majority of the notes Marx made during this period were first reproduced in *MEGA*, Pt. I, Vol. 3, pp. 437–583 and more fully in *MEGA2*, Pt. IV, Vol. 2, 1981, pp. 279–579.
29. See *MECW*, Vol. 3, p. 231. For Marx's 1858 plan, see Karl Marx, *Grundrisse*, translated by M. Nicolaus, Harmondsworth: Pelican Books, 1973, p. 108.
30. See *MEGA*, Pt. I, Vol. 3, p. 30; Marx to Engels October 1844, January 22 and March 7, 1845 (*MECW*, Vol. 38, pp. 6, 16, 23) as well as Engels' advanced notices of the work published in *The New Moral World* (*MEW*, 2, pp. 514–19). Most accounts of this contract indicate Marx signed it with Carl W. Leske but Monke (*Moses Hess: Philosophische und sozialistische Schriften, 1837–50, op. cit.*, note 172a, p. 506) corrects the misunderstanding that led to this error.
31. See *Karl Marx: Chronik, op. cit.*, p. 14.
32. See Bruno Bauer, 'Charakteristik Ludwig Feuerbachs,' *Wigandsvierteljahrschrift*, III, 1845 cited in *Karl Marx: Chronik, op. cit.*, p. 29; Max Stirner, *The Ego and His Own*, translated by S. Byington, edited by J. Martin, New York: Libertarian Book Club, 1963; Marx to Leske, 1 VIII 1846, where he noted that his critique of political economy had to be preceded by 'a polemical piece against German philosophy and German socialism up till the present' (*MECW*, Vol. 38, p. 50); see also *Karl Marx: Chronik, op. cit.*, p. 28; Marx to Joseph Weydemeyer, 14–16 V 1846, *MECW*, Vol. 38, pp. 41–2. For the 'Theses' and *The German Ideology* see *MECW*, Vol. 5, pp. 3–5, 6–8; 19–539.
33. *Karl Marx: Chronik, op. cit.*, pp. 31–2; Marx to Proudhon, 5 V 1846, *MECW*, Vol. 38, pp. 38–40; see Proudhon's 17 V 1846 reply *MEGA2*, Pt. III, Vol. 2, pp. 205–7; see also Marx *et al.*, to Gustav Kottgen, 15 VI 1846, *ibid.*, pp. 12–16. For Engels' first communications with the Correspondence Committee during his stay in Paris (19 VIII 1846, 16 IX 1846, 23 X 1846), see *MECW*, Vol. 38, pp. 56–60, 60–7, 81–6.
34. See *Karl Marx: Chronik, op. cit.*, p. 31; Engels to Marx, November–December 1846, *MECW*, Vol. 38, pp. 91–2.
35. Paul Annenkov, 'From the Essay "A Wonderful 10 Years",' *Reminiscences of Marx and Engels*, Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, n.d., p. 271. See also *Karl Marx: Chronik, op. cit.*, pp. 31–2; Hess to Marx, 20 V 1846, 29 V 1846, *MEGA2* Pt. III, Vol. 2, pp. 208–9, 211.
36. See *MECW*; Vol. 6, pp. 35–51. In *Herr Vogt* Marx indicated that 'we published a series of pamphlets, partly printed, partly lithographed, in which we mercilessly criticized the hotchpotch of Franco-English socialism or communism and German philosophy which formed the secret doctrine of the League at that time. In its place, we proposed the scientific study of the economic structure of bourgeois society as the only tenable theoretical foundation. Furthermore, we argued in a popular form that it was not a matter of putting some utopian system into effect but of conscious participation in the historic process revolutionizing society before our very eyes' (*MECW*, Vol. 17, p. 80).
37. See The Communist Correspondence Committee in London to Karl Marx, 6 VI 1846, *MEGA2* Pt. III, Vol. 2, pp. 219–23.
38. Carl Schapper, Joseph Moll, Henry Bauer to Karl Marx, 17 VII 1846, *MEGA2*, Pt. III, Vol. 3, pp. 252–53.
39. George Julian Harney to the Brussels Correspondence Committee, 20 VII 1846, *ibid.*, p. 263.
40. See *Karl Marx: Chronik, op. cit.*, p. 37.

ROB BEAMISH

41. See D. McLellan, *Karl Marx, op. cit.*, pp. 171–2; F. Mehring, *Karl Marx, op. cit.*, pp. 138–9; K. Marx, *Herr Vogt*, in *MECW*, Vol. 17, p. 81.
42. See B. Andréas, *Gründungsdokumente des Bundes der Kommunisten (Juni bis September 1847)*, Hamburg: Hauswedell & Co., 1969. Mehring's classic biography is very superficial on this part of Marx's life; see *Karl Marx, op. cit.*, pp. 136–47. Surprisingly both Bender ('Introduction,' *The Communist Manifesto, op. cit.*, pp. 12–13) and McLellan (*Karl Marx, op. cit.*, pp. 172–83) tend to overlook these documents in their discussions of this point in Marx's life.
43. See 'Rules of the Communist League (June 1847),' 'A Circular of the First Congress of the Communist League to the League Members. June 9, 1847,' 'The Central Authority to the League,' *MECW*, Vol. 6, pp. 585–588, 589–600, 601–15.
44. Engels to Marx, 23–24 XI 1847, *MECW*, Vol. 38, p. 149.
45. See, for example, Arnold Winkler, *Die Entstehung des 'Kommunistischen Manifestes': Eine Untersuchung, Kritik und Klärung*, Vienna: Manzsche Verlag, 1936, pp. 240–44; H. Laski, 'Introduction,' *Communist Manifesto, op. cit.*, pp. 24–5; F. Mehring, *Karl Marx, op. cit.*, pp. 147–8; E. Bender, 'Historical and Theoretical Backgrounds of the *Communist Manifesto*,' *The Communist Manifesto, op. cit.*, pp. 12–14.
46. Similar insight can be gained by comparing the draft rules from June 1847 to the final rules of December 1847; cf. *MECW*, Vol. 6, pp. 585–88, 633–38.
47. The second circular reviews the debates as they took place in Sweden, Germany, Holland, America, France, Switzerland, and Belgium; see 'The Central Authority to the League,' *MECW*, Vol. 6, pp. 603–13.
48. See *Karl Marx: Chronik, op. cit.*, p. 40. For a discussion of the relationship between Hess and Marx and Engels at this time, see W. Monke, *Moses Hess Philosophische undsozialistische Schrziën, op. cit.*, pp. xcvi–c; see also Engels to the Communist Correspondence Committee in Brussels, 16 IX 1846, *MECW*, Vol. 38, pp. 64–5.
49. It is not known exactly why Engels suggested the term manifesto. It may well be that he borrowed the term from Victor Considérant's 1843 'Principles of Socialism: Manifesto of the Democracy of the Nineteenth Century' which was reissued in 1847. This would have made some sense since there is a high degree of overlap between the two positions in terms of the image of capitalist society and the role of the proletariat. It is, however, incorrect to claim as Varlaam Tcherkesoff (*Pages of Socialist History*, New York: C.B. Cooper, 1902, pp. 55–66) has that Marx and Engels simply copied Considérant's ideas; see Rondel Davidson, 'Reform versus Revolution: Victor Considérant and the *Communist Manifesto*,' *Social Science Quarterly*, 58 (1), 1977, pp. 74–85.
50. The 'Confession' was also republished in 1846/147 in a two volume collection *Rheinische Jahrbücher zur gesellschaftlichen Reform*; see '*Kommunistisches Bekenntnis in Fragen und Antworten*,' in W. Monke, *Moses Hess Philosophische und sozialistische Schriften, op. cit.*, pp. 359–68; see also pp. lxxxii–lxxxiii.
51. See E. Engels, 'Draft of the Communist Confession of Faith,' *Birth of the Communist Manifesto, op. cit.*, pp. 163; Moses Hess, 'Kommunistisches Bekenntnis in Fragen und Antworten,' *Moses Hess: Philosophische undsozialistische Schriften, op. cit.*, pp. 362–4.
52. The 'community of goods' was based in part on the productive powers of the society but also 'on the fact that in the consciousness of every human being there

exist certain tenets as indisputable principles, tenets which, being the result of whole historical development, are not in need of proof' These tenets were then identified – 'each human being is in search of happiness' and 'the happiness of the individual is inseparably linked to the happiness of all, etc.' (see *Birth of the Communist Manifesto*, *op. cit.*, pp. 163).

53. For Fourier's position on sexual relationships, see, for example, Mark Poster (Editor), *Harmonian Man: Selected Writings of Charles Fourier*, Garden City New York: Doubleday & Co., 1971, pp. 75–89, 115–119, 202–237, 238–280.
54. F. Engels, 'Draft of the Communist Confession of Faith,' *Birth of the Communist Manifesto*, *op. cit.*, pp. 168. The text then acknowledges that 'the family relationship has been modified in the course of history by the property relationships and periods of development' and that consequently the ending of private property will therefore also substantially affect this family relationship.'
55. See especially questions 1–13, Moses Hess, 'Kommunistisches Bekenntnis in Fragen und Antworten,' *Moses Hess: Philosophische und sozialistische Schriften*, *op. cit.*, pp. 359–61.
56. See Engels to Marx, 25–26 X 1847, *MECW*, Vol. 38, pp. 138–9.
57. See The Central Authority of the Communist League to the Brussels Circle, 18 X 1847, *MEGA2*, Pt. III, Vol. 2, p. 368. The letter indicated the League would do everything possible to assist Marx with his costs.
58. See Engels to Marx, 14–15 XI 1847, *MECW*: Vol. 38, pp. 142–5; *Karl Marx: Chronik*, *op. cit.*, p. 41.
59. See *MECW*, Vol. 6, pp. 585, 633.
60. See *Karl Marx: Chronik*, *op. cit.*, p. 42; *MEGA*, Pt. I, Vol. 6, pp. 473, 680. It is on the rough notes for these lectures that Marx wrote out a draft outline for Section III of the *Manifesto*; see *MEGA*, Pt. I, Vol. 6, p. 650. The notes Marx used in his lectures are printed in *MECW*, Vol. 6, pp. 415–37; the notes were revised and published as *Wage-Labour and Capital* in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in 1849; see *MESW*: Vol. 1, pp. 142–74. Marx remained engaged with other workers' groups, such as the Brussels Democratic Association, trying to bring them into the new Communist League; see *MEGA*, Pt. I, Vol. 6, p. 636.
61. See Engels to Marx, 14 I 1848, *MECW*, Vol. 38, p. 153. Contrary to the Preface statements of 1872 and 1888 (see *The Communist Manifesto: Socialist Landmark*, *op. cit.*, pp. 101, 112) when one takes into account the timing of Engels' visit to Brussels and return to Paris as well as the correspondence discussed below, it is clear that Engels did not directly participate in the writing of the text that went to London as the *Manifesto*. This should not diminish, however, Engels' significant contribution at the two congresses—especially the first one—the impact of his draft The Basic Principles of Communism, and the correspondence and discussions he had with Marx during this period; see also *MEGA*, Pt. I, Vol. 6, pp. 682–3.
62. Cited in *The Communist Manifesto of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels*, edited, with an introduction, explanatory notes and appendices by D. Ryazanoff, New York: Russell & Russell Inc., 1963, pp. 21–2. It seems unlikely that Marx met the February 1st deadline but he must have delivered the manuscript to London by early to mid-February. The minutes of the London 'Workingmen's Educational Society' indicate February 29, 1848 approval of the transfer of funds covering the costs of the *Manifesto* publication. Working backwards from that date, the pamphlet was probably printed the preceding week (February 22–29) or as early

- as February 14–21. Since the page proofs were set in the office of the Worker's Educational Society (191 Drury Lane, High Holborn) with the gothic character set the Society had purchased in the summer of 1847, and then delivered to the printer, J. E. Burghard, at his shop at 46 Liverpool Street, Bishopsgate by Friedrich Lessner, it seems that Marx must have submitted the manuscript to London in early to mid-February; see B. Andréas, *Le Manifeste Communiste de Marx et Engels*, *op. cit.*, pp. 9–10; Friedrich Lessner, 'Erinnerungen eines Arbeiters an Karl Marx,' *Karl Marx als Denker, Mensch und Revolutionär*, edited by D. Ryazanoff, Berlin: Verlag für Literatur und Politik, 1928, p. 115.
63. *MEGA*, Pt. I, Vol. 6, p. 525. The German word *Gespent* is ambiguous; it can mean ghost, apparition, phantom, nightmare, or spectre. Indeed, Helen Macfarlane, in the first English translation of the *Manifesto* (it appeared in Harney's weekly *The Red Republican* in 1850) translated the opening sentence as 'A frightful hobgoblin stalks throughout Europe' (see *MEGA2*, Pt. I, Vol. 10, pp. 605). The selection of the word *spectre* clearly captures the intended image of terror felt by the bourgeoisie while also linking nicely to the concept of a 'holy alliance' that opposes the movement.
64. See B. Andréas, *Le Manifeste Communiste de Marx et Engels*, *op. cit.*, pp. 3–4. There is an obvious link between Schulz's sentence and Marx's opening salvo. Those who maintain that Marx took the line from Lorenz Stein's *Socialism and Communism in Present Day France* have to argue either that Marx did not understand Stein's intention when he wrote 'an ominously threatening nightmare [*Gespent*], in whose actuality no one wants to believe. . . ' or that he intended to turn the phrase back on Stein, but that seems an unlikely stretch; see *ibid.*, p. 3; cf. Arnold Winkler, *Die Entstehung des 'Kommunistischen Manifestes'*, *op. cit.*, pp. 128ff.
65. See B. Andréas, *Le Manifeste Communiste de Marx et Engels*, *op. cit.*, pp. 2–3; D. Ryazanoff, *The Communist Manifesto of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels*, *op. cit.*, pp. 69–254.
66. See *ibid.*, pp. 286318.
67. Marx and Engels were first declared the authors of the *Manifesto* when its third section was published in numbers V and VI (May–October, 1850) of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*; see *MEGA2*, Pt. I, Vol. 10, p. 445; B. Andréas, *Le Manifeste Communiste de Marx et Engels*, *op. cit.*, p. 27; see also note 61 above.
68. See B. Andréas, *Le Manifeste Communiste de Marx et Engels*, *op. cit.*, pp. 14–24.