

## Introduction to Volume I

MARCEL VAN DER LINDEN

‘Socialism’ means different things to different people. The concept denotes a just society in which no individual lacks the basic necessities of life and in which prosperity and knowledge are shared fairly. But opinions on what form such a society should take have always varied widely. Should it be governed centrally? Should it be a federation of small communities? A meritocracy? A democracy? ‘Socialism’ was, and is, a house with many rooms, and as a political movement it has left a deep mark on the past two centuries. These two volumes attempt to provide a – necessarily incomplete – overview of the non-communist aspect of this tradition; the communist aspect is the subject of a separate publication project.<sup>1</sup>

### Egalitarianism

Socialism has its intellectual roots in the French Revolution’s pursuit of liberty, equality, and fraternity. There have been myriad debates about how to define these three basic values, about their mutual coherence and relative significance. Does equality encompass only rights, or also outcomes? Is liberty – or freedom – only negative (freedom *from* – restraint or coercion), or can it be positive (freedom *to* – that is, self-determination)? Does fraternity embody the unity of a group or class based on shared interests, objectives, standards, or beliefs? And which of the three core values is the most fundamental? Is liberty conditional on equality, as many socialist French republicans believed in the 1840s? Or is liberty a precondition for equality, as many anarchists argued, because true ‘equality’ means not ‘the forced equality of the convict camp’ but

<sup>1</sup> S. Pons et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Communism*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

MARCEL VAN DER LINDEN

the ability to live in different ways?<sup>2</sup> And how do liberty and equality relate to fraternity, or to solidarity, a value that appears to have more to do with communities and moral obligations than with individuals, rights, and contracts?

Despite the close relationship among those three core values, it is probably the pursuit of equality that has most distinguished socialism from other movements. Liberals too fought for freedom, and conservative Christians aspired to solidarity, but it was the socialists in particular whose aim was equality, and especially social equality. Eric Hobsbawm rightly noted that:

Unlike the word ‘communist’, which always signified a programme, the word ‘socialist’ was primarily analytical and critical. It was used to describe those who held a particular view of human nature (e.g. the fundamental importance of ‘sociability’ or the ‘social instincts’ in it), which implied a particular view of human society, or those who believed in the possibility or necessity of a particular mode of social action, notably in public affairs (e.g. intervention in the operations of the free market). It was soon realised that such views were likely to be developed by or to attract those who favoured equality, such as the disciples of Rousseau, and to lead to interference with property rights.<sup>3</sup>

Supporters and opponents alike regarded socialism primarily as the embodiment of the pursuit of equality – with its opponents in particular often suggesting that socialism would amount to equality without either freedom or solidarity.<sup>4</sup>

The pursuit of social equality has an ancient pedigree that predates socialism as such. In fact there have existed few human societies without a degree of social inequality,<sup>5</sup> and when the first states and social classes emerged with the neolithic revolution structural inequality became a long-term phenomenon.

2 C. Coste, “‘Si je crois à la liberté c’est que je crois à l’égalité’”. *Philosophie pour une république sociale et pratique de l’égalité autour de 1848*, *Revue européenne des sciences sociales* 56, 2 (2018), pp. 209–39; A. Berkman, *What Is Anarchism?* (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2003), p. 164.

3 E. J. Hobsbawm, *How to Change the World: Marx and Marxism 1840–2011* (London: Little, Brown, 2011), p. 24.

4 For example, when, in the late nineteenth century, the German orientalist T. Nöldeke rediscovered the Mazdak Persian egalitarian movement of the fifth and early sixth centuries (described in Chapter 1 in this volume), he wanted to show that such a ‘socialist’ experiment was necessarily doomed to fail. See T. Nöldeke, ‘Orientalischer Socialismus’, *Deutsche Rundschau* 18 (1879), pp. 284–91.

5 The gendered division of labour in hunter–gatherer societies does not seem to imply inequality and hierarchy, since ‘these societies deliberately level differences’. See Karen L. Endicott, ‘Gender Relations in Hunter–Gatherer Societies’, in R. B. Lee and R. Daly (eds.), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Hunters and Gatherers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 411.

### Introduction to Volume I

Since then, the world has witnessed egalitarian revolts over and over again, with subservient groups rebelling against the privileges of the higher echelons. As early as the fourth century BCE, the Athenian philosopher Plato had his teacher Socrates say that, in every city, there are two communities, 'warring with each other, one of the poor, the other of the rich'.<sup>6</sup> There are many examples of egalitarian conflict, but one will suffice here: the rebellion in the province of Jiangxi in eastern China in 1644–5 at the end of the Ming dynasty. One account reported as follows on the rebellious serfs:

They sharpened their hoes into swords, and took to themselves the title of 'Levelling Kings', declaring that they were levelling the distinction between masters and serfs, titled and mean, rich and poor. The tenants seized hold of their masters' best clothes. They broke into the homes of important families and shared their mansions with them. They opened the granaries and distributed the contents. They tied the masters to pillars and flogged them with whips and with lashes of bamboo. Whenever they held a drinking bout they would order the masters to kneel and pour out the wine for them. They would slap them across the cheeks and say: 'We are all of us equally men. What right had you to call us serfs? From now on it is going to be the other way around!'<sup>7</sup>

But egalitarian sentiments circulated in non-violent form too. Mikhail Bakhtin and others have pointed out that carnivals or carnivalesque behaviour were associated with the transcendence or inversion of social hierarchies, when for a few days peasants and other subalterns could ridicule their rulers with impunity and display eccentric and sacrilegious behaviour.<sup>8</sup> A somewhat less public expression of the same idea was the many variants of an egalitarian parable narrated by radical propagandists in the nineteenth-century Russian Empire. Essentially, it took the following form: the speaker placed a grain of wheat or a hazelnut on the table and asked his listeners, 'What does this mean?' Of course, no one had any idea, so the speaker explained that it was the tsar. Adding more grains or hazelnuts, he explained that these were the governors and other officials, the army officers, the landlords, and the nobility. Finally, he poured a handful of grain or hazelnuts on top of them: 'Look, these are all of us! Can you tell me now who was the tsar, the governor, or the landlord?'<sup>9</sup>

6 *The Republic of Plato*, trans. A. Bloom, 2nd edn (New York: Basic Books, 1991), p. 100 (§ 423a).

7 M. Elvin, *The Pattern of the Chinese Past* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1973), pp. 245–6.

8 M. Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. H. Iswolsky (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984). One might debate the extent to which such inversions ultimately strengthen power relations or not.

9 R. Rosdolsky, 'A revolutionary parable on the equality of men', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 3 (1963), p. 291.

MARCEL VAN DER LINDEN

Incidentally, most egalitarian movements aimed at achieving equality only among men. Characteristic in this regard was the fairly major uprising that took place in 1416 in part of the Ottoman Empire, with Sheikh Bedreddin as its influential spokesman. He apparently decreed that, ‘with the exception of women, everything must be shared in common – provisions, clothing, yokes of beasts, and fields. “I shall have access to your house as though it were mine and you shall have access to my house as though it were yours, with the exception of the female members.”’<sup>10</sup> And when in 1791, during the French Revolution, Olympe de Gouges demanded that women be given the same rights as men, she became only the second woman, after Marie Antoinette, to be sent to the guillotine.<sup>11</sup>

### The Invention of ‘Socialism’

The French Revolution also spawned other thinkers who developed egalitarianism into a radical political programme. The most important was probably journalist and agitator François-Noël (Gracchus) Babeuf. His Conspiracy of the Equals included a number of supporters, such as Sylvain Maréchal and Filippo Buonarroti. Unlike the older egalitarians, they were not obsessed solely with the fair distribution of property and goods, but also developed coherent ideas about an alternative society based on the abolition of private property and the introduction of universal democracy – for men at least. Their manifesto stated:

Long enough, and too long, have less than a million of individuals disposed of what belongs to more than twenty millions of men like themselves – of men in every respect their equals. Let there be at length an end to this enormous scandal, which posterity will scarcely credit. Away for ever with the revolting distinctions of rich and poor, of great and little, of masters and servants, of *governors* and *governed*. Let there be no longer any other differences in mankind than those of age and sex. Since all have the same wants, and the same faculties, let all have accordingly the same education – the same nourishment.<sup>12</sup>

10 Doukas, *Decline and Fall of Byzantium to the Ottoman Turks: An Annotated Translation of ‘Historia Turco-Byzantina’* by H. J. Magoulias (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975), p. 120. For the context, see S. Salgırlı, ‘The rebellion of 1416: recontextualizing an Ottoman social movement’, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 55 (2012), pp. 32–73.

11 S. Mousset, *Women’s Rights and the French Revolution: A Biography of Olympe de Gouges*, trans. J. Poirel (New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2007); M. Fauchoux, *Olympe de Gouges* (Paris: Gallimard, 2018).

12 ‘Manifesto of the Equals’ (1796), in *B Buonarroti’s History of Babeuf’s Conspiracy for Equality ...*, trans. Bronterre (London: Hetherington, 1836), p. 316. See also

Introduction to Volume I

When Babeuf attempted to organize a coup, he was arrested and in 1797 guillotined.

Less well known than the Babouvists' manifesto is a pamphlet on *The Rights of Nature* published in that same year by the British radical orator and writer John Thelwall. Inspired by the French Revolution, Thelwall found it intolerable that power should lie with the richest 10 per cent in the country – some of them amounting to no more than 'caterpillars and locusts, the blights and mildews of social industry!' – while the remaining 90 per cent were victims of 'political annihilation'. To remedy this, he proposed a more equitable distribution of wealth, a reduction in working hours, and better education:

*every man, and every woman, and every child, ought to obtain something more, in the general distribution of the fruits of labour, than food, and rags, and a wretched hammock with a poor rug to cover it: and that without working twelve or fourteen hours a day, six days out of seven, from six to sixty. – They have a claim, a sacred and inviolable claim, growing out of that fundamental maxim, upon which all property can be supported, to some comforts and enjoyments, in addition to the necessities of life; and to some tolerable leisure for such discussion, and some 'means of such information', as may lead to an understanding of their rights; without which they can never understand their duties.*<sup>13</sup>

From the 1820s, ideas like those of Babeuf and Thelwall were sometimes referred to as 'socialism'. Although the word had occasionally surfaced before, it was probably first used in a serious sense in 1827 in *The Cooperative Magazine*, a periodical published by the social reformer Robert Owen and his supporters.<sup>14</sup> In a notice about the Co-operative Benevolent Fund Association – an organization founded six months earlier in Brighton with 170 members and a capital of five pounds – it is noted: 'The chief

R. B. Rose, *Gracchus Babeuf: The First Revolutionary Communist* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1978); I. Birchall, *The Spectre of Babeuf*, 2nd edn (Chicago: Haymarket, 2016).

<sup>13</sup> J. Thelwall, *The Rights of Nature Against the Usurpations of Establishments . . .* (London and Norwich: H. D. Symonds and J. March, 1796), pp. 15–19. E. P. Thompson has argued that Thelwall 'took Jacobinism to the borders of Socialism; he also took it to the borders of revolutionism'. See Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Gollancz, 1963), p. 160.

<sup>14</sup> Franco Venturi has pointed out that the word 'socialism' had already been used in Ferdinando Facchini's *Note ed osservazioni sul libro intitolato Dei Delitti e Delle Pene* (1765); it referred to followers of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who assumed that people were free and equal on the basis of the *contrat social*. This notion of '*socialismo*' therefore has a meaning different from the English word 'socialism'. See F. Venturi, 'Socialista e socialismo nell'Italia del settecento', *Rivista storica italiana* 75, 1 (May 1963), pp. 129–40.

MARCEL VAN DER LINDEN

question . . . between the modern (or Mill and Malthus) Political Economists, and the Communionists or Socialists, is, whether it is more beneficial that this capital [of the fund] should be individual or in common?<sup>15</sup>

It took several years before the term passed into common usage. In 1833 *The Crisis* magazine wrote about “The Socialist who preaches of community of goods, abolition of crime, of punishment, of magistrates, and of marriage . . .”<sup>16</sup> This development was crowned in 1837 when in an editorial the Owenist magazine *The New Moral World* argued that the ‘Congress of all classes and all nations’ should no longer call itself Owenite, but ‘socialist’: ‘We, the disciples of the New Moral World, advocate principles, and aim at establishing a Community-System founded upon these principles . . . are not we socialists as well as this new society?’<sup>17</sup> Perhaps the first to reflect extensively on the term was the French philosopher and political economist Pierre Leroux, who had already written an article on it in 1833.<sup>18</sup> But Robert Owen himself also published his thoughts in his *What Is Socialism?* in 1841.<sup>19</sup>

The word ‘socialism’ gradually spread from Britain and France to gain currency elsewhere, first in other parts of Europe, and from there all over the world.<sup>20</sup> Although a number of protagonists tended to agnosticism or

15 ‘Cooperation’, *The Cooperative Magazine* (London), November 1827, p. 509, editorial note.

16 ‘Weekly Proceedings’, *The Crisis, and National Co-operative Trades’ Union and Equitable Labour Exchange Gazette* (London) 2, No. 35–6 (31 August 1833), p. 276.

17 ‘Our Name’, *The New Moral World and Manual of Science* 3, 21 (No. 125), 18 March 1837, p. 161.

18 P. Leroux, ‘Philosophie sociale’, *Revue encyclopédique* 60 (October–December 1833), pp. 94–116, reprinted as ‘De l’individualisme et du socialisme’, in P. Leroux, *Oeuvres 1825–1850* (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1978), pp. 365–80.

19 *What Is Socialism? And What Would Be Its Practical Effects upon Society? A Correct Report of the Public Discussion between Robert Owen and Mr John Brindley, held in Bristol . . .* (London: Home Colonization Society, 1841).

20 See, for example, K. Grünberg, ‘Der Ursprung der Worte “Sozialismus” und “Sozialist”’, *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung* 2 (1912), pp. 372–9; G. Deville, ‘Origine des mots “socialisme” et “socialiste” et de certains autres’, *La Révolution Française. Revue d’histoire moderne et contemporaine* 54 (January–June 1908), pp. 385–401; E. Czóbel, ‘Zur Verbreitung der Worte “Sozialist” und “Sozialismus” in Deutschland und in Ungarn’, *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung* 3 (1913), pp. 481–5; R. de Mattei, ‘La prima apparizione in Italia dei termini “socialismo” e “socialisti”’, *Storia e politica internazionale* 20, 4 (1941), pp. 3–9; A. E. Bestor, Jr, ‘The evolution of the socialist vocabulary’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 9, 3 (1948), pp. 259–302; J. Gans, ‘L’origine du mot “socialiste” et ses emplois les plus anciens’, *Revue d’histoire économique et sociale* 35, 1 (1957), pp. 79–83; H. Müller, *Ursprung und Geschichte des Wortes ‘Sozialismus’ und seiner Verwandten* (Hanover: J. H. W. Dietz Nachf., 1967); W. Schieder, ‘Sozialismus’, in O. Brunner, W. Conze, and R. Koselleck (eds.), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, vol. v (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1984), pp. 923–96; G. Spini, ‘Sulle origine dei termini “socialista” e “socialismo”’, *Rivista storica italiana* 105, 3 (1993), pp. 679–97.

## Introduction to Volume I

atheism, the new body of thought immediately found support among believers of different persuasions. Because ‘socialism’ was a previously unknown concept in any language, the English neologism was usually adopted literally: *socialisme* in French, *Sozialismus* in German, *socialismo* in Spanish, *sotsializm* in Russian, *sosyalizm* in Turkish, *socialisme* in Bahasa Indonesia. In some language areas, however, a completely new term was invented. For example, *shakai-shugi* – formed by the elements *shakai* (‘society’) and *shugi* (‘doctrine’) – was introduced in Japan in the 1880s, and this subsequently found its way into Chinese as *shehuizhuyi* (‘socialism’).<sup>21</sup> In Arabic, *ishtirakiyyah* became fashionable from the second half of the nineteenth century.<sup>22</sup>

## The Discovery of Class Struggle

That the concept of ‘socialism’ originated in Britain had, of course, everything to do with the enormous social and economic upheaval that had been going on there since the late eighteenth century. That upheaval is commonly referred to as the Industrial Revolution, a designation meaningful insofar as a rapidly growing number of workers produced textiles for the market, in cottages, manufactories, and some industrial works – although steam- or water-powered factories did not predominate until the mid-nineteenth century. Men, women, and children all worked, and the formation of proletarian concentrations was conducive to rebellious sentiment. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, John Millar, a leading intellectual of the Scottish Enlightenment, observed the consequences of economic growth:

As the advancement of commerce and manufactures in Britain has produced a state of property highly favourable to liberty, so it has contributed to collect and arrange the inhabitants in a manner which enables them, with great facility, to combine in asserting their privileges . . . Villages are enlarged into towns; and these are often swelled into populous cities. In all those places of resort, there arise large bands of labourers or artificers, who by following the same employment, and by constant intercourse, are enabled, with great rapidity, to communicate all their sentiments and passions. Among these there spring up leaders, who give a tone and direction to their companions . . . In this situation, a great proportion of the people are easily aroused by every popular discontent, and can unite with no less facility in

21 W. Lippert, ‘Marxism and the Development of the Chinese Political Lexicon’, in C. Neder, H. Roetz, and I.-S. Schilling (eds.), *China in seinen biographischen Dimensionen/China and Her Biographical Dimensions* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001), pp. 374–5.

22 M. M. Wahba, ‘The meaning of *ishtirakiyah*: Arab perceptions of socialism in the nineteenth century’, *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics* 10 (1990), pp. 42–55.

MARCEL VAN DER LINDEN

demanding a redress of grievances. The least ground of complaint, in a town, becomes the occasion of a riot; and the flames of sedition spreading from one city to another, are blown up into a general insurrection.<sup>23</sup>

Some reformers tried to counteract the alienation and immiseration of the growing working class by setting up new forms of business and alternative communities. They included Robert Owen (1771–1858), the Welsh textile entrepreneur mentioned earlier, and the French philosophers Claude-Henri de Saint-Simon (1760–1825), Charles Fourier (1772–1837), and Etienne Cabet (1788–1856). Striving to overcome social inequality and poverty ‘from above’ through alternative societies, they are sometimes referred to as utopian socialists or utopian communists. They established their self-created, often quite authoritarian,<sup>24</sup> communities not only in western Europe but also in sparsely populated parts of North America.

Nevertheless, social tensions grew, not only in Britain, but also increasingly in continental Europe and North America. Labour protests had been a feature of Europe since the fourteenth century, but they became more intense and more visible in the early decades of the nineteenth century – especially in the three politically most important countries in western Europe. Between 1831 and 1834 an uprising by silk workers in Lyon triggered a general strike unique for that era, as well as two very bloody confrontations with the authorities.<sup>25</sup> In England the popular Chartist movement for political reform had an enormous impact from 1838.<sup>26</sup> And in 1844 the rebellion of

23 J. Millar, ‘The Advancement of Manufactures, Commerce, and the Arts, since the Reign of William III; and the Tendency of this Advancement to Diffuse a Spirit of Liberty and Independence’ (c. 1800), in W. C. Lehmann (ed.), *John Millar of Glasgow, 1735–1801* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), pp. 337–9.

24 A contemporary observer criticized, for example, Robert Owen’s New Lanark community and its treatment of workers as ‘human machines’: ‘Owen in reality deceives himself. He is part-owner and sole Director of a large establishment, differing more in accidents than in essence from a plantation: the persons under him happen to be white, and are at liberty by law to quit his service, but while they remain in it they are as much under his absolute management as so many negro-slaves.’ See R. Southey, *Journal of a Tour in Scotland in 1819*, with an Introduction and Notes by C. H. Herford (London: John Murray, 1929), pp. 263–4. Against this background the attempt of a Mississippi planter to transplant Owen’s practices to a slave plantation becomes understandable. See M. Hayek et al., ‘Ending the denial of slavery in management history: paternalistic leadership of Joseph Emory Davis’, *Journal of Management History* 16, 3 (2010), pp. 367–79.

25 F. Rude, *Les Révoltes des canuts (1831–1834)* (Paris: Maspero, 1982); M. Moissonnier, *La Révolte des canuts, Lyon, novembre 1831* (Paris: Ed. sociales Messidor, 1958). The best monograph in English is R. J. Bezucha, *The Lyon Uprising of 1834: Social and Political Conflict in the Early July Monarchy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974).

26 The literature on the Chartists is vast. See, for example, D. Thompson, *The Chartists: Popular Politics in the Industrial Revolution* (London: Temple Smith, 1984), or M. Chase, *Chartism: A New History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).



Introduction to Volume I

weavers in Peterswaldau and Langenbielau (Silesia) showed that in Germany too the working class were starting to awaken.<sup>27</sup> In addition, in the United States, the first local workingmen's parties were established in Philadelphia and New York during the crisis years of 1827–33.<sup>28</sup>

German intellectuals were generally the first to attempt to draw theoretical conclusions from such developments. They could have recourse to the notions of class and class struggles, which dated back to the eighteenth-century debates. During the decades preceding the revolution of 1789 French social analysts such as François Quesnay and Anne Robert Jacques Turgot had begun to distinguish two or three social classes. In Britain, David Hume, Adam Ferguson, and others developed similar distinctions almost at the same time. A possible explanation for this discovery of social classes is the growth of nation-states, combined with expanding trading circuits, and the concomitant increase in income inequality. Moreover, the rise of manufactures and factories made it increasingly difficult for journeymen and other skilled workers to become independent entrepreneurs themselves.

Reflecting on these trends, in 1842 the social scientist Lorenz von Stein published a study of the socialism and communism of contemporary France in which he argued that the growing industrial society either made workers obstinate and malicious or transformed them into dull instruments and servile subordinates. He considered personal and hereditary property to be the root cause of this decline of the working classes, since it resulted in the dominant power of some and the unfreedom of others. However, a proletarian revolution was not inexorable. Stein proposed a reformist political strategy in which the state guides the redistribution of economic resources so as to prevent class polarization.<sup>29</sup>

In late 1843 or early 1844 Karl Marx characterized the proletariat as 'a class with *radical chains*, a class in civil society which is not a class of civil society, an estate which is the dissolution of all estates, a sphere which has a universal character by its universal suffering and claims no *particular right* because no

27 L. Kroneberg and R. Schlösser, *Weber-Revolt 1844. Der schlesische Weberaufstand im Spiegel der zeitgenössischen Publizistik und Literatur* (Cologne: C. W. Leske, 1979); C. von Hodenberg, *Aufstand der Weber. Die Revolte von 1844 und ihr Aufstieg zum Mythos* (Bonn: Dietz, 1997).

28 H. L. Sumner, 'Citizenship (1827–1833)', in J. R. Commons et al., *History of Labour in the United States*, 2 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1918), vol. 1, pp. 169–332; B. Laurie, *Working People of Philadelphia, 1800–1850* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1980); S. Wilentz, *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788–1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), Part 111.

29 L. von Stein, *Der Socialismus und Communismus des heutigen Frankreichs. Ein Beitrag zur Zeitgeschichte* (Leipzig: Wigand, 1842).

MARCEL VAN DER LINDEN

*particular wrong*, but *wrong generally*, is perpetrated against it'. The proletariat was the 'all-round antithesis' to existing society, which is 'the *complete loss* of man and hence can win itself only through the *complete re-winning* of man'.<sup>30</sup> Shortly after, in 1845, Friedrich Engels published *The Condition of the Working Class in England: From Personal Observation and Authentic Sources*. Basing himself on Manchester's textile industry, Engels suggested how 'industry has been concentrated into fewer hands', and therefore how the working population had become centralized, as 'Big industrial establishments need many hands massed together in one building. They have to live together and the labour force of even a relatively small factory would populate a village.'<sup>31</sup> In a fragment from 1845–6, Marx and Engels asserted that the abolition of bourgeois society would require a social revolution.<sup>32</sup>

For quite some time it remained unclear who exactly were workers and who were proletarians, for they were not usually seen as separate 'classes'. Some regarded wage labourers as *part* of the proletariat. According to Adolphe Granier de Cassagnac, writing in the 1830s, the proletariat formed 'the lowest rank, the deepest stratum of society', which consisted of four groups, 'workers, beggars, thieves, and public women':

The worker is a proletarian, because he works in order to live and earns a wage; the beggar is a proletarian, who does not want to work or cannot work, and begs in order to live; the thief is a proletarian, who does not want to work or beg, and, in order to make a living, steals; the prostitute is a proletarian, who neither wants to work, nor beg, nor steal, and, in order to live, sells her body.<sup>33</sup>

According to others, wage labourers were part of the 'producing classes', also termed 'working men'. In 1859 Emile Levasseur defined the 'working classes' as 'All those who earned their living in and from industry, from simple apprentices to great merchants'.<sup>34</sup>

30 K. Marx, 'A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's *Philosophy of Right*' (1843), in *Marx Engels Collected Works* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2010) (hereafter *MECW*), vol. 111, p. 186; translation corrected.

31 [F.] Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, trans. and ed. W. O. Henderson and W. H. Chaloner (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), pp. 27–8; *MECW*, vol. 1v, p. 325.

32 K. Marx and F. Engels, 'The German ideology' (1845–6), in *MECW*, vol. v, p. 88. See also M. Hess, 'Consequences of a Revolution of the Proletariat' (1847), in M. Hess, *The Holy History of Mankind and Other Writings*, ed. S. Avineri (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pp. 128–35.

33 A. Granier de Cassagnac, *Histoire des classes ouvrières et des classes bourgeoises* (Paris: Desrez, 1838), p. 30.

34 E. Levasseur, *Histoire des classes ouvrières en France depuis la conquête de Jules César jusqu'à la Révolution*, 2 vols. (Paris: Guillaumin, 1859), vol. 1, p. iii.