Excerpt from Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* 1848

The following is an excerpt from the first chapter of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* (1848; rev. English ed., 1888).

THE BOURGEOISIE AND PROLETARIANS

The history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggles.

Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary re-constitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes.

In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost every where a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations.

The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones. Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinctive feature: it has simplified the class antagonisms: Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes, directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat...

In proportion as the bourgeoisie, i.e., capital, is developed, in the same proportion is the proletariat, the modern working class, developed--a class of labourers, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labour increases capital. These labourers, who must sell themselves piece-meal, are a commodity, like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market.

Owing to the extensive use of machinery and to division of labour, the work of the proletarians has lost all individual character, and consequently, all charm for the workman. He becomes an appendage of the machine, and it is only the most simple, most monotonous, and most easily acquired knack, that is required of him. Hence, the cost of production of a workman is restricted, almost entirely, to the means of subsistence that he requires for his maintenance, and for the propagation of his race. But the price of a commodity, and therefore also of labour, is equal to its cost of production. In proportion therefore, as the repulsiveness of the work increases, the wage decreases. Nay more, in proportion as the use of machinery and division of labour increases, in the same proportion the burden of toil also increases, whether
by prolongation of the working hours, by increase of the work exacted in a given
time or by increased speed of the machinery, etc.

Modern industry has converted the little workshop of the patriarchal master into
the great factory of the industrial capitalist. Masses of labourers, crowded into
the factory, are organized like soldiers. As privates of the industrial army they are
placed under the command of a perfect hierarchy of officers and sergeants. Not only
are they slaves of the bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois State; they are daily and
hourly enslaved by the machine, by the over-looker, and, above all, by the individual
bourgeois manufacturer himself. The more openly this despotism proclaims gain to
be its end and aim, the more petty, the more hateful and the more embittering it is.

But with the development of industry the proletariat not only increases in number;
it becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows, and it feels that
strength more. The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the
proletariat are more and more equalized, in proportion as machinery obliterates all
distinctions of labour, and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level.
The growing competition among the bourgeois, and the resulting commercial crises,
make the wages of the workers ever more fluctuating. The unceasing improvement
of machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes their livelihood more and more
precarious; the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeois
take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. There upon the
workers begin to form combinations (Trades Unions) against the bourgeois; they
club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent
associations in order to make provision beforehand for these occasional revolts.
Here and there the contest breaks out into riots.

Now and then the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The real fruit of their
battles lies, not in the immediate result, but in the ever-expanding union of the
workers. This union is helped on by the improved means of communication that are
created by modern industry and that place the workers of different localities in
contact with one another. It was just this contact that was needed to centralize the
numerous local struggles, all of the same character, into one national struggle
between classes. But every class struggle is a political struggle. And that union, to
attain which the burghers of the Middle Ages, with their miserable highways,
required centuries, the modern proletarians, thanks to railways, achieve in a few
years.

This organization of the proletarians into a class, and consequently into a political
party, is continually being upset again by the competition between the workers
themselves. But it ever rises up again, stronger, firmer, mightier. It compels
legislative recognition of particular interests of the workers, by taking advantage of
the divisions among the bourgeoisie itself. . . .

Hitherto, every form of society has been based, as we have already seen, on the
antagonism of oppressing and oppressed classes. But in order to oppress a class,
certain conditions must be assured to it under which it can, at least, continue its slavish existence. The serf, in the period of serfdom, raised himself to membership in the commune, just as the petty bourgeois, under the yoke of feudal absolutism, managed to develop into a bourgeois. The modern laborer, on the contrary, instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class. He becomes a pauper, and pauperism develops more rapidly than population and wealth. And here it becomes evident, that the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to be the ruling class in society, and to impose its conditions of existence upon society as an over-riding law. It is unfit to rule because it is incompetent to assure an existence to its slave within his slavery, because it cannot help letting him sink into such a state, that it has to feed him, instead of being fed by him. Society can no longer live under this bourgeoisie, in other words, its existence is no longer compatible with society.

The essential condition for the existence, and for the sway of the bourgeoisie class, is the formation and augmentation of capital; the condition for capitalist wage-labour. Wage-labour rests exclusively on competition between the laborers. The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the labourers, due to competition, by their revolutionary combination, due to association. The development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie, therefore, produces, above all, is its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.

Discussion Questions

1) How did the industrial age simplify “class antagonisms,” according to Marx and Engels? What are the two classes they define here?

2) In your view, do these two classes still apply to contemporary American society? Why or why not? If so, what kinds of people or professions fall into each category?

3) Does this class structure apply to universities? Why or why not? (This is a good time to talk about the corporatization of the university.) If so, who are the bourgeoisie and who are the proletarians? (This is a good time to talk about what it means to be an adjunct.)

4) What is the strength of the proletarians, according to Marx and Engels?

5) What do they predict will eventually happen as a result of the conflict between the two classes? If you believe these classes still exist in contemporary American society, how likely do you think it is that Marx and Engels’ prediction will become reality?