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Keynote speakers

**Terrell Carver** is Professor of Political Theory at the University of Bristol. He has degrees from Columbia University and the University of Oxford, and has held visiting appointments in the USA, Australia, Japan and China. He has published widely on Marx, Engels and Marxism, including *Marx* (2018),  Friedrich Engels: His Life and Thought (re-issued for a 30th anniversary edition in 2021) and Engels Before Marx (2020).

**Helena Sheehan** is Emeritus Professor at Dublin City University with academic interests in philosophy, history of ideas, science studies and media studies. Her books include Marxism and the Philosophy of Science (2018), Navigating the Zeitgeist (2019) and *Until We Fall* (forthcoming) as well as many articles on philosophy, science, culture and politics.

**Friedrich Engels’ Two Irish Wives: Recovering the Narratives of Mary and Lizzie Burns**

**Aidan Beatty**

“Ireland”, as a real geographical place and as a discursive category, had a recurring importance for Friedrich Engels, the father of scientific socialism. In his seminal 1843 work, *The Conditions of the Working-Class in England*, Engels railed against the adverse impact that Irish migrant labourers had on their more advanced comrades in the English working class; classed as unhygienic, primitive and undisciplined, and some even still speaking “the Irish-Celtic Language”, the Irish were a decidedly negative presence in Engels’ narrative. Yet the Irish could also be a potentially revolutionary force in British politics; Engels began to develop a sense that, with the right leadership, Irish workers (not yet schooled by capitalist work ethics) could play a pivotal role in the future of British (and even global) socialism. By the 1860s, Engels (along with Marx) was seeking to build connections to Fenianism and encouraging British workers to do the same. By the end of his life, though, Engels was aghast that the Irish peasants had, apparently, turned bourgeois, choosing mortgages and private property over communist internationalism.

Behind the scenes in all this, Engels maintained close relations with two Irish women; Mary Burns (1821-1863), Engels’ common law wife, and then her sister Lydia “Lizzie” Burns (1827-1878), who formally married Engels just before her death. The history of women, like those of the working classes and racial minorities, is always bedeviled by what EP Thompson called *“*the enormous condescension of posterity”, in which illiterate peoples are erased from the historical record. Yet, it is rare to find illiterate women so close (and seemingly making a major determining impact) on the lives of literate men. Drawing on Marx and Engels’ sprawling correspondence, as well as contemporary censuses, this paper seeks to uncover why Ireland mattered for Engels and how much we can ever truly know about these two women? How much of a role did they actually play in Engels’ political and literary work? And how much have their real lives been covered up with a Marxist romanticizing of two proletarian, illiterate factory workers?

**Aidan Beatty** teaches at the Honors College of the University of Pittsburgh. His first book, *Masculinity and Power in Irish Nationalism, 1884-1938*, was published in 2016. His peer-reviewed work has appeared in the *Journal of Modern History*, *Irish Historical Studies*, the *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* and the *Journal of Jewish Studies*. His new book, *Private Property and the Fear of Social Chaos* was recently published with Manchester University Press. His next book, a study of the Trotskyist group the Workers Revolutionary Party and their Irish-born leader Gerry Healy will be published with Pluto Books in 2024. aib28@pitt.edu

**“Marxism and Chinese-style Modernisation”**

 **Wang Binglin**

Marxism is the fundamental ideology upon which China is founded and flourishing. Over the past century and more, China has promoted Chinese modernization successfully by upholding and developing Marxism, and offered the humanity a new choice to achieve modernization. It is very important to understand the great power of Marxism, and adaptation Marxism to Chinese context and the needs of our times, which will play a very crucial role in promoting the modernization of China fully.

**Prof. Wang Binglin, is** Former Director of the Social Science Development Research Center of Higher Education, Ministry of Education, Director of the Research Center of Chinese Communist Party History and Party Building, Beijing Normal University

**Engels’ revolutionary accounts of the June Days uprising**

**Katherine Connelly**

‘The insurrection is purely a workers’ uprising’ wrote Engels about the Paris June Days (1848) in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (*NRZ*). It is evident that it was Engels, rather than Marx, who reported most extensively on the uprising which they both considered of paramount importance. It is known that Engels had to rely on press reports universally hostile to the uprising and so it has been easy for subsequent historical accounts to assume that his claims about the social composition of the participants and emotive scenarios were embellishments added far away from the action in Cologne. These approaches have relied on the various collected works which separate Marx and Engels’ writing from the publications in which they appeared. This paper offers a contrasting re-reading of Engels’ June Days reports within the context of the *NRZ*. This reveals that Engels relied on eyewitness reports from contacts in Paris that were published alongside his own. They contained conversations in the cafes and the testimonies of wounded insurgents – unique because they were not mediated by the forces of repression. Read in context, Engels’ reports offer exceptional insights on the June Days and the practice of revolutionary journalism.

**Dr Katherine Connelly** is a writer, lecturer and activist. She has recently written on Karl Marx’s theory of the lumpenproletariat in Paris’ June Days for the edited collection *The Idea of the Lumpenproletariat* (Routledge, forthcoming). Kate was awarded her PhD in History from Queen Mary, University of London, in 2018 for her thesis ‘Conjuring away the Revolution: Parisian popular culture in Marx’s writings on the French Second Republic’. She is the author of *Sylvia Pankhurst: Suffragette, Socialist and Scourge of Empire* (Pluto Press, 2013) and edited/introduced E. Sylvia Pankhurst, *A Suffragette in America* (Pluto Press, 2019). She teaches at London centres of New York University, Boston University, Arcadia University and Lawrence University. Kate is branch chair of NYU London UCU. katherine.connelly@nyu.edu

**Engels’ Utopianism Revisited**

**Judy Cox**

Engels published *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* in the spring of 1880. The publication expanded previous critiques of socialism, most notably in the *Communist Manifesto* (1848). Many followers of Engels assume that he was scathing in his attacks on the “utopian socialism” of Owen, Fourier and Saint-Simon. Utopianism socialism has been dismissed asa principled but obsolete precursor of scientific socialism. As the working-class challenge to capitalism was beginning to take emerge, utopian socialism generated opposition to competition and the free market. However, when Marxism provided a fully scientific account of capitalist relations, there is no longer any need for the beautiful, or ludicrous, dreams of the early socialists.

However, utopian imaginings have proved to be an enduring element of Marxist literature, animating texts such as William Morris’s *News from Nowhere*. This paper will address the reasons for the persistence of socialist utopias by returning to Engel’s relationship with the early socialists, which was more complex than is often assumed. Engels praised Saint Simon’s analysis of the French Revolution as ‘a most pregnant discover’, he thought Fourier as much a master of the dialectic as Hegel and paid tribute to Owen’s brave attempts to enact communism despite facing ‘Outlawry, excommunication from official society, the loss of his whole social position’. Engels also wrote several articles for Owen’s paper, *The New Moral World*, between 1843-5. Utopian socialism may have been ‘A mish-mash’, but it was and remains a powerful current within socialist critiques of capitalism and imaginings of alternative ways of organising society.

**Judy Cox** works as a primary school teacher. She was awarded an MA with distinction in Victorian Studies from the University of Birkbeck and has recently submitted a PhD thesis on the women in the Chartist Movement which she researched at Leeds University. She is the author of several books including *The Women's Revolution: Russia 19015-1917* (Haymarket Press) and the *Rebellious Daughters of History* (Redwords). judycox2000@yahoo.co.uk

**“Why the view ‘Marx contra Engels’ is wrong”**

**Prof. Li Dianlai**

发言摘要：恩格斯的自然辩证法与马克思的辩证法思想具有根本的一致性， 恩格斯也没有因为研究自然辩证法而下降到费尔巴哈式的直观唯物主义的水平，同时他也没有用研究自然界的方式来研究人类历史。恩格斯与马克思存在兴趣点上的差异，但将他们对立起来的观点却是站不住脚的。

Engels’ dialectics of nature and Marx’s dialectics have a fundamental consistency. His research of natural dialectics did not degrade into Feuerbach’s perceptual materialism, nor did he research human history in the way of researching nature. Engels and Marx had different research interests，but the view of opposing them is untenable.

李佃来院长、教授

**Prof. Li Dianlai** is Dean of School of Philosophy at Wuhan University

**Engels the revolutionary**

**Lindsey German**

Friedrich Engels spent his whole life engaged in political activity. He was, like Marx, committed to the idea of working class revolution and he saw his first glimpses of this in the Lancashire general strike of 1842, and in the Chartist movement more generally. His direct experience of revolution was that of Germany in 1848 where he and Marx described themselves as on ‘ the extreme left of the democracy movement’. The failure of the wave of European revolutions by 1849 changed the terrain on which he was able to organise however. Firstly the prospect of a mass working class or socialist party receded after the defeats of 1848, and this relegated the Communists to small groups. Secondly the focus of revolutionary and radical change took the form of national liberation or democratic movements – in Poland, Ireland, in the US during the civil war, in Italy for unification. Engels showed great enthusiasm for these contests and regarded them as democratic movements which if successful would have a huge impact on achieving democracy everywhere.

In the later years of his life, he saw the prospects of mass socialist parties again being built – in his native Germany but also internationally. His assessment of the revival of the British workers’ movement following the New Unions upsurge in the late 1880s led him to understand the need for a party of labour in Britain, and he was involved in the establishment of the ILP in the years before his death. This paper argues that his guiding principles were both the self activity and self emancipation of the working class, and the defence of democratic and national rights as a means of challenging the old structures of feudalism and absolutism. His active engagement with all these movements demonstrated his lifelong commitment to revolutionary change, and his awareness of the impact particular struggles could have on the wider movement was profound.

**Dr Lindsey German** is a writer and campaigner who has written extensively on Marxism and socialism, revolution, working class history and women. She has written several books, including *A People's History of London* (with John Rees),(Verso 2012), *How a Century of War Changed the Lives of Women* (Pluto 2014) and *Material Girls* (Bookmarks 2007). Her PhD is on class and feminism. She has taught work organisation, employment relations and equality and diversity at the University of Hertfordshire. She is also a campaigner against war, and has spoken on a range of platforms. She is a regular media contributor, including the *Guardian, Independent*, *Any Questions*, (BBC) Jeremy Vine (BBC) , BBC News, and Sky News. germanlindsey@hotmail.com

**Engels and the *Communist Manifesto*: Against the Condescension of the Historians**

**Tom Hickey**

 From even before the death of his collaborator, Marx, the reputation, intellectual standing and contribution of Engels has been minimised or marginalised. Treated by intellectual historians and many biographers as, at best, an intellectual sounding board for Marx’s original contributions and as an able proselytizer for Marx’s ideas, Engels’ status is often and typically reduced to that of an epigone, or of an accomplished but dutiful assistant. As one of the historians has put it, he was Marx’s “loyal lieutenant”. In the words of another, he was Marx’s “glosser”. Not least is this the case in the treatment of Engels in respect of the attribution of responsibility and credit for the *Manifesto*. One historian commissioned to introduce one of the English editions reduces Engels’ authorial role, on page one of his 47-page Introduction, to supplying “some of the ideas”, and only mentions him twice more and in passing. Yet a close reading of the joint and separate works of the two friends and collaborators demonstrates, or at least suggests, that the opposite is the case. The evidence offers no support to such condescension.

**Tom Hickey** is an Honorary Research Fellow at the University of Brighton, and a member of the British Committee for the Universities of Palestine (BRICUP). One of the founding members of undergraduate programme in the Humanities at the University of Brighton, he was the Course Leader for the MA Cultural and Critical Theory and the BA (Hons.) Philosophy, Politics, Art. Currently supervising doctoral research on the philosophical implications of digital interfaces in art experience, his previous PhD supervisions have included research on Althusserian Marxism, on Analytical Marxism, and on the philosophy of music. He is currently completing two monographs – on Feasible Socialisms and on Freedom and Image: Political Ontologies of Representation. t.hickey2@brighton.ac.uk

**Reclaiming Engels for our times: gender oppression, capitalism and revolution**

**Marnie Holborow**

Most Marxist feminists have little time for Engels. Lise Vogel’s criticism of Engels is that an over-focus on property relations family prevented him explaining the persistence of male authority in the working-class family (Vogel 2013). Others claim that Engels laid the seeds of a dual systems theory of women’s oppression, by implying that the family and reproduction were relatively autonomous from production (Gimenez 1984). Engels is also judged to be an economic determinist, less nuanced than Marx and tainted by his own ‘oppositional sexism’ (Brown 2013; Lewis 2016).

Counter to these views, this paper asserts the value of Engels integrated historical materialist approach for understanding gender oppression in capitalism today (Holborow, forthcoming). The key to Engels’ analysis is that kinship/ family units are shaped and function differently according to the mode of production (Engels 1972). Despite the paucity of anthropological evidence available to him at the time, the paper argues that Engels offers a convincing and socially dynamic account of the social functions of the family in different social systems. It also makes the case that seeing gender oppression as a product of history not of biology, Engels provides us with an early account of the social construction of gender.

His insight was to appreciate the degree to which changes to capitalism disrupted materially and ideologically home life for working people, even if this led him to make some mistaken predictions about the working class family (Engels 1984). He foregrounded the political significance of women joining the ranks of wage labour in the early days of industrial capitalism, an understanding which remains relevant today. Furthermore, both Marx’s and Engels observations concerning the experience of oppression being conditioned by social class have become even more evident in contemporary neoliberal capitalism (Eisenstein 2009; Aruzza *et al* 2019).

Finally, Engels’ locating the capitalist family alongside other superstructural institutions, such as the state and the legal system, brings out the unstable condition of individual homes and care in capitalism. This frame also carries the important political conclusion that for the sources of women’s oppression to be lifted, radical changes to the capitalist relations of production are required.

**Marnie Holborow**, Associate Faculty of Dublin City University, has written widely on politics and language. Currently, she is writing on women and the working class, gender oppression in late capitalism, and the anti-gender backlash from the far right.  She is author of a forthcoming book entitled *Homes in Crisis Capitalism* with Bloomsbury.  She is an activist with People before Profit in Ireland. marnie.holborow@dcu.ie

**THE INFLUENCE OF FRIEDRICH ENGELS’S WORKS ON THE BEGINNINGS OF THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IN ROMANIA (1870-1900)**

**Ionuț C. Isac**

The communication aims at remembering and analysing certain aspects of how Marxism was received, in the first decades of the Romanian socialist movement (1870-1900). The socialist milieus of the Romanian intellectuals contributed to spreading the Marxist ideas via the mass-media, round-table studies, workers clubs, meetings etc., reason for which the works of Marxism’s founders were translated, papers to popularise the Marxism were drafted and debates of the main social issue of that time were organised, all from a Marxist perspective. We, thus, highlight the very important role held by the papers published by Fr. Engels for the intellectual configuration of the Romanian socialist movement, some of them being worldwide premiere translations: *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*; *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*; *The Historical Materialism; Anti-Dühring* etc. On the grounds of these works, the famous Romanian Marxist thinkers of the time, as Constantin Dobrogeanu-Gherea (1855-1920), Ioan Nădejde (1854-1927) and Panait Mușoiu (1864-1944) published influential critically-polemic studies on the themes of dialectical and historical materialism, scientific socialism, state and law theory, ethics, aesthetics etc. Some of them corresponded with Engels, both concerning the translations made, as well as the principle issues of the socialist movement organisation. From these correspondences results that Engels particularly appreciated their efforts, offered them his opinions, as well as advice to continue their activity. Our work is meant as a non-ideological homage brought to Engels’ intellectual personality, which has practically been forgotten following the disastrous failure of the communist regime in Romania (1945-1989).

***Ionuț Isac*** is Senior Researcher at the „George Barițiu” Institute of History, Romanian Academy, Cluj-Napoca Branch, where he is project manager in the history of modern Romanian philosophy. His degrees are from „Babeș-Bolyai” University in Cluj-Napoca, Department of History and Philosophy, and he has attended conferences in the Republic of Moldova, Germany, France, Switzerland, United Kingdom, USA and other countries. His main fields of specialisation are history of philosophy, epistemology and theory of education. He researched particularly on the connections between the Romanian philosophy and Central-/ East-European philosophy. He has published extensively on modern and contemporary philosophy, as well as on history of culture and education. His current research project (in a team) is focused on the phenomenon of morality as seen in the contemporary philosophical thought. isac.ionut@cluj.astral.ro

**Engels’ Conception of Dialectics in the *Plan 1878* of *Dialectics of Nature***

**Kaan Kangal**

This article intends to offer an overview of Engels’ conception of dialectics in the *Plan 1878* (MS 164) of *Dialectics of Nature*. Going against the grain of classical readings of Engels’ work, it firstly proposes to distinguish three larger and four smaller projects that make up what posthumously became to be known as ‘Dialectics of Nature’. It argues that what is commonly regarded as *the* plan of *Dialectics of Nature* was actually planned to be the plan of Engels’ second project. Then it goes on to elaborate on the (con)textual background and theoretical function of Engels’ definition of dialectics as ‘science of universal inter-connection’ in contradistinction to his previous and later manuscripts of *Dialectics of Nature*. The purpose of this take is to unfold the internal tensions of Engels’ contentions present throughout the entire writing process. For instance, Engels largely works with two parameters of opposition: metaphysics vs. dialectics, and idealism vs. materialism. The theoretical arena in which he defends dialectics and materialism against metaphysics and idealism is shaped by a third pair of opposites which he tries to overcome: natural sciences vs. philosophy. Read against the problem field in which Engels orients himself, this article defends that the content as well as intention of the *Plan 1878* falls short of establishing a consistent ontology of nature, defending dialectics and materialism against metaphysics and idealism, and overcoming the divergence between philosophy and natural sciences. Engels’ shortcomings remained largely unresolved in the post-1878 period, an obvious fact which a significant number of researchers fail to take into account.

**Kaan Kangal** is an associate professor at the Center for Studies of Marxist Social Theory in the Philosophy Department of Nanjing University. His work on *Marx’s Bonn Notebooks* won the 2019 David Riazanov Prize. He recently published the book *Friedrich Engels and the Dialectics of Nature* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2020). kaankangal@googlemail.com

**Engels' Bremen Years: Start of a Great Career**

**Johann-Günther König**

 Friedrich Engels lived and worked in the Free Hanseatic City of Bremen from 11th August 1838 to late March 1841. The Bremen years marked the start of his pre-eminent career in journalism, politics and economics – albeit under the pseudonym of *Friedrich Oswald,* a fact that only came to light long after his death.

In his Bremen years between the ages of 18 and 20, Friedrich Engels developed all the skills that he soon afterwards put to use as co-author of the ‘Communist Manifesto’ and as an ever-reliable motivator and advisor to Karl Marx, whose defining work ‘Capital’ would not have come to fruition without him. But it was not by chance that Engels – under the widely recognised name of Friedrich Oswald – was able to lay the foundation for a career that changed the world in Bremen. Nothing and no-one stood in his way in this city. Between 1838 and 1841, he voraciously read democratic journals, all kinds of newspapers and magazines, chapbooks, works by Goethe, writings by Börne and virtually every new publication by the young generation of German writers called Young Germany. Friedrich Engels would either sit in his favourite spot in St. Martin’s parish garden with views of the river Weser and the Schlachte, in his lodgings, at the trading house or on the warehouse floor, or in the reading room at the Union club. He also considerably broadened his knowledge of shorthand and foreign languages.

During his Bremen years, Friedrich Engels lived a double life: that of a genial merchant’s clerk, a lodger and an enthusiastic drinking partner; and that of a journalist, commentator and intellectual, writing about literature, society and religion under a pseudonym. The liberal city offered the talented industrialist’s son conditions that played an instrumental part in his incredible development: an employer who was unusually tolerant, a landlord and landlady who allowed him every conceivable freedom, a censorship commission that was remarkably restrained, a well-established music scene, and societies that fostered the education of young businessmen.

 **Johann-Günther König** is a freelance writer.He has written more than 35  books mostly on political economy, cultural history and as well biographies. He studied social pedagogy and earned a Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Bremen. His book: "Friedrich Engels. Die Bremer Jahre. 1839 bis 1841 (Bremen: Kellner Verlag 2008)" - a detailed biography which includes all letters, writing and drawings from the historical-critical complete works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (MEGA) - has become a standard reference work for Engels' Bremen years. schreiben.an@johann-guenther-koenig.de

**Friedrich Engels as a Moral Thinker**

**Renzo Llorente**

Nearly four decades ago, the philosopher Kai Nielsen observed, “Friedrich Engels wrote more fully and perhaps more adequately about morality than did Karl Marx.” Nielsen’s observation is unexceptionable, and it is therefore quite surprising that scholars should have devoted relatively little attention to Engels’s views on morality, at least in comparison with the extensive literature on Marx’s comments, or implicit positions, on moral matters. But careful consideration of the texts in which Engels addresses moral questions, from such early works as the “Speeches in Elberfeld” (1845) to *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy* (1886), confirms that he wrote both more fully *and* more adequately about morality than did Marx.

Among the most noteworthy aspects of Engels’s writing on moral questions are his elucidation of the class character and ideological nature of moral views; his thesis that the moral outlook of the proletariat represents the most advanced morality; his resistance to, and criticism of, excessively reductionistic explanations of moral phenomena; and his analysis of equality.

Taken together, these ideas constitute a distinctively communist outlook on morality and moral questions.

**Renzo Llorente** teaches philosophy at Saint Louis University-Madrid. He is the author of *The Political Theory of Che Guevara* (Rowman and Littlefield International) and B*eyond the Pale: Exercises in Provocation* (Vagabond Voices), as well as many articles in political philosophy, ethics and Latin American philosophy. He is also the translator and editor of T*he Marxism of Manuel Sacristán: From Communism to the New Social Movements* (Brill). He is currently completing a book on the political thought of Fidel Castro. renzo.llorente@slu.edu

**Engels, Tom Mann and the New Unionism**

**Terry McCarthy**

All the components for revolutionary change (historical and dialectical materialism) existed amongst the English working class instead they chose gradualism. This frustrated Frederick Engels leading him to write letters and articles complaining about the lack of class consciousness amongst organised labour.

The New Union Movement came as a complete surprise to Engels he wrote in 1885 in an article for the Commonweal: “The East end of London is an over-spreading pool of stagnant misery and desolation, of starvation when out of work, and degradation, physical and moral, when in work The East end of London is an over-spreading pool of stagnant misery and desolation, of starvation when out of work, and degradation, physical and moral, when in work “

Engels had underestimated, which is still the case with Anglo-Marxist historians, the Social Union of ethnic minorities, especially in areas like the Docklands that were forming Trade Unions before the 1889 Dock Strike. Often ignored is the founding of the Stevedores Union in 1871 which was predominantly Irish or Anglo-Irish

The role in founding trade unions and the teaching of socialism within the Jewish community has been well documented by historian Bill Fishman, however ethnic minorities within Docklands and their importance to the new union movement has often been overlooked.

Also understated is the importance of the Match Women Strike and the successful struggle of Eleanor Marx supported by Engels to get the leader of the Gas Workers Will Thorne to allow women members of the Gas Workers Union Ben Tillett rejected out of hand women being  allowed in the Dock Workers Union. I was bequeathed unpublished letters from and to Tom Mann some of the correspondence concerns Frederick Engels (Warwick University has a record of some of this correspondence but not the personal letters about Engels and the New Union movement and its leaders)

**Terry McCarthy:** I began work at 15 as a labourer in London’s Docklands are always a member of the young communist league from my early teens and was active in the anti-fascist and trade union movements I became a shop steward and was involved in several industrial disputes.  I became a student at Ruskin College and then moved on to Sussex University. When national museum of labour history was founded in 1975 I took the post of curator and then the Director of the National Museum of Labour History in Limehouse London.

I helped John Bird In setting up the *Big Issue* and subsequently set up my charity teaching children with special educational needs. My publications include *The Great Dock Strike 1889.  Labour v Sinn Fein the last Revolution*.  *An Abridged History of the Trades and Labour Movement from the industrial revolution to the present day* *A Short History of the British Labour Movement.* At present I’m working on a rewrite of the 1889 Dock strike with an emphasis on the role of ethnic minorities in the new union movement. mccarthy790@btopenworld.com

**Engels on ‘The Part played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man’**

**Sheila McGregor:**

*Engels’s short text was written in 1876. He outlined a materialist account of the evolution of human beings based on Darwin’s theory of evolution: - On the Origin of Species was published in 1859 and Descent of Man in 1871. Unlike Darwin and his followers, who focused on the size of the human brain, Engels focused on ”labour” as “the prime basic condition of all human existence”. Much has been learned about our evolution since Darwin and Engels’s time. Engels’s approach is considered irrelevant. This paper will look at some of the ways scientists’ world views impede insights into our past and repose the question of whether Engels’s focus on the concept of “labour” is still useful today.*

**Sheila McGregor:** I am a regular contributor to *International Socialism Journal*. I contributed an article on “Engels on women, the family, class and gender” in 2021 to the issue on Engels of Human Geography. sheila14mcgregor@gmail.com

**The Ragged-Trousered Samaritans:** **Engels’s Labouring Men in ‘The Condition of the Working Class in England’**

**Raza Naeem**

 Frederick Engels was twenty-four years old when he wrote ‘The Condition of the Working Class in England’. However the truth is that this book remains today, as it was in 1845, by far the best single book on the working class of the period. Subsequent historians have regarded, and continue to regard it as such, except for a recent group of critics, motivated by ideological dislike. It is not the last word on the subject, for 175 years of research have added to our knowledge of working-class conditions, especially in the areas with which Engels had no close personal acquaintance. It is a book of its time. But nothing can take its place in the library of every 19th century historian and everyone interested in the working-class movement. It remains an indispensable work and a landmark in the fight for the emancipation of humanity. On the occasion of Engels’s bicentennial, the paper not only gives a historical and personal – though not uncritical - background in which Engels wrote the book, but also deals with the accusations of its anti-Marxist critics who accuse him of plagiarism in the light of available evidence and sources; argues and analyzes the work within the corpus of literature produced about the Industrial Revolution; and questions raised in the work about the type of working class which capitalism produces, what are its conditions of life, and what sort of individual and collective behavior do these material conditions create; how far is Engels’s description of the British working class in 1844 reliable and comprehensive; as well as addressing critics of the work such as V.A. Huber, B. Hildebrand, de Tocqueville and Henry Colman*.*

**Raza Naeem** is a Pakistani social scientist, book critic, blogger and an award-winning translator and dramatic reader currently based in Lahore. He has been trained in Political Economy from the University of Leeds in UK, and in Middle Eastern History and Anthropology from the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, US. He is the recipient of a prestigious 2013-2014 *Charles Wallace Trust Fellowship*. He is currently the President of the *Progressive Writers Association* in Lahore. He has written the introduction to the reissued edition (HarperCollins India, 2016) of Abdullah Hussein's classic partition novel *The Weary Generations* (Udas Naslein). His most recent work is a contribution to the edited volume *Jallianwala Bagh: Literary Responses in Prose & Poetry* (Niyogi Books, 2019). His forthcoming work is a popular history of the pioneers of Islamic socialism in the Indian subcontinent, tentatively titled *Inquilab Zindabad*! (LeftWord Books, 2020)

**Young Engels and the critique of political economy**

**Alkis Nikolakeas**

The theoretical relationship between Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, is a main issue in the study of Marxian social theory. On one hand, the epistemological and philosophical approaches of two friends are different, but on the other hand we can see the influence Engels exerted in Marx’s work. In this proposed presentation, we are going to analyze the article under the title *Outlines of a Critique of Political Economy* (1844), and the influence of Engels in Marxian critique of political economy.

More specifically, in order to confirm some elements of the aforementioned influence, we are going to discuss the following questions:

1. The problem of humanity’s emancipation and the anthropological approach in young Engels, based on the methodological problematic of usage of the tools of the critique of religion in the critique of political economy,
2. The epistemological approach of private property and competition as civil society’s mediations and as legal and ideological fields to establish not only the critical method, but also the political action.

We argue that in the same Engelsian work, the social phenomenon of competition in Engels’ thought, can be a starting point for more social phenomena such as individualism, immorality and the social differences from the modern division of labour, in dialectical consistent presentation of the categories [Darstellung]. This study targets to set the foundations in an important confabulation of the reconstruction of Marxian dialectic, the method of critique and the political appeal of social emancipation, and Engels could not be absent.

 **Alkis Nikolakeas** is a PhD Candidate at the Department of Sociology, University of Crete, Greece. He has studied Sociology in University of Crete and earned his master's degree from the same Department. The title of his PhD Thesis is “*Critique of ideological forms of consciousness and modern egoism in Hegel and Feuerbach*”. His publications and announcements focus on forms of consciousness, the theoretical and practical problems of social emancipation and the issues of freedom, social power and modern forms of egoism and individualism (K. Marx, F. Engels, G.W.F. Hegel, L. Feuerbach et al.). His research interests lie in the area of Social Theory, Epistemology of Social Sciences, Sociology of Religion and the Critique of Ideology. nikolakeas\_alkis@hotmail.com

**Engels on Colonialism: Ireland and the Agency of the Colonised**

**Ken Olende**

Engels’ 1856 tour of Ireland was key to the political shift in his and Marx’s shift away from the idea that colonialism might have a progressive element – if only in fomenting the development of a working class. This paper will examine how this relatively early experience, before the Great Indian Uprising of 1857, was part of a shift that looked to the agency of the oppressed peoples in their own liberation. This replaced the idea that they should wait for help from an outside working class or the development of their own working class. As such it was part of seeing capitalism as an interrelated world system. It will discuss the extent to which that Engels view was consistent and evolved in the decade he remained active after Marx’s death in 1883. He did not write extensively on this matter, but the paper will look at how he related to the attitudes of other socialists at the end of his life, such as his 1882 comment that “the proletariat emancipating itself cannot conduct any colonial wars”.

**Ken Olende** is researching a PhD on race and identity at the University Brighton. He was a tutor in Black and African history for the Workers' Educational Association. He has worked as a journalist for *Socialist Worker* and edited the Unite Against Fascism magazine *Unity*. Recent publications include "Marx and race: a Eurocentric analysis?", *International Socialism journal* (2019), "The 'hostile environment' for immigrants, the Windrush scandal and resistance" in Hart, Greener & Mothe (eds) *Resist the Punitive State* (Pluto, 2020) and "Cedric Robinson, racial capitalism and the return of black radicalism", *International Socialism journal* (2021). k.olende@brighton.ac.uk

**Frederick Engels on State Socialism**

**Joe Pateman**

In Frederick Engels’ ideological legacy, the criticism of the reformist conception that was once known as ‘state socialism’ has a prominent, if overlooked place. According to this nineteenth century conception, the essence of socialism is that the state intervenes in the economy and social relations in terms of a state policy based on the capitalist economic system. This ‘false socialism’, as Engels termed it, was, on the one hand, the fruit of the petty-bourgeois illusions of the utopian socialists, who anticipated ‘the introduction of socialism from above’ by the government, and on the other hand, the result of the deliberate falsification of the policy of the exploiting state by its ideologists. Their aim was to paint every government effort to regulate the economy and social relations as ‘socialism’. Then, with the inception of modern imperialism in the twentieth century, Lenin showed that this concept became a tool of the apologists of state monopoly capitalism. This paper highlights the timeless relevance of Engels’ analysis of state socialism. The first section provides a chronological examination of his writings on the concept. It argues that Engels’ criticisms provide an important insight into the objective conditions for socialism. Section two argues that his critique can inform the ideological struggle amongst socialists today. Most notably, it can be utilised as useful bulwark against the pseudo-socialist trends that have sought to gloss over, appropriate and implement the repressive features of contemporary state monopoly capitalism. The conclusion briefly summarises the main purpose and significance of Engels’ analysis.

**Joe Pateman** is a teaching associate in the Department of Politics and International Relations at the University of Sheffield. Joe's main research interests are Marxism-Leninism, black politics, and liberation politics. His recent publications include *Public Libraries and Marxism* (Routledge, 2021). joepateman@yahoo.co.uk

**Friedrich Engels – Oscillating between Anticolonialism and Military Expertise**

**Detlev Quintern**

It was Mary Burns, the Irish cotton spinner in the Manchester based production side of *Ermen & Engels* and life-long companion of Friedrich Engels – his father owned the company partly – who not only opened the eyes of the rich German industrialist to the hardship of the English-Irish working class but also sensitized Engels for the Irish Question. During the early 1840s Engels looked down to the Irish scornfully while changing his attitude later which holds true also for Karl Marx on whom his wife Jenny had a similar impact. Both classics interlinked later Ireland and India when it comes to the question of British Imperialism, underlining the decisive impulse of the anti-colonial résistance for the social revolution in England. On the other hand, the extended military writings of Friedrich Engels who wrote also for imperial military reviews lay not only his strong interest in military strategies and tactics bare but show also the ambivalent and contradictory position regarding anticolonial résistance be it in India, Egypt or Sudan. Not different from Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels followed an assumed socio-economic lawfulness of globalizing capitalism – an inevitable process which does not allow detrimental actions.

**Detlev Quintern** teaches history, cultural heritage and museum studies at Turkish German University in Istanbul. He contributes to the Institute of Postcolonial and Transcultural Studies at Bremen University where he lastly co-edited a volume under the title: *From Marx to Global Marxism: Eurocentrism, Resistance, Postcolonial Criticism* (Trier 2020). He currently works on the edition of a volume *on Antiimperial Rosa Luxemburg.* cdq@uni-bremen.de

**Military Tactics, Technology and Power.**

**Friedrich Engels on the Evolution of Warfare**

**Palle Rasmussen**

Engels was an acknowledged expert on military matters. From the 1850’s onwards, he studied military history and theory and wrote on different aspects of warfare. Part of this writing consisted in newspaper articles about contemporary conflicts, such as the Franco-Prussian war, the American Civil War and British wars in India and China. Another part was surveys of different weapons and military forces, including article series for periodicals and for the *New American Encyclopedia* (1857-60). He also contributed broader strategic studies such as ‘Po and Rhine’ (1859).

In the paper, I will discuss Engels’ analysis of the evolution of warfare in the second half of the 19th century, He considered the complex relationships between socio-political regimes, technology, military organization and tactics. He saw the development of technologies such as rifled guns, machine guns and ironclad warships as changing the character of warfare towards an industrial model that made most existing types of offensive tactics futile. Further, the industrialized warfare demanded great technological capacity and immense investments from the states, and this would lead to what was later called the ‘military-industrial complex’. Together, these factors would lead to much more comprehensive and destructive warfare than earlier, threatening the very fabric of societies. In his writings on war, Engels usually included considerations of the consequences for the working class movement; and in the last part of his life, he saw it as an urgent task for the movement to roll back the growing militarism in Europe.

**Palle Rasmussen**, emeritus professor, Department of Culture and Learning, Aalborg University, Denmark My main field is educational research, focusing on adult education and education policy. I have also written on critical social theory, including Marxism. Last year I published a book (in Danish) on Engels and his work; *Friedrich Engels og historisk materialisme [Friedrich Engels and Historical Materialism]*. Aalborg University Press 2020; <https://vbn.aau.dk/ws/portalfiles/portal/456355089/FriedrichEngels_OA.pdf>

Web: <https://vbn.aau.dk/en/persons/109880>

Email: palleras@ikl.aau.dk

**The urban political ecology of Friedrich Engels**

**Camilla Royle**

The past few years have witnessed both the acceleration of climate breakdown and a radical response from groups such as Extinction Rebellion and the global school strike movement. There are also the beginnings of a return to discussions of ecological Marxism. What role can Engels play in these discussions? Scholars such as John Bellamy Foster have rejected the notion that Engels took a fundamentally different approach to Marx on questions of ecology. However, Kohei Saito counters that a distinction between the two thinkers is clearest when ecological questions are taken into account; Engels was apparently insufficiently aware of the implications of his work in the natural sciences for an integrated understanding of human-environment relations. However, the distinctive contribution of Engels’ work on urban environments is somewhat overlooked in Saito’s account.

This paper will address this omission by drawing out some of Engels’ insights into what we now call urban political ecology. In his classic *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (1845) Engels demonstrates the ways in which urban environments that are detrimental to workers are produced under capitalism. However, in *The Housing Question* (1872), he makes clear that he does not wish for a return to a rural existence. Engels also rejects the Proudhonist solution - workers owning their own homes - calling instead for revolutionary change so that workers collectively own the products of their labour. This has implications for environmentalism today where strategies based on changing consumption patterns contrast with demands centred on workplace action.

 **Dr Camilla Royle** is an LSE Fellow in Human Geography. She is the author of A *Rebel’s Guide to Engels* (Bookmarks, 2020) and a chapter on “Engels as an Ecologist” in the collection *Engels in the 21st Century: Re-examination from a Critical Perspective* (Palgrave, 2021). She edited the Engels special issue of the journal *Human Geography* (2021). camillaroyle1986@gmail.com

**“The Future of the Family, Private Property, and the State: Insight from Marx's Late Manuscripts”**

**David N. Smith**

This paper is an outgrowth of my work as the editor of *Marx’s World: Global Society and Capital Accumulation in Marx’s Late Manuscripts* (Yale University, *forthcoming*). The centerpiece of this volume is the suite of manuscripts Engels found in Marx’s archive and publicized, to great effect, in his renowned *Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*. That text is exceedingly well-known – and yet much about the background and import of that work remains obscure.

In 1972, Marx’s original manuscripts appeared under the title *The Ethnological Notebooks of Karl Marx.* But that volume was a polyglot transcription in alternating German and English with interpolations in Greek, Spanish, French, Hindi, Gaelic, and other languages. My volume is in English and clearly distinguishes Marx’s comments from his citations, in every line. What emerges from this text – and from the mass of related manuscripts which will appear in a forthcoming volume of the *Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe* – is eye-opening.

What Engels reported was essential but only half the story. Marx, it becomes clear, was just as keenly interested in the contemporary status of communal cultures as he was in the emergence, from those cultures, of patriarchy and class dynamics. Capitalism was growing into a world in which pre-class cultures were still present on every continent. Those cultures presented globalizing capital with obstacles and opportunities. That remains true even now – and so, too, is what Engels and Marx learned about those cultures.

**David Smith** works at the point of intersection between political sociology, political psychology, and political economy at the University of Kansas. He is keenly interested in all of the many ways in which people think and feel about democracy and tolerance, not only in politics but in culture and the economy. That interest, and a background in social theory, has led him to pursue an ever-expanding menu of research – on prejudice and intolerance, authority and authoritarianism, the Holocaust and the Rwandan genocide of 1994; on charisma and crisis, capitalism and labor. In each of these areas, he seeks multi-faceted insight by whatever means are available – socio-historical study, survey research, and close reading, especially of texts by major sociological theorists. emerald@ku.edu

**Engels, private property and the State**

**Greta Sykes**

 In German the word for history is ‘Geschichte’, meaning ‘layered story’.  Kornemann (1992) comments ‘We need a vertical not just horizontal way of looking at old narratives in order to view the layering of history.’ When incorporating antiquity and history before writing we gain a more comprehensive perspective of the human story, because the ancient times go back many thousands of years before the invention of writing. Judith Foster (2013) puts it another way in the subtitle to her book ‘Invisible women of prehistory: Three million years of peace, six thousand years of war.’

Engel’s publication ‘On the Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State’ came out in Zurich in 1884 as an edition of 5000 copies. ‘The struggle between men and women was the first class struggle in history’ Engels states. Lenin appraised the book in his lecture ‘The State’ delivered at the Sverdlov University, July 11, 1919 commenting: This is one of the fundamental works of modern socialism, every sentence of which can be accepted with confidence, in the assurance that it has not been said at random, but is based on immense historical and political material.’

Engels work is founded on anthropological studies that had been undertaken by Lewis H. Morgan, the founder of the American Anthropological society and the work of the Swiss professor of Roman law and anthropologist Johann Jakob Bachofen. Both scientist made detailed studies of cultural differences and a range of practices among peoples  in relation to male and female roles and expectations which suggested that the possible ways of how families organised themselves varied more than  had previously assumed. Evelyn Reed in his foreword to the 1972 publication of Engels book comments:

Morgan’s data confirmed the Marxist principle that social institutions are not unchanging or eternal but come into existence at certain periods of history as a result of specific socioeconomic conditions.’

We are today nowhere near equality for women in spite of a hundred years of campaigns and legislation.

**Dr Greta Sykes** is a German/English writer and poet. She trained in psychology and worked as a professional tutor on the doctoral programme (Institute of Education) teaching child, adolescent and educational psychology. She is currently an Honorary Research Fellow (UCL) and has produced a range of published essays which can be viewed on academia.edu and on liveencounters.net. She has published two volumes of poetry as well as two novels, *Under Charred Skies* and *The Defeat of Gilgamesh.* With the title *‘Unter verbranntem Himmel’* her book was published in Germany in 2016. She contributes regularly to the newsletter of the socialist History Society (SHS). She has contributed an essay to ‘1917 The Russian Revolution, Reactions and Impact’, SHS OP No 41 and written an essay for ‘Writers of the Left in an age of extremes’, SHS OP No 46. She is co-chair of the Socialist History Society. With her background in psychology Greta is able to delve into the history of exclusion that women have experienced and are experiencing – her main area of focus - and thus help to shed a particular light on matters around the subject.

gretafsykes@hotmail.com

**Interpretation of the Materialistic-Historical View of Chinese-style Modernisation**

**Professor Xia Wei,**

Modernization is a global phenomenon, and the greatest "reality" and universal historical destiny faced by everyone in civilized countries. From a materialist perspective, the history of modernization, in essence, is a history of social power shaped by emotions. World history has always been a power structure, with capital the dominant power, which has laid the foundation for modern civilization and determined its direction.

The possibility of a new form of human civilization created by Chinese-style modernization at the level of ideas lies in the rootedness of the sensual spirit of Chinese excellent traditional culture. The main difference between Chinese and Western cultures is that Western cultural spirit is based on rational norms, while Chinese cultural spirit is rooted in sensual life. It is precisely in this aspect that China harbors the potential to break free from the logic of capital at the ideological level. The possibility of a new form of human civilization created by Chinese-style modernization at the level of reality lies in rejecting capitalist modernization and ending the absolute power of capital. Abandonment is carried out from two dimensions: actively acquiring the achievements of capital civilization and effectively restraining and controlling capital. Chinese-style modernization will not only be the modernization of things but also the modernization of people, the modernization of the community of human beings and nature, and the modernization of the community of human destiny. It will be the most likely path to end the absolute power of capital and create a new form of human civilization.

**Professor Xia Wei**, School of Marxism, Fudan University

**Engels on Climate Change?**

**Derek Wall**

With the Met Office recording 2022 as Britain’s hottest year on record and concern over climate change rising, it is worth considering how concepts and approaches mobilised by Friedrich Engels might help us in 2023 to better understand this challenge. John Bellamy Foster’s pioneering research in *Marx’s Ecology* places environmental questions at the centre of Marx and, indeed, Engels’ work. Marx and Engels were committed to understanding the most advanced science of their day. Engels, in works such as the *Dialectics of Nature* and *The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man,* examined questions which might be termed ecological. While the suggestion that Marx and Engels attended lectures on the Victorian science of climate change appears to be misplaced, there are a number of insights from Engels that can be applied productively to this question.

Engels argues that human action has specific and complex effects on the rest of nature, noting that severe environmental problems resulted from our actions. Engels’ concept of ‘social murder’, developed in *The Condition of the English Working Class,* might be applied to the results of accelerating climate change. The notion that capitalism both exploits workers and degrades the environment was made from Engels’ earliest texts to his last works. In turn, Foster has argued that Marx and Engels mobilised the concept of a ‘metabolic rift’ to understand environmental problems of their day. Saito’s recent claim *in Marx in the Anthropocene: Towards the Idea of Degrowth Communism* (2023) that Engels advocated an anti-ecological, productivist approach to Marxism, will be critiqued.

**Dr Derek Wall** teaches political economy at Goldsmiths’ University. His PhD examined the sociology of environmental protest movements in the UK during the 1990s. In *The Sustainable Economics of Elinor Ostrom* who examined the ecological implications of the work of Elinor Ostrom, the first women to win a Nobel Prize in economics. Recent work has included the essay ‘Imperialism is the Arsonist’ examining the overlap between Green politics and Marxism, as well as the book *Climate Strike: The Practical Politics of Climate Change.* His main areas of research focusses upon the ecological, social and political implications of common pool property systems. d.wall@gold.ac.uk

**On the Outlook of Nature in Engels and Its Contemporary Significance**

**Professor Wang Xinyan**

发言提要：恩格斯的自然观主要表现为他在《劳动在从猿到人转变过程中的作用》一文中所阐述的关于人与自然关系的理论，它以实践观点为理论基石，以自然辩证法理论为方法论基础，深刻阐述了人与自然的分化过程、人与动物的本质区别以及人与自然的矛盾及其协调途径，对于协调当代人与自然的关系具有极其重要的指导意义。

Engels’ conception of nature mainly presents as his theory of human-nature relation clarified in The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man, it takes the view of practice as its theoretic foundation stone, and the theory of dialectics of nature as its methodological basis, profoundly analyzes the process of differentiation of human and nature, the essential distinctions between human and animals, and the contradictions between human and nature and the means to coordinate and resolve them, is of great significance in guiding us to coordinate the relation between human and nature.

汪信砚 武汉大学人文社科资深教授

**Professor Wang Xinyan**, is distinguished Professor of Humanities and Social Sciences at Wuhan University

**The “Alienation” and “Revival” of the “Wonderful Constitution”**

**- An Analysis of Ideas of Governance in Engels’s *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State***

**Yang Li**

 Engels analyzed different forms of power in different gens and states. The paper argues that this can be interpreted as different systems of governance in different social forms. According to the discourse of Engels, different systems of can chronologically be divided into three stages: the governance system in the ancient gentile society, the governance system in a modern state and the governance system in the future society. The paper depicts the characteristics of the governance system in each stage and believes that the ancient gentile governance system is a kind of ‘wonderful constitution’.

For Engels the development of the forces of production is the main course that drives the change of the governance system. Because the forces of production developed, the gens began to disintegrate, and states were invented. The gentile governance system which embodies the principle of democracy has transformed into the state governance system which aims at safeguarding private ownership. The paper argues that state governance is the **alienation** of the gentile governance. As the forces of production develop, the state governance system will disintegrate and will be replaced by the governance system of the ‘Association of Free People’. The governance system of the ‘Association of Free People’ is a **revival** of the ancient gentile governance. An analysis of the changing processes of the systems of governance reveals Engels’s distinctive views on governance.

 **Yang Li**, a PhD candidate of School of Marxism, Peking University, PRC, and also a visiting PhD student of Department of Sociology, University of Cambridge, UK. Now she is studying in Cambridge University and her email address is yl744@cam.ac.uk.

**On Political Power of Economic Factors: from the Perspective of Engels in His Later Years**

**Professor Li Zhi**

发言提要：众所周知，晚年恩格斯在他的政治遗嘱和书信中重新讨论了经济基础与上层建筑之间的关系。他的一些观点曾经被视为他背离历史唯物主义基本原理的证据，甚至被视为他背叛马克思的证据。但是，事实并非如此。恩格斯历来强调，经济因素在人类历史上是决定性的，是历史“归根结底”的“最终”原因。不过，他也指出，经济因素对政治生活和意识形态的影响不是直接的，政治权力不能简单地归结为经济因素。

As known, Late Engels re-discussed about the relationship between economic basis and superstructure in his political testament and letters. Some of his opinions were ever regarded as the evidence that he deviated from the basic principles of historical materialism, even as the evidence he betrayed Marx. But, it’s not true. Engels had always emphasized that economic factors are decisive in human history and are the "ultimate" reason "in the final analysis" in history. Yet, he had pointed out that, the impact exerted by economic factors on political life and ideology is not direct, and political power cannot simply be reductive to economic factors.

李志副院长、教授

**Prof. Li Zhi** is Deputy Dean of School of Philosophy at Wuhan University