

Proofread by “OP”, editor’s comments in blue. I only speak English, so any suggestions are based solely from how the English reads.

Chapter VII -The Intellectuals

There is still another? (1) important category of the bourgeoisie that ought to be mentioned, the bourgeois intelligentsia. The capitalist mode of production separated two functions that were previously united in ~~craftsmanship~~ **handicraft production** (2) and assigned them to two different categories of ~~workers~~, **workers**: manual **workers** and ~~intellectual~~ **mental** workers. It has furthermore, in the society wherein it formed, pushed the division of labour to its limit (4) and given birth to many professions devoted solely to ~~intellectual~~ **mental** labour.

1. The previous chapter was all about the different facets of the bourgeoisie – financiers, merchants, workshop owners, etc.
2. The original German word Kautsky uses here, *handwerk*, is translated as “handicraft production” in English translations of *Capital*.
3. “Mental” is shorter and uses alliteration with “manual”. I can’t remember what the English translation for this term was in *Capital*. The German is apparently a compound word meaning “Brain-worker”.
4. “Limit” seems to be implying that the division of labor is now being held back by the capitalist MOP – is that the case here?

The eighteenth century ~~engineer~~ **technician?** (1) played only a small role in ~~industry~~ **industry**. The industrial applications of scientific mechanics (2) and chemistry were still in their infancy by the end of the century. ~~In transportation however, the new mode of production already assigned important tasks to its technicians: it had to build boats, bridges, roads, canals.~~ **In the field of transportation, however, the new mode of production already assigned the technician important tasks: he had to build bridges, roads, canals.** (3) ~~Just as important as its know-how was its art of war.~~ **Equally important for the advancement of his expertise was the art of *war*.**

1. A bunch of words are either italicized or in bold in the German and French versions. Also I can’t help but notice that “engineer” was originally “technician” in French, and “techniker” in German – perhaps “technician” is a better translation? This is another word I’ll have to consult *Capital* for to see if there’s an established translation.
2. Does “mechanics” imply mechanical engineering, or is it another word for “scientific techniques?”

3. Is it the “new mode of production” building the bridges or the technicians themselves?

The ever-increasing concentration of the population into the cities, in addition to the ~~increasing~~ **growing** proletarianization of large popular strata, had resulted in the spread of ~~diseases~~ **sickness** and devastating epidemics. ~~The need for doctors only went up.~~ **The need for doctors was growing.** However, with the development of the bourgeoisie as well as the ~~inflow~~ **influx** of the rural gentry towards the capital, the numbers of ~~those~~ **people** who could afford to ~~pay~~ **pay** for a doctor increased.

We ~~have seen~~ **saw** in the fourth chapter how ~~to~~ **the** need for jurists ~~came to be~~ **arose and grew.**

The new centralised State, ~~taking over from~~ **which replaced** the looser association of feudal ~~entities~~ **formations**, could not function ~~with the only administrative relay of~~ **with administration solely carried out by** the gentry and the Church. That actually became bothersome (1). It was eventually ~~replaced~~ **supplanted** by a centralised ~~bureaucracy~~ **bureaucracy**, a category of people for whom administration was not an accessory occupation, but an exclusive and professional activity.

1. I'm really confused by this line. “Actually, it had become an embarrassment?” “Actually, it had become an obstacle?” I also noticed that there is a semicolon rather than a new sentence separating this in the original German.

In order to train these elements, many schools were needed, ~~many teachers~~ **many teachers**.

It is in this way that ~~a numerous~~ **an extensive** class of individuals took ~~shape.~~ **Originating shape, originating** (1) largely from the bourgeoisie, ~~and making~~ **which made** a living from the ~~usage~~ **use** of their intelligence, ~~this is the reason~~ **hence** why we can call this class the "intelligentsia", which of course doesn't mean that all its members were smart, nor that intelligence could only be found within this group. From their ranks ~~came~~ **emerged** thinkers whose goal wasn't to use their knowledge for concrete applications, but rather to explore the fundamental relations ~~structuring~~ **which structure** nature and society and to ~~extract laws therefrom~~ **discover the laws that govern them**, without asking oneself if these laws really have a practical use in civil life. These thinkers saw research as ~~a goal sufficient in and out of itself~~ **an end in of itself**, not a means to an end. However

abstract their theories could be, their personal needs were of a very ~~of a very~~ concrete nature. They wanted to live, and live well. (2)

1. Adding commas and stretching out the sentence, in line with the original
2. Does “living well” imply using their intellectual skills to “live large” by accumulating wealth? The “needs of a concrete nature” is confusing, as it seems to imply that despite doing “research as an end in itself”, these philosophers did not have intellectual enlightenment as a goal.

For the ~~Greeks and in particular the~~ Greeks, especially the Athenians, the search for the truth, philosophy, was the most noble activity of the free men of the possessing class, their prerogative. Leisure, ~~provided for by~~ based on slave labour and other methods of exploitation, ~~was put to the service of~~ served? science and the arts.

The same was true for the Romans, but in a coarser way. They had gone too ~~fast~~ abruptly from being peasants to becoming the rulers of the world in order to prevent that the ~~hunger of~~ greed for exploitation and the ~~impulsive~~ indulgent desire for extravagant and ridiculous boasting could take root in the spirits of most free ~~possessors~~ proprietors instead of the thirst for knowledge and aesthetic pleasures.

But what became of science and the arts, when at the end of the Middle-Ages, both started to wake up from their slumber! On the one hand, apart from the high nobility which we shall talk about later, there were many poorly civilised feudal lords as well as many dull priests only interested in primitive pleasures. On the other we could find a world of merchants which, with only few exceptions, used to ~~calculating and~~ speculating for profit, started to lose its capacity to make abstract speculations as competition increased. We could of course not expect ~~of~~ the lower classes, condemned to hard labour, ~~to get attracted to~~ to make advances in scientific thought. Everything failed them: the basis of education, occasion and time.

None of the possessing dominant classes, interested only in the pleasures of life, had ~~in themselves~~ the resources necessary ~~for the development of~~ to develop science and the arts. Thought and literature were left to the intellectuals, people who were forced to go offer their intellectual labour power on the market, just like the wage labourer offers the strength of his arms. But the only ~~public~~ audience? that could afford to pay these philosophers and artists ~~was~~ were the ~~high nobility~~ court nobility (1). This nobility section / section of the nobility had cut itself off from the crudeness of the rural nobility and had developed an

inclination for more delicate pleasures. It also had more ~~recreations~~ hobbies? and less immediate worries than the merchants. However, no real court ever became an academy ~~nor a philosophical school~~, a school of philosophy. ~~Courtesans~~ Courtiers ? (2) never transformed into thinkers or researchers, they were only "protectors", the patrons of artists and philosophers. It was more comfortable. They loathed perseverant work directed towards an objective. The arts as well as science were there only to contribute to their amusement. Courts needed buffoons and dwarfs as much as they needed artists and philosophers. Naturally, philosophy must not have required a great intellectual effort. It had to be presented in a funny, spiritual and pleasant manner.

1. I feel like "Court Nobility" is more exact, coming from "noblesse de cour" (or "hofadel" in German)
2. "Courtesans" implies prostitutes, at least in English. "Courtiers" encompasses all residents of the court.

A social theory that would not have fulfilled these conditions, or worse, who would have dared go against the high nobility, would not have gained the slightest attention in France during the first decades of the eighteenth century. As admirable as these ideas could have been, as long as the social conditions did not make them audible, they could not have had more success than a high-quality seed falling on a rock.

~~Given such conditions~~ Under these circumstances, the oppositional tendencies of the Third-Estate ~~only had few occasions~~ few opportunities to find a theoretical ~~manifestation~~ expression. The only field where this was still ~~more or less possible~~ feasible was ~~religion~~ religion. Both the high court nobility and the bourgeoisie were both hostile to the Roman Catholic Church. It is ~~however significant that~~ significant, however, that in the first half of the eighteenth century, the most violent attacks of the enlightened philosophers were directed not against the most ~~feudal and decrepit~~ decrepit, feudal forms of the Church, but ~~in~~ on the contrary, against the form best suited to modern realities. This is explained, not by the power of abstract ideas, but by class interests. The old feudal organisation of the Church, founded on land ownership, had long since become "national" in France. It was ~~not~~ no longer the pope, but the king that nominated its dignitaries and ~~distributed payments~~ bestowed its benefices, and ~~only~~ that exclusively to members of the gentry, as we have seen. This gentry ~~may have~~ liked to mock religion, but they found it to be ~~to its~~ their taste. ~~It didn't~~ They did not tolerate attacks that could have disturbed the interests of the Church.

There ~~existed~~ *was*, however, another ecclesiastic organisation that was not controlled by the king but by the ~~pope~~ *pope*. This stranger (1) had at his disposal incomes which were not meagre. They benefited not only the French but also the Italians, the Spanish, the Germans, ~~...~~, *etc.*, because this order was international. These incomes were not used ~~in order to~~ fill the chests of the privileged, because ~~the~~ *this* order did not recognise differences between ~~different states~~ *the estates?* (2) and ~~instead~~ promoted its members based ~~only~~ *solely* on their ~~merit~~ *merit*.

1. Not sure what "stranger" means here, everyone would know the pope. Strange man? Foreigner?
2. The context of the later sentence makes me think that this is referring to the estates system, not different countries.

This order was hated by the nobility, but just as much by the bourgeoisie, ~~their competitor which it competed against~~. Because all modern means of getting rich were made available to the Church, that it was able to get rid of any competitors and accumulate gigantic fortunes, that it had missionaries, agents and spies all ~~over~~ *around* the world, even in China, Japan, Mexico and Peru, wherever its rivalry with protestants did not prevent it. ~~this~~ *This* order not only did business in Europe but also organised a coherent system of colonial exploitation, and was the first European power to successfully profit from the colonies ~~by other means than~~ *not only by* pillaging, doing commerce, and establishing plantations, but ~~by also~~ *also by using employing?* the indigenous people in ~~industrial~~ *industrial* undertakings, sugar plants, and other ventures. These ~~advised~~ *shrewd* businessmen, cunning and merciless, ~~were always cooperating~~ *scheming*, (1) ~~These individuals without homeland~~ *these rootless cosmopolitans* (2) whom the Catholic bourgeois ~~competed~~ *found* or thought he ~~was competing against~~ *found* as a competitor ~~in every place~~ *behind every corner* where money could be made, these ~~individuals~~ *men* whom he hated as much as he ~~feared superstitiously weren't~~ *superstitiously feared*, were not the Jews, as a modern "Aryan" or "Christian" would think, they were ~~might assume today, but the~~ *Jesuits*. It is against them, ~~against these enemies, common~~ *against these common enemies* of both the bourgeoisie and the ~~high~~ *court* nobility, that the most violent attacks of the enlightened philosophers, the courts and their police, were directed.

1. I believe that price fixing / plotting is being implied here? Also, the original is a monster run-on sentence. It's hard to break this sentence up in a way that makes sense though, so I'm restoring it.

2. Found a great phrase which adds to the joke, however I think we should add a translator's note just to clarify that this is not the origin of the term used during the "doctor's plot" purge.

But the hunt for Jesuits ~~hadn't~~ had not solved the eighteenth century's problems any more than ~~the anti-Semitic speeches here~~ today's anti-Semitic rhetoric is solving ours. ~~As we have seen,~~ the burden weighed more and more on the mass of the nation, ~~and as we have seen.~~ It became increasingly obvious that the ~~principal oppressor,~~ ~~the court was~~ responsible for all these abuses, ~~all these obstacles to growth,~~ ~~that was the main oppressor.~~ ~~was the royal court.~~

At the same time, the ~~links~~ social ties which had kept most thinkers and researchers subservient to the princely courts had started ~~to fade away~~ come undone. The "intelligentsia" had grown in numbers, ~~and~~ the bourgeoisie was waking up to politics. Publications on politics and economics were starting to find buyers. Alongside this new market for books there was journalism. The bourgeois philosopher and ~~literary man~~ man of letters could find other means of living than pensions and ~~the court's gifts.~~ gifts from the court; he could now make a living, even if only meagrely, as a ~~spokesperson~~ spokesman (1) for the interests of the? bourgeoisie. From this moment on, ~~from the second half of the eighteenth century,~~ it became possible to create and push forward theories ~~that were not only not just~~ independent from the court, but ~~sometimes~~ even hostile towards it.

1. If Kautsky is not intentionally using gender-neutral language here (and it's entirely possible), I think we should stick to "spokesmen", "mankind", etc.

Given the number of different capitalist categories benefiting from the court's extravagant expenses and thus taking part in the State's exploitation, even certain anti-capitalist theories started to gather some support. In fact, these attempts to abolish abuses aroused their hostility. It became increasingly obvious that the only way to put an end to the reign of the court and privileges were the peasants and the "petites gens"[1] of the cities, the people who were this reign's first victims.

Bourgeois thinkers ~~ceased to be philosophers~~ were no longer "*philosophes*," ~~They were now economists and politicians~~ but now economists and politicians, ~~and~~ ~~They were increasingly expressing~~ increasingly they expressed themselves in favour of the people, ~~not just against the priesthood and nobility,~~ ~~and were~~ become increasingly hostile towards ~~priesthood~~ but also against the "rich" in general. Nevertheless, the first socialist critiques that appeared in the second half on the eighteenth century found little support and were misunderstood. Popular

theories such as those of J.J. Rousseau had nothing in common with communism, even though a superficial observer might have considered them to. What ~~these times required~~ **this age demanded** was the abolition of feudal barriers obstructing *market production*[2] (1), and the bourgeois intelligentsia was too astute ~~to not realise~~ **not to recognize this and that and go for a socialism without any perspectives** **indulge in a socialism still hopeless from a historical perspective** (2). Despite all the sympathy ~~it~~ **they** might have held for the lower and toiling classes, it could not go further than the bourgeois horizon to which it belonged ~~to~~, given its familial relations, its social positions and its conditions of existence. But its vision was not ~~limited~~ **obscured** by the blinders of ~~temporary~~ **the current special interests and in particular by the interests** of this or that capitalist clique (3), preventing it ~~them~~ **them** from seeing what the mode of production needed most or preventing it ~~them~~ **them** from discerning the long term interest of its class as a whole ~~and working in order to satisfy those needs.~~ **which prevented them from recognizing the interests of the capitalist class as a whole, the need of develop the capitalist mode of production, and of working to fulfill that need.** Thus many capitalists ~~were partisans of~~ **supported** the feudal regime and loathed innovation. The intelligentsia was well-ahead of the ~~bourgeois' narrow-mindedness~~ **the narrow-minded viewpoint of the bourgeoisie, which was** too preoccupied by business. Their tasks led them to ~~generalize~~ **take a larger view**, to follow a certain logic; they knew in detail the social and political structures of past times as well as today's. This is why it was the intelligentsia that identified the fundamental interests of the bourgeoisie as a class, ~~These interests happened to~~ (3) **which** coincided with the necessities of economic development. It was the intelligentsia that ~~was the spokesperson~~ **spoke for the bourgeoisie**, not only against the court, the aristocracy, ~~and~~ the clergy, ~~and sometimes~~ against the peasants, the petite-bourgeoisie and the proletarians, but also against certain capitalist cohorts when their **immediate** interests ~~were at that time was~~ in contradiction with the basic ~~permanent~~ **long-term** interest of the capitalist class as a whole. Unmoved by personal interests nor by ~~temporary~~ **ephemeral** interest, acting on the basis of a profound understanding of society that was the fruit of their long intellectual labour, the enlightened bourgeois appeared **to history?** not as the defenders of material interests but as the representatives of ~~void principles~~ **eternal truths?** (4), pure ideas, “doctrinaires,” ~~against~~ **vs.** the capitalist "practitioners", whom, proud of their ignorance, thought about nothing else than using the State for their personal undertakings.

1. I'm honestly surprised that he's not using “commodity production” – it appears the same in the German as well
2. I think “historical perspective” is what's being implied – another passage to consult the original German

3. Happened to? I think the argument is the other way around – economic development demanded that intellectuals support the bourgeoisie.
4. Taking a recurrent term used in Anti-Duhring, haven't checked if this is the same term in the original language

The bourgeois intellectuals would not adapt their theories to the wishes of the ~~"practitioners of politics"~~ "practical politics?", but they could not ask of them to apply their theories either, that is, until the Revolution. Then, They acquired in France the power to realise their theories. After the fall of the ~~high nobility and the court as well as high finance which was its ally~~ court nobility, as well as their allies in high finance, one and only one class was able to govern, that class being the bourgeois intelligentsia. ~~Today too,~~ Even today, when in most constitutional countries large popular strata, and in the first place, the urban working class, have familiarised themselves with the tasks of legislation and administration of a large modern State thanks to their political activities, it is still the bourgeois intelligentsia that dominates parliaments. (1) It could not be more different a hundred years ago in France, a country where all political actions had been banned for centuries!

1. I can't think of any way to fix it myself right now, but this whole digression is clunky to read and should be cleaned up.

Even the petite-bourgeoisie of Paris ~~hadn't elected~~ did not elect deputies from its ranks, but from jurists, journalists, etc.

~~It is in this way that the~~ This is how the bourgeois intelligentsia ~~could take central power in its hands and use it in order to put its theories in effect~~ was able to take the reigns of state power and use to realize their theories, that is, their bourgeois class interests. And given that these options (1) were the best available to respond to a necessary development, they were the ones best suited with real revolutionary tendencies. It is of these options that we hear the most of during the whole Revolution. It is these speeches, these books, these journals that have been the best kept preserved. ~~It is thus not surprising that ideologues~~ No wonder that idealists, ~~looking only at the superficial aspect of things~~ seeing only the superficial side of things, come to imagine that it is these thinkers and their ideas that have made and led the Revolution.

1. I've confused what exactly an "option" is. "Decisions?"

There is no doubt that this class is one of those who have left a brilliant mark upon the French Revolution. ~~It is its masterpiece in all that concerns the management of the State and legislation~~ is its masterwork. It would ~~however be~~

~~wrong~~ be wrong, however, to believe that the Revolution was made exclusively by ministerial decrees and parliamentary motions. ~~In crucial times~~ At crucial moments, the initiatives and the decisions came from popular uprisings, in particular from the suburbs of Paris and from the peasants. The most important motions made by the successive assemblies, the Constituent, the Legislation and the Convention, only formalised what the people had already done. During revolutionary struggles, these assemblies showed themselves to be without compass: (1) they received orders from the people, not the other way around.

1. Added a colon, even though there isn't one in either the French or German

~~It is not during the events that marked the Revolution that the importance of the intelligentsia manifested itself, but in its makings.~~ It was not the events of the Revolution that revealed the impact of the intelligentsia, but its achievements. The intelligentsia did not take the Bastille, it did not destroy the old feudal burdens, it did not purge the new France of its external and internal enemies. But it is was the intelligentsia that laid the groundwork foundation upon which rests its which its political organisation is based on to this day. It created the civil rights code? that continue to be what exists the best in accord with modernity the best in the modern world? (1). This code may have been annexed just like many other things by a victorious general who put it to the service of his own ideas. Even though the civil code became the Napoleonic code, it is no less the creation of the Convention's revolutionary Intelligentsia.

1. I don't know how much of a France fanboy Kautsky was, but it's plausible. Definitely best to double check still.

Translator's notes:

[1]: literally "little people"

[2]: Originally "production marchande" which would literally translate to "merchant production".