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 PART I:

THERORETICAL PREPARATION

 CHAPTER TWO

 “Modern German Economic Research”

Because her exclusion from graduate study in the United States also excluded her from an academic career in her native land, Florence Kelley arrived in Zurich in September 1883 more as the daughter of Congressman William Kelley than as a scholar or professional-in-the-making. Her father and mother and younger brother, Albert, travelled with her to Zurich. There, Judge Kelley presented a volume of his recently published speeches to the young economics professor with whom she planned to study--Julius Platter. Caroline and Bert stayed on and lived with her.[[1]](#endnote-1)

That fall a succession of gaieties included a ball at which she danced from eight o’clock until two, leaving her “giddy.” This bright world dimmed in mid-December when she learned of the death of Margaret Hicks in London. It took a week for her to recover from high fever and physical collapse, then two more weeks under the care of a woman physician who “forbade my reading heavy books.” Caroline wrote William Kelley, “Florrie’s brave, unselfish spirit keeps her up, but she is very much broken by this blow.” FK wrote in January to her father, “Margaret’s death is not yet a reality to me. I cannot conceive of my life without her.”[[2]](#endnote-2) In these circumstances in January she began receiving the attentions of Lazare Wischnewetzky.

She seemed to have two beaux. Lazare Wischnewetzky, her first caller on New Year’s morning, was a socialist medical student, whom she described to WDK as “a charming Russian gentleman who has been very kind in bringing me books on the National Economy lectures that we both hear. He has access to a private library of rare books, and has taken a good deal of trouble for my benefit.” Another caller was “Mr. Cabot a young Harvard man,” whom she described as “a fine, upright, thoughtful, fellow, clear headed and possessed of strong convictions—worth the trouble of discussing things with.” Cornell friend, Ruth Putnam, who had traveled to Zurich with the Kelley family, was also in her circle.[[3]](#endnote-3)

In early January she returned to her studies, writing WDK excitedly about Professor Platter’s lectures. An economist of the new historical school, he was guiding her through debates about the writings of Ricardo, Malthus and Marx. “What would I not give to have such a man in an American university! Just, candid, thoughtful, earnest, learned, enthusiastic, I regret daily that his class is not made up of Americans; whereas, so far as I can see, Mr. Wischnawitsky [sic] and I are the only students upon whom his teaching takes a deep hold.”[[4]](#endnote-4)

Kelley responded keenly to the opportunity to study the German historical school of economics, which included the socialist writings of Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx.[[5]](#endnote-5) Many male college graduates in her generation, most notably Richard Ely, John Bates Clark and Simon Patten, also studied in German universities and absorbed new views of economics as historically and socially constructed. The writings of Karl Knies, Wilhelm Roscher and Bruno Hildebrand of the Universities of Heidelberg, Leipzig and Jena, as well as socialist authors like Marx and Engels, viewed economic activity as embedded in the daily life of politics and society. This represented a deep challenge to the British political-economy tradition of Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill, which promoted universal principles such as “the wealth of nations,” or “maximum utility.”[[6]](#endnote-6)

After returning from Germany, Richard Ely and others launched academic careers and founded the American Economic Association in 1885 to differentiate themselves from the old guard of American laissez-faire economists like Henry Carey and the British political economists on which their authority rested. The four founding principles of the group marked a new era in American reform politics. Bringing the energy of young economists into the nation’s politics, they declared:

 I. We regard the state as an agency whose positive assistance is one of the indispensable conditions of human progress.

2. We believe that political economy as a science is still in an early stage of its development. While we appreciate the work of former economists, we look not so much to speculation as to the historical and statistical study of actual conditions of economic life for the satisfactory accomplishment of that development.

3. We hold that the conflict of labor and capital has brought into prominence a vast number of social problems, whose solution requires the united efforts, each in its own sphere, of the church, of the state, and of science.

4. In the study of the industrial and commercial policy of governments we take no partisan attitude. We believe in a progressive development of economic conditions, which must be met by a corresponding development of legislative policy.

The German-educated founders of the American Economics Association—and their academic allies--formed a life-long support system for Florence Kelley’s reform activism in the United States. Directly and indirectly, they created new political agendas that made room for hers. But she was not one of them. Her exclusion from graduate study at Penn marked her as separate and in Zurich she found a different path—as a free radical that ranged across social movements, academia and politics, rather than a specialist in any one reform venue. That independence made it possible for her to innovate in ways that lay beyond members of the American Economics Association.

This new path opened in 1884, when she began to study the economic writings of Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx. Their 1848 *Communist Manifesto* and its call for revolution placed them outside the boundaries of middle-class political respectability in the 1850s and 60s. Yet by the mid-1880s the German revolution they had tried to shape had withered as a social movement and German socialism was cooperating with the Bismarckian state.[[7]](#endnote-7) Meanwhile, thanks to recent publications by Engels, the writings of Marx and Engels were enjoying a surge of intellectual popularity in ongoing efforts to critique the burgeoning power of industrial capitalism.[[8]](#endnote-8) Florence Kelley stepped into her future by studying those writings.
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A year later she was in the midst of translating a classic Marxian text, Friedrich Engels’s *Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844.* That experience gave her an insider’s view of Karl Marx’s *Capital* and a deep understanding of why Engels and Marx considered wages the moral center of industrial capitalism. The social origins of minimum wage in the United States begins with the social critique of industrial capitalism by Engels and Marx. But to understand that history from Florence Kelley’s perspective requires us to know some of what Kelley knew about the social and intellectual movements at the time Engels and Marx wrote—especially the traditions of political economy that they rejected. She was transformed by her studies of their work. But that transformation was only possible, she thought, because she had previously read the British political economist writings of Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Thomas Malthus and John Stuart Mill.

Kelley insisted on the importance of that political economy reading in a column written for the leading suffragist periodical, *The Woman’s Journal* in the summer of 1885. Taking a break from her translation of Engels’ book, she encouraged American women students to come to Zurich and study the curriculum that she had pursued in her first year, including “the German master-works.” But because those works “cannot be understood without a knowledge of the researches which preceded them,” she recommended that students read the British political economists before they arrive in Zurich. “[T]he student should read attentively the works of Adam Smith and Ricardo, as preparation for the study of modern scientific investigation,” and she warned students away from condensations. All, “should also be read unadulterated in the original.”

By focusing on discourse about wages in British political economy we see the middle class social origins of “classical” economists as well as the limitations of their “science;” their authority lay in their social origins as well as their science. Their hegemony was seriously compromised by the intervention of Engels and Marx, German exiles with an international vision, who, beginning in the 1840s lived in England and wrote about English industrial capitalism. The clash between British political economy and Marxian Socialist writings opened the way for new economic theories in the late nineteenth century, especially the marginal utility school, which by 1899 dominated American academic economics and on which Florence Kelley drew heavily to promote a consumers’ theory of value. Yet her understanding of wages remained anchored in Engels and Marx. She would later combine the morality of their view of wages as social system of exploitation with the new view of consumers as creating value. Important to her beginnings in this process was the destruction of the hegemony of British political economy, and its replacement—using many of the same categories of analysis (especially “competition” and “wages”)—by the writings of Engels and Marx.

Adam Smith (1723-1790), Scottish author of *The Wealth of Nations* (1776), originated many of the concepts used in the next century of economic writers, including Engels and Marx. Smith began with a concern about unproductive social groups, including opulent aristocrats as well as the poor. Far from thinking that all economic questions were solved by the market, he urged economic planners to develop manufacturing, which, he believed would generate surplus wealth sufficient to support unproductive groups. Smith endorsed a labor theory of value in which the value of all things was created by “the trouble and toil” of acquiring them. Recent scholarship has shown that Smith was not a simple-minded laissez-faire economist but instead primarily sought to end mercantilist policies that allowed merchants to better their condition without contributing to the nation’s economic welfare.[[9]](#endnote-9) So while he advocated less governmental control of economic markets, traditional morality and equity were part of his economic landscape.

Thus Smith wrote of wages, “No society can surely be flourishing and happy, of which the far greater part of the members are poor and miserable. It is but equity, besides, that they who feed, cloath, and lodge the whole body of the people, should have such a share of the produce of their own labour as to be themselves tolerably well fed, cloathed and lodged.”[[10]](#endnote-10) Wages hinged on what was required to reproduce life. “A man must always live by his work, and his wages must at least be sufficient to maintain him. They must even upon most occasions be somewhat more; otherwise it would be impossible for him to bring up a family, and the race of such workmen could not last beyond the first generation.”[[11]](#endnote-11) Wages were shaped by competition and supply and demand, categories that dominated thinking about wages in subsequent writings in British political economy.[[12]](#endnote-12)

Yet government regulation of wages remained a live issue for Smith and his wider world. He noted “that though anciently it was usual to rate wages, first by general laws extending over the whole kingdom, and afterwards by particular orders of the justices of peace in every particular county,” these practices have “gone entirely into disuse.” He was critical of “acts of parliament” that still attempted “to regulate wages in particular trades, and in particular places” because the set maximum wages at the request of masters and kept wages low. Smith commented: “Whenever the legislature attempts to regulate the differences between masters and their workmen, its counsellors are always the masters. When the regulation, therefore, is in favour of the workmen, it is always just and equitable; but it is sometimes otherwise when in favour of the masters.” For example, “the law which obliges the masters in several different trades to pay their workmen in money, and not in goods, is quite just and equitable.” But the new law limiting the pay that workmen can receive from master tailors in London seemed unfair. “When masters combine together, in order to reduce the wages of their workmen, they commonly enter into a private bond or agreement, not to give more than a certain wage, under a certain penalty.” Smith remarked, “Were the workmen to enter into a contrary combination of the same kind, not to accept of a certain wage, under a certain penalty, the law would punish them very severely.” If it dealt “impartially,” Smith continued, “it would treat the masters in the same manner.”[[13]](#endnote-13)

Smith later opposed the enactment of a proposed minimum wage for agricultural workers in 1795, when grain prices rose and the rural poor were unable to buy grain. The proposed Parliament bill would have given to justices of the peace the same power to set minimums as they currently held to set maximums, consisting of a quarterly adjustments. Falling real wages were a double problem at the time since the “Law of Settlements” prevented working people “when thrown out of employment, either in one trade or in one place: from going to “another place, without the fear . . . of a prosecution.”[[14]](#endnote-14) This gave great power to their employers. So Smith and others supported the end of the Law of Settlement rather than allow justices of the peace to establish minimum wages.[[15]](#endnote-15)
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Smith invented a concept that remained part of wages discourse for the next century—the wages fund. “The demand for those who live by wages, it is evident, cannot increase but in proportion to the increase of the funds which are destined to the payment of wages.” Those funds come from two sources: surplus beyond that needed to maintain the family of “the landlord, annuitant, or monied man,” or surplus from the sale of goods.[[16]](#endnote-16) Smith’s view of wages as coming from a fund was based on his view of an ongoing proportional relationship between wages and profit. He wrote, “The proportion between the different rates, both of wages and profit, in the different employments of labour and stock,” should remain the same despite “the advancing, stationary, or declining state of the society.” Those proportions “must remain the same, and cannot well be altered.”[[17]](#endnote-17)

(The wages fund became known as “the iron law of wages” in the writings of Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-1864), German socialist and competitor with Marx for the allegiance of German socialists; a figure Kelley knew well by political reputation if not through his writings. After Lassalle’s death his “iron law” lived on, achieving his goal of channeling German socialists into political action rather than the Marxian route of trade-unionist affiliation, Lassalle’s logic being that only the state could overcome the “iron law.” This logic led trade unionists themselves and not only in Germany to believe in necessary limitations on their wages.[[18]](#endnote-18))

Adam Smith’s account of wages was compatible with his tolerance for slavery though his writings were about free labor. The ownership of people forced to labor without pay was widely accepted as part of property rights in the British Empire of 1776. Smith advocated free labor and believed it was “cheaper in the end than the work performed by slaves” because a slave wants “to labour as little as possible. Whatever work he does, beyond what is sufficient to purchase his own maintenance, can be squeezed out of him by violence only, and not by any interest of his own.”[[19]](#endnote-19) Smith did not follow up on his implication that work could be “squeezed out of” wage workers if they believed it was in their own interest.

Smith’s view of slavery rested on that of John Locke (1632-1704), known as the father of English liberalism and scientific empiricism, who distinguished between wage-earners and slaves in *Two Treatises on Government* (1689). “Master and servant are names as old as history,” he explained, “for a free man makes himself a servant to another by selling him for a certain time the service he undertakes to do in exchange for wages he is to receive.” Slaves, by contrast, had no contractual rights. They, “being captives taken in a just war are, by the right of Nature, subjected to the absolute dominion and arbitrary power of their masters.” These men, he wrote, cannot “be considered as part of civil society, the chief end whereof is the preservation of property.”[[20]](#endnote-20)

Also writing when slavery was still widespread, the enormously influential Thomas Malthus (1766-1834) contested Smith’s optimism about the benefits of industry in *An Essay on the Principle of Population* (1798), arguing that British increases in manufacturing wealth “have no tendency to better the condition of the labouring poor.” Blaming living conditions of the working poor on their numbers, Malthus used cyclical demographics to explain high and low variations in wages. High wages led to population growth, which in turn produced famine and population decline, which in turn eventually led to high wages and population growth. Malthus directed much of his argument against William Godwin’s 1793 book, *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and its Influence on General Virtue and Happiness*, a foundational Anglophone enlightenment treatise that critiqued the inadequacies of law, advocated individual fulfillment, social solidarity and moral sentiments, but had little to say about wages. Political justice could be studied separately from political economy.

Very important to Marx and Engels was British political economist David Ricardo (1772-1823), who generated a band of protégés known as Ricardian socialists. Born into a Sephardic Jewish family of Portuguese origin, recently migrated to England from Holland, he was disowned when he married a Quaker and became a Unitarian. He became a banker and grew wealthy in stock market investments, retiring and writing about economics, including *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation* (1817). There he advanced a sophisticated labor theory of value, arguing: “The value of a commodity . . . depends on the relative quantity of labour which is necessary for its production, and not on the greater or less compensation which is paid for that labour.” Thereby equating the value of a commodity with the *amount* of labor rather than the cost of labour to produce it, Ricardo set the stage for Engels’s and Marx’s intervention about the extraction of capital from unpaid wages. Ricardo did not inquire closely into the origins of capital, but described it as coming from profits, and considered it the source of economic growth: “Capital is that part of the wealth of a country which is employed with a view to future production.” Rent, on the other hand, he considered unproductive, landlords being able to collect it simply because they claim ownership.[[21]](#endnote-21)

Engels and Marx often treated John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), powerful advocate of British utilitarianism, as their chief political economy opponent. They viewed him as a hypocrite and an apologist for the manufacturers. Son of political economist James Mill (1773-1836), J.S. Mill was the author of *Essays on Government* (1840) and *Principles of Political Economy* (1848). He supported the notion of a wages-fund as a customary distribution of wealth rather than a scientific law, writing, “The nature of the industry, therefore, will determine whether a greater or a less share of capital will be spent in wages.” But Mill insisted that wages could not be raised disproportionately to other costs, such as “fixed capital and materials,” or “the capitalist must withdraw from the enterprise.” Heavily influenced by Malthus, Mill concluded that the main variable affecting wages was population—“the proportion of the wages-fund to the number of the wage-receivers.” He called for population reduction as the main route to wage-earners’ prosperity and took a punitive view of the relatively high fertility rates of working people, supporting the New Poor Law, (the provisions of which Henry Carey had championed in 1835.)[[22]](#endnote-22)

Mill revealed the social origins of his economic views in his reaction to proposals that Chartists made for a minimum wage in the 1840s. With the possible exception of Smith in 1796, Mill was the first political economist to review “a legal or customary minimum of wages” as a remedy for “low wages.” (75) Not mentioning the Chartist uprising of the 1830s and 40s as its origin, he wrote that a “plan, which has found many advocates among the leaders of the operatives, is that councils should be formed, which in England have been called local boards of trade.” The plan would consist

of delegates from the work people and from the employers, who, meeting in conference, should agree upon a rate of wages, and promulgate it from authority, to be binding generally on employers and workmen; the ground of decision being, not the state of the labor market, but natural equity; to provide that workmen shall have *reasonable* wages, and the capitalist reasonable profits.(75) (His emphasis.)

Mill did not say what he meant by “natural equity,” but the term was widely used to invoke common sense or “natural law” in contexts lacking more specific legal standing.[[23]](#endnote-23) The term allowed him to acknowledge the different moral foundation of the minimum wage campaign and his own “modern” view of what was owed to the poor.

 Although Mill characterized the minimum wage bill as promoted by “leaders of the operatives,” the bill’s focus, as advocated by radical middle-class Chartist members of Parliament John Fielden and John Maxwell, was to aid handloom weavers whose earnings had plummeted with the introduction of the power loom in the 1830s. Parliament members of diverse politics supported the bill, many fearing the rising tide of destitution and violent protest in towns where handloom weavers and other preindustrial crafts were being priced out of their markets by machine production. Handloom weavers were refusing to accept the alternatives of starving in their villages or migrating to factory towns and becoming “hands.” In 1835 the bill gained sufficient support to launch a parliamentary inquiry. But the bill was ultimately defeated, its opponents arguing that if the wage regulation became law for handloom weavers, “other workmen would likewise apply for the same privilege.”[[24]](#endnote-24)

Mill wrote a decade after the handloom weavers lost their struggle (except for the production of luxury goods like Paisley shawls in Scotland). The violence had receded and the New Poor Law was supplanting traditional “moral economy.” In historian E.P. Thompson’s words, “the new political economy of the free market” required “the breakdown of the old moral economy of provision,” giving rise in the Chartists to a nation-wide, class-based movement.[[25]](#endnote-25) Fielden and Maxwell’s minimum wage proposal was anchored in Chartist moral economy views of the popular right of access to provision, especially food, when it was withheld from them by well-provisioned others who demanded high prices or otherwise made food unattainable.

When Mill offered his reasons for opposing the minimum wage proposal, he first cast aspersions at Fielden and Maxwell as “philanthropists interesting themselves for the laboring-classes, [rather] than the laboring people themselves.” Then he argued against the moral sanction of the bill. What could not be accomplished by legal means, he wrote, “these persons desire to encompass by the moral. Every employer, they think, ought to give sufficient wages; and if he does it not willingly, should be compelled to it by general opinion; the test of sufficient wages being their own feelings or what they suppose to be those of the public.”[[26]](#endnote-26)

 Having discounted the bill’s political leadership and its moral foundation, Mill argued that the “wages fund” made the bill economically impossible. Even if “contrivances wages could be kept above the point to which they would be brought by competition,” he wrote, the result would be that “some laborers are kept out of employment.” Since “the rate of wages which results from competition distributes the whole wages-fund among the whole laboring population, if law or opinion succeeds in fixing wages above this rate, some laborers are kept out of employment.” For a minimum wage to work it must include “all who apply” and the wages fund would prevent it from reaching all.[[27]](#endnote-27)

Mill then explored the possibility that increased wages might be funded outside the box of the wages-fund, which took him to moral economies, to the resources of “capital,” and finally to population restriction. His logic illuminated the modern separation of the poor from the resources of the rich and the necessity of that separation. “Popular sentiment looks upon it as the duty of the rich, or of the state, to find employment for all the poor,” he began. “If the moral influence of opinion does not induce the rich to spare from their consumption enough to set all the poor at work at ‘reasonable wages,’ it is supposed to be incumbent on the state to lay on taxes for the purpose, either by local rates or votes of public money.” In that case, the “proportion between labor and the wages-fund would thus be modified to the advantage of the laborers, not by restriction of population, but by an increase of capital.”

Mill abruptly ended this speculation with a new section heading: “Would Require as a Condition Legal Measures for Repression of Population.”[[28]](#endnote-28) That section showed that a minimum wage funded by capital was impossible for Malthusian reasons. “If this claim on society could be limited to the existing generation; if nothing more were necessary than a compulsory accumulation, sufficient to provide permanent employment at ample wages for the existing numbers of the people; such a proposition would have no more strenuous supporter than myself,” he insisted. But the minimum wage claim went beyond “the existing generation.” The relationship among poor wage-earners, propertied people and the taxation power of the state was limited to “persons already in existence,” he maintained. “Society mainly consists of those who live by bodily labor; and if society, that is, if the laborers, lend their physical force to protect individuals in the enjoyment of superfluities, they are entitled to do so, and have always done so, with the reservation of a power to tax those superfluities for purposes of public utility; among which purposes the subsistence of the people is the foremost.” owever. However, it was one thing to tax the wealthy to provide poor relief for “all persons already in existence,” and, as he imagined the effects of minimum wage, “another thing altogether when those who have produced and accumulated are called upon to abstain from consuming until they have given food and clothing, not only to all who now exist, but to all whom these or their descendants may think fit to call into existence.” Rising wages would “suspend all checks, both positive and preventive” on rapid population growth, which would eventually mean “taxation for the support of the poor would engross the whole income of the country.” To avoid this, minimum wage “would require as a condition legal measures for repression of population,” which would be impossible.[[29]](#endnote-29)

Mill concluded that “the evil of low wages” could best be remedied by “a due regulation of the number of families,” and “converting the moral obligation against bringing children into the world, who are a burden to the community, into a legal one.” Also useful, he thought, was “colonization,” consisting of “a grant of public money, sufficient to remove at once, and establish in the colonies, a considerable fraction of the youthful agricultural population.”[[30]](#endnote-30)

These writings help us understand why Karl Marx subtitled *Capital* *“Critique of Political Economy.”* From his historical perspective political economy writings championed class-specific interests while claiming they spoke for the whole society. Their bias was especially visible with regard to wages. He critiqued them for failing to analyze wages in terms that accounted for the value that wage-earners added to their employers’ capital as well as to the products that they created. Mill’s idea that “laborers, lend their physical force to protect individuals in the enjoyment of superfluities” was a peak example of political economy bias and the scale of its failure to cope with the complexities of industrial capitalism.

\*\*\*

Florence Kelley’s reading of the British political economists, under the supervision of Professor Platter after she arrived in Zurich, enabled her to move quickly so as to concentrate on modern German writers. A good student of languages, and, living in a German-speaking community, she began reading difficult German texts soon after her arrival. Within a few months she was reading “modern German economic research” from her own altered perspective as a socialist.[[31]](#endnote-31)

By inventing modern graduate study, German universities created space for the study of modern social science generally and new historical perspectives on economics and history in particular. This new space attracted scores, perhaps hundreds, of young college graduates from the United States in the 1880s and 90s, including Simon Patten, Henry C. Adams, and W. E. B. DuBois. Florence Kelley was one of them, but surprisingly, perhaps, she was the only American who, in the words of historian Daniel Rodgers, “actually threw in her lot with working-class socialism.”[[32]](#endnote-32) She came to Zurich because its new intellectual space made room for women. She stayed because the historical study of economics intersected so deeply with the themes of her girlhood and young adulthood. And she went native because she was so deeply attracted to the socialist alternative to her father’s political economy.

FK’s her conversion to socialism was shaped by two powerful events in 1884, which made her plunge into “modern German economic research” transformative process: her break with her father’s authority, and her decision to translate Friedrich Engels’s 1845 book, *die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England: nach eigner Anschauung und authentischen Quellen* (“Condition of the Working Class in England: From Personal Observation and Authentic Sources.”)[[33]](#endnote-33) Separating from her father was transformative. So too was her embrace of socialism. Both were enabled by her unexpected decision in October 1884 to marry Lazare Wischnewetzky.[[34]](#endnote-34)

Kelley had at first rejected Lazare’s insistent marriage proposals, writing him in the spring of 1884 “that to stay in Europe and work at and for Socialism was utterly preposterous and out of the question and that I could not possibly think of marrying him.”[[35]](#endnote-35) Not mentioned in her or her family’s correspondence about Lazare was his Jewish heritage. Strongly in his favor was his intellectual companionship; he was beginning to translate socialist writings into Russian.[[36]](#endnote-36)

The example of Mary Putnam Jacobi (1842-1906) also offered support for Lazare’s courtship. Mary Putnam, the sister of Kelley’s Cornell friend and Zurich companion, Ruth Putnam, married Abraham Jacobi in New York City in 1873. Jacobi (1832-1919), a German-born Jewish physician was a member of the Communist League in the 1850s aftermath of the German revolution of 1848. Tried and imprisoned in Cologne, he became a “party martyr.”[[37]](#endnote-37) Upon his release in 1853, he emigrated to London and lived with Marx, then to Manchester and lived with Engels before moving to New York and becoming in the 1860s “the father of pediatrics” in American medicine through his rescue work with abandoned infants and children. Mary Putnam, meanwhile, after graduating from the Female Medical College of Pennsylvania in 1864, studied at the New England Hospital for Women and Children, and was admitted as the first woman student at Ecole de Medecine at the University of Paris. In 1876 she won Harvard’s Boylston Prize in medicine for her essay “The Question of Rest during Menstruation,” which championed the ability of women to study and work despite menstruation. From 1871 to 1889 she taught at the Woman’s Medical College of the New York Infirmary for Women and Children. She and Abraham were well-established medical professionals when they married, she age 31, he a decade older. Mary continued her professional career and Abraham supported her work, a model that was not common among white, Anglo-Saxon Protestants.

Stunned but pretending not to be, Caroline and Bert witnessed Florence and Lazare’s civil wedding ceremony. Then they traveled with the newly-weds to Heidelberg, where Lazare pursued medical studies and Florence began to translate Engels’s book, settling into her new identity as a German socialist.[[38]](#endnote-38) Friendships with exiled Russian socialist students in Zurich, including Lazare, had introduced her to meetings of the German Social Democratic Party, and, powerfully attracted to the party’s social-justice goals, she joined and began a life-long commitment to social democracy. Translating Engels carried that commitment forward. As if to affirm her new path, she gave birth to three children during her first three and a half years of marriage.

Florence Kelley’s 1927 memoir skipped over her marriage to Lazare, but described her conversion to socialism in dramatic detail. “Coming to Zurich, the content of my mind was tinder awaiting a match,” she explained.[[39]](#endnote-39) Unacceptable suffering in her native culture included “the tragic oppression of the recently emancipated Negroes, by disfranchisement and lynching.” Also haunting were the “pasty-faced little working children,” from neighboring textile mills, whom she “saw in the streets year after year as I drove in the phaeton between my homes in West Philadelphia and Germantown.” Recently, on her way to Zurich she travelled with her father to visit working class communities in England and had conversed with “pitiable toiling mothers in the chain-makers cottages.”[[40]](#endnote-40)

Socialist writings explained and offered a way out of such injustice and misery, “its assurance flooding the minds of youth and the wage-earners with hope that, within the inevitable development of modern industry, was the coming solution.” In this regard socialist meetings were an answer to the challenges posed by Charles Elliot in 1882.[[41]](#endnote-41) Socialist meetings engaged her morally and intellectually. After Bismarck’s anti-socialist laws of 1873 banned socialist gatherings and publications in Germany, Zurich became the Social Democratic Party’s headquarters. Although voting for the SPD was banned at the provincial level, it was legal nationally, and, thanks to the party’s success in obtaining national voting rights for wage-earning men, its power in the Reichstag was growing. So Kelley interacted with the SPD on the cusp of its move from margin to mainstream.

FK described herself at her first socialist meeting as “so trembling with excitement that I grasped the sides of my chair and held them firmly, for the speaker was Eduard Bernstein,” chief editor of party’s publications. The meeting was “in an old part of the city, on the second floor of a modest little eating-place,” but for her it was a gateway to a new life: “here was I in the World of the Future!”[[42]](#endnote-42)

In that 1927 account, FK mentioned the issue that defined her separation from her father—tariffs as a route to wage justice. The speaker’s subject was “Bismarck’s proposed high tariff for Germany” and the discussion included “every aspect of the tariff that I had ever heard or read of, plus one which was utterly new to me.” That new perspective came from a Swiss railroad man, who argued, “We are internationalists; we are intimately acquainted with the textile industries.” If “prices of silk products in Germany are to be raised,” then “the livelihood of the producers of raw silk in China and Japan will obviously have to be crowded down at least enough to meet the tariff charges in German custom houses. As internationalists, should we give our assent to this lowering of the standard of living of fellow workers on the other side of the globe?” Kelley described her reaction as invoking Sarah Pugh. “This might well have been a Quaker meeting. Here was the Golden Rule! Here was Grandaunt Sarah!”[[43]](#endnote-43)

Harkening back to the moral framework of Sarah Pugh’s politics of the 1830s and 40s was appropriate since German socialism originated more from those decades than from the 1880s.[[44]](#endnote-44) And connecting with childhood memories of Sarah Pugh also fit this moment of ritual-like separation from her father’s politics; she needed a different anchor in her family’s heritage. And she needed an alternative to her father’s reliance on Henry Carey’s political economy.

Her work at the New Century Guild in 1882 had set her on a path that blended her father’s support for wage-earners with her grand-aunt’s leadership of women’s organizations. She described that path in January 1884 in response to a letter from Susan B. Anthony that invited her to join the ranks of suffrage movement leadership, replying that her future was already dedicated to wage-earning women and invoking her father’s example: “When my student life is over, I shall give myself to work for the best interests of the working women of America, as my Father has given himself to work for the best interests of the country, as far as he has seen his way clearly.”[[45]](#endnote-45)

Yet the closer she came to her father’s footsteps, the more his example failed to help her step forward. This had begun in childhood. Her 1927 memoir described her first disappointment at the age of twelve, when, accompanying him on a spectacular midnight tour of the new Bessemer method of steel production, she was stunned by the rough labor of boys younger than herself, “carrying heavy pails of water and tin dippers, from which the men drank eagerly.” The miracle of the Bessemer furnace monopolized the “attention of all present,” including her father, who did not notice the boys. But to her they seemed “a living horror” of abuse and neglect.[[46]](#endnote-46)

She knew the limits of her father’s economic views; her study of “modern German economic research” took her beyond his views, furnished a critique of his views, and provided compelling alternatives. Their alliance was strained beyond the breaking point in the spring of 1884, when, as she dove more deeply into that study, he began an ill-timed effort to win Congressional support for his embattled political agenda by quoting her notes and letters. Opponents within his party were explaining sluggish contemporary economies in Europe and the United States was due to “overproduction” and insistently proposed searches for new markets outside North America as the solution. He responded with new evidence and arguments.[[47]](#endnote-47)

In a speech published in April 1884, WDK appropriated his daughter’s notes about their joint travels in England on the way to Zurich. Dramatizing the urgent importance of protective tariffs, he reported that his daughter had interviewed wage-earning women in the chain-making industry near Birmingham “as to their wages.” “They might not have answered me,” he noted, “but to one of their own sex, who addressed them in tones of sympathy, they told their stories freely.” The women earned six shillings ($1.50) a week for long hours of heavy labor, knowledge that WDK used to promote himself and tariff policies. “I am unwilling to reduce the duties on any form of iron or steel,” he declared, “to allow my countrymen to consume the results of the labor of these British maidens, wives, and matrons. The plea that their employers, in order to sell us cheap goods, must compel them to accept such wages is not one that satisfies my judgment, but is one from which my manhood revolts.”[[48]](#endnote-48)

This speech also warned against socialism and popular uprisings. “Nihilism in Russia, socialism in Germany, socialism in the western and nihilism in the eastern sections of Austria, communism in France, socialism accepted by the state within the limits of the British Islands,” he insisted, “are but expressions of the discontent born of indescribable suffering which the masses of the people of all transatlantic countries feel they can no longer endure.” Such conditions could emerge in the United States, he declared, and noted that a recent letter from his daughter mentioned medical reports about unprecedented disease among “the poor in some worst wards of New York.” In conclusion he argued that the wages of American workers should be defended through immigration restriction. “We should forthwith prohibit the importation of cheap labor as we do that of cheap commodities, and send back to the country from which they have been shipped men or women who have signed contracts in foreign lands or on shipboard to work at lower than prevailing American wages.”[[49]](#endnote-49)

A few months later in June 1884, Florence sent him what might be interpreted as a shot across his bow, declaring her new understanding of American economic development. She began with an understatement: “I think I see better from this distance than I should if I were in the midst of it.” Then came her historical analysis. Before the Civil War, the interests of “our American working people . . . harmonized more or less with that of the American capitalist,” she wrote. The “whole country—working classes pre-eminently—needed the industrial development of our resources, the development of capital in general.” During the war “in the struggle against slave labor, Northern capital and Northern labor stood, perforce, side by side against the South and the slave, in identity of interest.” Yet now “how rapidly this identity is melting out of sight and existence under the influence of internal conflict.” Poverty on a new scale was emerging in the United States, “as our industry develops home competition under a fostering tariff.” Congress should shield “the American workingman” in “his growing struggle with American capital and American pauperism,” but more effective than tariffs would be the renewal of federal eight-hour day legislation.[[50]](#endnote-50)

Judge Kelley found these warnings about American poverty useful and on June 3, 1884, read portions of her letter into the *Congressional Record*. Identifying her as “a young lady, now in Europe, who bears my name,” he supported “the conclusions of this young but profound student of political science.” That day, he and his colleagues in the House of Representatives were debating a bill that sought to recover public land illegally seized by railroads and restore it to homesteaders. Speakers in both parties recognized what one called “a system of land piracy,” funded by what Judge Kelley called “flocks and herds of British capitalists,” which permitted railroad corporations to erect fences and illegally claim land beyond what was awarded to them.[[51]](#endnote-51)

Using Florence’s voice to boost his argument “for our laborers who are yet able to escape from the growing poverty of the times,” he quoted her recommendation that “in this District and in our Territories an eight-hour law with heavy penalties for its violation” was needed. But this turn to his daughter for fresh perspectives backfired since her interest in socialism had become a topic of insiders’ gossip. In a speech on June 19, 1884, he declared that if his pro-labor stance was the reason Republican colleagues were whispering “the word socialism” about him, “I declare myself to be a socialist”--if socialism meant the desire to achieve “the best possible conditions for our laborers.”[[52]](#endnote-52)

So, just when Florence Kelley was developing her own ideas, William Kelley distorted her views to buttress his own. What they shared was an understanding that it was no longer possible to see capital and labor as mutually compatible features of economic development.

Florence Kelley Wischnewetzky’s break with her father became public in December 1884, prompted by the use of her Birmingham letters in a book to promote his reelection. To a Philadelphia friend she wrote that she had withdrawn permission for the letters because they “could be used for advocating Mr. Blaine and Protection and I believe in neither.” The debate between father and daughter was long and hard. “My father wanted the book for campaign purposes and has made my suppression of it—in spite of my elaborate explanations that I could not publish what I no longer believe—the cause of profound unhappiness for four months past.” She complained that “the whole American and Americo-European scandal-press has published a rumor that Lazare forbade me to publish the poor little worthless book for fear of the Russian authorities!”[[53]](#endnote-53) The family clash appeared in *The New York Times* as a report that “Judge Kelley’s recent illness” was caused by the fact that “his daughter had married a Russian Nihilist.” The *Times* noted that William Kelley dismissed the report “as false in every particular, and says that his daughter and her husband are profound and congenial students,” and that the marriage “had his cordial approval.”[[54]](#endnote-54)

By March 1885 in a letter to May Lewis she expressed her alienation from her elite origins and her search for an alternative political identity. She denounced her father’s youthful departure from his printing handicraft to become a lawyer, thereby joining “the privileged class.” Her brother “would not have become assistant-city-solicitor in a thousand years without the paternal name and fame.” Six months later she stopped communicating with her Philadelphia family.

\*\*\*

Florence Kelley Wischnewetzky’s dispute with her father was immensely difficult, but her stream of publications and her pathbreaking translation of Engels the next year showed that it was also liberating.[[55]](#endnote-55) As a young wife and mother she became more her own person. She was already beginning to construct an alternative political identity when she separated from her father. He viewed democracy and capitalism as closely aligned; for her the two became separate. Most important, in her new translation work she found a new understanding of wages as the moral center of industrial capitalism. Wages had been important in her father’s political economy, but now she learned to see them as the social center around which economic activity circulated.

FKW arranged to translate *die Lage* *der arbeitenden Klasse in England* about the time of her marriage in October 1884. Probably encouraged by Professor Platter, she asked Hermann Schluter, publications manager of *Sozialdemokrat*, an SPD paper in Zurich, to contact Engels and request his permission. Engels gladly consented.[[56]](#endnote-56) Marx had died the previous year, after living in exile in London since 1850, and, as his literary executor, he was now swamped with the task of editing and publishing what became Volumes II and III of *das Kapital,* (German first editions published in 1885 and 1894, respectively), as well as supervising the English translation of Volume I, which appeared in 1887.[[57]](#endnote-57) He was willing to assist with the translation of *die Lage* because, as he wrote Mrs. Wischnewetzky about the book’s continuing relevance, “the development of manufacturing industry” in England in 1844, “is almost exactly reproduced at the present moment in Germany” and America—“steam and machinery, and their social outcrop in the creation of a proletariat.”[[58]](#endnote-58) His job was to advance Marx’s legacy and his 1845 book was part of that legacy. Meanwhile, the positive reception of his *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* (1880), with its clear presentation of Marxian ideas, was energizing his work. As he wrote his American friend, Friedrich Sorge, “Most people are too lazy to read stout tomes such as *Das Kapital* and hence a slim little pamphlet like this has a much more rapid effect.”[[59]](#endnote-59)

FKW’s first surviving letter to Engels on December 5, 1884, asked him to review her translation of some of the book’s technical terms. So their collaboration was well underway by that date. Just over a year later, in January 1886, she was arranging for her translation’s publication and the first English translation of *das Kapital*, writing Engels, “I think it will be a very good thing that die Lage and das Kapital will appear in the same year in English, as each helps to the comprehension of the other, as I know from personal experience.”[[60]](#endnote-60) Her wish came true. *Capital* was available in London in 1887, and *The Condition* was published that year in New York (by John Lovell).[[61]](#endnote-61)

Forty years older than Kelley, Engels wrote *The Condition of the Working Class in England* in his mid-twenties. When he arrived in Manchester in 1842, the city and surrounding villages in Lancashire County, northern England, had more than 550 cotton textile mills and well over a hundred-thousand workers. Between 1830 and 1848 these and other British industrial towns were in the throes of social revolution—the equivalent of the German and French struggles of 1848, except that the British uprising was propelled by industrial wage-earners rather than cross-class opponents of aristocracy, including peasants.[[62]](#endnote-62) As the vanguard of the world’s industrial revolution, British society weathered wage-earner uprisings in the 1830s and 40s that shaped the future of British politics and class relations for the rest of the nineteenth century. Engels brought the compelling story of the Chartist struggle to German readers in 1845. In 1848 John Stuart Mill wrote for elite English readers as though that uprising had been defeated and could be ignored. A generation later Florence Kelley renewed the Chartist story for English-language readers. Her immersion in that narrative—in the social dimensions of economic transformation—tells a large story with wages at its center.

The Chartist movement--as it came to be called after the uprising’s creation in 1837 of a Parliamentary bill known as “the People’s Charter”--was a social movement fueled by discontent with the misery of early-industrial wage-earners. The Reform Bill of 1832 had extended the ballot to men with property worth ten pounds, essentially enfranchising the middle class. The Chartist uprising sought the ballot for men without property qualifications. Yet as Friedrich Engels depicted the movement in *The Condition of the Working Class in England,* and as historians have subsequently interpreted it, the uprising was a “knife and fork” movement about disastrously inadequate wages, which many hoped could be solved by political means.[[63]](#endnote-63)

Florence Kelley gained transformative strength from her immersion in Engels’ classic book. The book’s subtitle, “*From Personal Observation and Authentic Sources*,” highlighted his reliance on the evidence of empirical studies, and his trust of his own voice as the book’s moral authority. This template resembled Kelley’s own combination of empirical sources and personal interpretative perspective found in her “Despair” article. But Engels’s book contained content and analysis entirely new to her. It changed her. And it changed her understanding of her purpose. From a very smart, highly-motivated college graduate in the vanguard of her generation’s flow into public life who envisioned a future of working with coalitions of middle-class women to achieve better working conditions for wage-earning women, she embraced the larger challenge of carrying coalitions of women into moral critiques of capitalism and changing capitalism, especially its wage system.[[64]](#endnote-64)

Of course she did not know where she was headed in 1884, and she never explicitly acknowledged her translation work as the source of her radicalism. Pregnant and living around the corner from her mother and brother in Heidelberg, she focused on the day-to-day accomplishments of turning powerful German text into compelling English. The result was a translation of Engels’s book that remains authoritative more than a hundred years later—the one that scholars prefer. [[65]](#endnote-65) The task was worthy of her commitment to it. In *The Condition* she found a forceful, systematic critique of industrial capitalism that provided a new foundation for her political understanding. Just as important was Engels’s voice as a model for public discourse that drew on the publications of middle-class political culture but remained independent of that culture. Added to this systematic critique and independent voice was the book’s focus on wages as a system of power relations embedded in society. Her translation became a site for understanding the larger enterprise of industrial capitalism and a justification for separating from the hegemonic defense of capitalism in American political culture.

Although nowhere in his book did Engels mention why he was in Manchester, the “personal observation” of his subtitle was that of an apprentice accountant working in textile mills that were owned and operated by his family’s German company, Erman and Engels. He observed the company’s capitalist logic from the inside. His “observation” was also informed by his affiliation with a German youth movement that drew on Hegelian philosophy and rebelled against established religion. In the competing socialist and liberal groups that were shaping the German revolution of 1848, he had become a “communist” and briefly met Karl Marx. By the time he went to Manchester, he said that his Young Hegelian party “contended for the insufficiency of political change and declared their opinion to be that of a *Social* revolution based upon common property.” (His emphasis.)[[66]](#endnote-66)

Engels’s father sent him to Manchester in the hope that the family’s commercial interests would dampen his radical critique of industrialization. Just the opposite occurred.[[67]](#endnote-67) In Mary Burns, a young mill worker and domestic servant, he found a romantic partner who introduced him to Manchester working-class culture and plebian social movements. Within a year of his arrival, he began to write about the still-ongoing insurgency for the leading Chartist periodical, *Northern Star.*

To make sense of the upheaval, Engels read deeply in Parliamentary reports and writings by official and unofficial authorities on social conditions in Manchester. A sampling of these can be found in FK’s “Translator’s Note,” which listed publications for which she was unable to obtain a copy in the original English and therefore was “compelled to re-translate from the German.” These included writings on the management of the poor, reports of town councils, correspondence about the 1833 Factory Act, reports by the Children’s Employment Commission, a Factories Inquiries Commission’s Report, and a report by a Parliament member on the Cause of Rural Incendiarism. Engels found many of these sources in the reading room of Manchester’s Chetham Library, founded in 1653, where he explored its collections of contemporary writings. (In 1845, after the publication of *The Condition*, he returned to the library with Marx, and they spend the summer there and at the British Museum reading sources for use in Marx’s new project, which became the writing of *Capital*.[[68]](#endnote-68)) Engels also drew on “unstamped” (hence illegal) pamphlets and newspapers that came to his hand in evenings spent with Chartists, trade unionists, and Owenite socialists.[[69]](#endnote-69)

Recent and dramatic though they were the social uprisings in Lancashire County did not appear in Engels’s first chapter. Instead, his book (and Florence Kelley’s translation work) began with what came first in the history of capitalism-- The Industrial Proletariat,” the new social class created during the great transition from rural life to industrial work as farmers (and those associated with farming) were forced by capital-intensive changes in agriculture to migrate to the “great towns,” where they became “hands” for factory work.[[70]](#endnote-70) “Only in England can the proletariat be studied in all its relations and from all sides,” he wrote. The “mad rush of manufacture” that put England in the front of the Industrial Revolution displaced the “numerous, petty middle class of the ‘good old times,’” creating “rich capitalists on the one hand and poor workers on the other.”[[71]](#endnote-71) Bourgeois capitalists in the great towns gained a “monopoly” of the proletarians’ “means of existence,” which was protected “by the power of the State.”[[72]](#endnote-72) Proletarian individuals were not enslaved to individual employers, but the proletariat class was enslaved to the bourgeoisie.[[73]](#endnote-73) Coercion was central to the system’s ethics.

Much of the power of Engels’s book (and Florence Kelley’s struggle to match its intensity in English) came from chapter two, “The Great Towns,” with its ethnographic descriptions of the social misery of wage-earners’ lives. Manchester’s “working people’s quarters,” he wrote, stretched “like a girdle averaging a mile and a half in breadth, around the commercial district.” These quarters were unseen by “the eyes of the wealthy men and women,” who travelled from their homes in the “breezy heights” to the city’s center through avenues of shops deliberated designed to hide the despondency of the working class dwellings. Engels described many different desperate neighborhoods. In one:

The cottages are old, dirty, and of the smallest sort, the streets uneven, fallen into ruts and in part without drains or pavement; masses of refuse, offal and sickening filth lie among standing pools in all directions; the atmosphere is poisoned by the effluvia from these, and laden and darkened by the smoke of a dozen tall factory chimneys. A horde of ragged women and children swarm about here, as filthy as the swine that thrive upon the garbage heaps and in the puddles.[[74]](#endnote-74)

In another, “surrounded on all four sides by tall factories and high embankments, covered with buildings, stand two groups of about two hundred cottages, built chiefly back to back, in which live about four thousand human beings, most of them Irish.” Living “in measureless filth and stench, in this atmosphere penned in as if with a purpose, this race must really have reached the lowest stage of humanity.” The crowding was unimaginable. “[I]n each of these pens, containing at most two rooms, a garret and perhaps a cellar, on the average twenty human beings live; that in the whole region, for each one hundred and twenty persons one usually inaccessible privy is provided,” forcing everyone to walk through pools of excrement.[[75]](#endnote-75)

The liberal intentions of physicians and reformers had not been able to improve the working people’s districts. “[I]n spite of all the preaching of the physicians, in spite of the excitement into which the cholera epidemic plunged the sanitary police . . . in this year of grace 1844, it is in almost the same state as in 1831!” Engels blamed the manufacturers.

In the industrial epoch alone has it become possible that the worker scarcely freed from feudal servitude could be used as mere material, a mere chattel; that he must let himself be crowded into a dwelling too bad for every other, which he for his hard earned wages, buys the right to let go utterly to ruin. This manufacture has achieved, which, without these workers, this poverty, this slavery could not have lived. (43)

Meanwhile, the bourgeoisie was provisioned in villas in hillsides around the city, the vast new wealth generated by manufacturing going mostly into their pockets.

 Engels’s eighth chapter on “Labour Movements” reflected his involvement in the struggle as well as his analytic skills. He displayed (and his translator surveyed) a stunning mastery of recent social movement history in England. Relying on “a year’s file of the *Northern Star,*” he concluded that “social war has broken out all over England.” His detailed accounts of Chartists’ uprisings and strikes dramatically depicted the moral authority of the protests in the face of unrelenting exploitation. He called these protests “social.”[[76]](#endnote-76)

 Because “the bourgeoisie” forced them into the struggle, workers were often “neither clear nor united as to its object,” he wrote. But “they have shown their courage often enough when the matter in question was a specific, social one.” For example, when a brick firm “increased the size of bricks without raising wages, and sold the bricks, of course, at a higher price,” the workers, “to whom higher wages were refused, struck work. . . [and] declared war upon the firm.” A sustained gun battle between workers and guards occurred. “[T]he firing lasted half an hour until the ammunition was exhausted, and the object of the visit, the demolition of all the destructible objects in the yard, was attained.”(152)

Engels interpreted such local uprisings as occasions when “the peculiarly social character of the workingmen’s Chartism manifested itself.” He quoted Joseph Stephens, independent Methodist minister and opponent of the New Poor Law, speaking “in a meeting of 200,000 men on Kersall Moor, the Mons Sacer of Manchester: Chartist, my friends, is no political movement, where the main point is your getting the ballot. Chartism is a knife and fork question, the Charter means a good house, good food and drink, prosperity and short working hours.”(154).

Like their eighteenth-century precursors who rioted when landowners refused to sell grain at prices they could afford, nineteenth-century Chartists sought consumption rights to “good house, good food and drink.” Economist and medieval historian R. H. Tawney in 1926 explained the preindustrial roots of that moral economy as “one in which consumption held somewhat the same primacy in the public mind, as the undisputed arbiter of economic effort, as the nineteenth century attached to profits.”[[77]](#endnote-77)

The crucial difference between the new political economy and the old moral economy lay in the new imagining of the economy as a machine that ran by itself independent of society, whereas participants in the older economy treated it as woven into society.[[78]](#endnote-78) Adam Smith and others who believed that the wealth of nations lay in capital, especially capital deployed in manufacturing, could be optimistic about their views because they ignored the suffering of wage-earners. Their view of capital as having a life separate from society aided their ability to ignore those who were not benefiting from economic change. Engels, on the contrary, exposed the suffering of wage earners in ways that emphasized their connections with the rest of society. Quoting evidence that would have fascinated Florence Kelley--from Parliamentary debates, factory act reports, clergymen and city, county and national officials responsible for reporting on the condition of the poor--his account emphasized that the economic existence of the poor was woven into their social and political lives. So Engels not only used “liberal” sources (as he called them) to challenge the authority of political economy writings; his use of them revealed those sources’ belief that economic life was woven into social and political life.

 For example, Engels quoted Reverend George Alston of St. Philip’s, Bethnal Green, London, who wrote a series of letters to *The Times* in the 1840s, one of which Engels used to describe lives inside poor dwellings: “And if we make ourselves acquainted with these unfortunates, through personal observation, if we watch them at their scanty meal and see them bowed by illness and want of work, we shall find such a mass of helplessness and misery that a nation like ours must blush, that these things can be possible.”(21).[[79]](#endnote-79) The Chartist uprising meant “that the social war is avowedly raging in England; and that, whereas it is in the interest of the bourgeoisie to conduct this war hypocritically, under the disguise of peace and even of philanthropy, the only help for the workingmen consists in laying bare the true state of things and destroying this hypocrisy.” (142).

Engels’s chapter on “Labor Movements” was populated by Chartists. He described how they emerged as a coalition of workingmen and shopkeepers, then, after the middle-class enfranchisement of 1832, Chartism persisted as “knife and fork” issues with the ballot as an economic means, not an end. “Chartism is of an essentially social nature, a class movement,” he wrote. (158). Their basic goal was to prevent the bourgeoisie from forcing them to compete with one another: “Free competition has caused the workers suffering enough to be hated by them.” Their demands, “the Ten Hour Bill, protection of the workers against the capitalist, good wages, a guaranteed position, repeal of the new Poor Law,” he wrote, “are directly opposed to free competition and Free Trade.”[[80]](#endnote-80)

Relying on sources related to the series of Factory Acts and commissions passed by Parliament between 1818 and 1833, Engels emphasized that “the power of the State intervened several times to protect [children] from the money greed of the bourgeoisie.” But the “cold, calculating Political Economy of the manufacturers” limited the scope and enforcement of the acts. (115) The 1833 act provided for factory inspectors for the first time and Engels quoted extensively from their reports on the “barbarism” of the mills. “Nothing is more revolting than to compare the long register of diseases and deformities engendered by overwork,” he declared. Chartist campaigns for what in 1847 became the “Ten Hour Act” was for Engels an urgent proletarian goal.[[81]](#endnote-81)

Schools established by “Trades Unionists, Chartists and Socialists,” where “children receive a purely proletarian education” and reading rooms with “proletarian journals and books” were also important achievements. These differed from the “mechanics’ Institutes” where “Political Economy is preached, whose idol is free competition and whose sum and substance for the workingman is that, that he cannot do anything more rational than resign himself to starvation.”[[82]](#endnote-82)

Comparing trade unionists, Chartists and Owenite socialists, Engels thought “Chartists are theoretically the more backward, the less developed, but they are genuine proletarians all over, the representatives of their class.” He thought the “Socialists are more farseeing, propose practical remedies against distress, but proceeding originally from the bourgeoisie, are for this reason unable to amalgamate completely with the working class.” Trade unionists were found in both groups. Class consciousness was key to their future. “The moment the workers resolve to be bought and sold no longer, when in the determination of the value of labor, they take the part of men possessed of a will as well as of working power, at that moment the whole Political Economy of to-day is at an end.” [[83]](#endnote-83) Presently, class-based identity was strong. Workingmen feel that they “form a separate class, with separate interests and principles, with a separate way of looking at things in contrast with that of all property owners; and that in this class reposes the strength and the capacity of development of the nation.”[[84]](#endnote-84)

Crucial to Engels’s analysis of the class relationship between workers and employers was his depiction in chapter three, “Competition,” of how the wage system worked within a force-field of competition. Competition among employers could drive wages up. “The maximum [wage] is determined by the competition of the bourgeois among themselves,” Engels explained. “The proletarian produces the goods which the bourgeois sells with advantage. When, therefore, the demand for these goods increases so that all the competing workingmen are employed, and a few more might perhaps be useful . . . the bourgeois begin to compete among themselves.” Thus, “one capitalist after another goes in chase of workers and wages rise.” But capitalists don’t lose sight of their bottom line. “If the capitalist, who willingly sacrificed a part of his extraordinary profit, runs into danger of sacrificing any part of his ordinary average profit, he takes very good care not to pay more than average wages.”[[85]](#endnote-85)

In the competition among employers for disciplined workers, the proletarian had some power. “Civilization” was a lever that could elevate wages. The “Englishman’s level of civilization” differed from “the Irishman’s level,” Engels argued, and since employers often needed the Englishman’s skills, they had to pay higher wages. “If the workers are accustomed to eat meat several times in the week, the capitalists must reconcile themselves to paying wages enough to make this food attainable.”[[86]](#endnote-86)

More often, competition among workers was widespread and keen, due to the relative plentitude of workers and the relative scarcity of jobs. In that circumstance, wages fell to a minimum for those who were employed and others were left to starve. Contrary to Malthus’s view that surplus population created poverty, Engels argued: “Surplus population is engendered rather by the competition of workers among themselves, which forces each separate worker to labor as much each day as his strength can possibly admit.”[[87]](#endnote-87)

Engels then added his crucial intervention in political economy writings about wages. Employers could gain capital in the form of uncompensated labor, he explained, by lengthening the working hours of individual wage-earners.

If a manufacturer can employ ten hands nine hours daily, he can employ nine if each works ten hours, and the tenth goes hungry. And if a manufacturer can force the nine hands to work an extra hour daily for the same wages by threatening to discharge them at a time when the demand for hands is not very great, he discharges the tenth and saves so much wages.

Thus, competitive conditions could enable employers to pocket wages gained from forcing wage-earners to work longer hours than were necessary for the profitable production of commodities. This, he said, “is the process on a small scale, which goes on in the nations on a large one.”[[88]](#endnote-88) The theft of wages was not an occasional event that legal aid could remedy; it was inherent in the system, imbedded at its center and coercively enforced.

 The publication of Engels’s book in Leipzig in 1845 launched a life-long alliance with Karl Marx and instantly made Engels a major player in German socialist economics. Especially important for his translator was the notion of “surplus value,” which Marx developed out of Engels’s description of how capital could be accumulated from unpaid wages. “Surplus value” was fully developed in *das Kapital*, when Kelley read the German edition in 1884. Originating as it did in Engels’s text, “surplus value” would become her chief theoretical paradigm for understanding how wages occupy the moral center of industrial capitalism.[[89]](#endnote-89)

 Between the publication of Engels’s *die Lage* in 1845 and Marx’s *das Kapital* in 1867, Marx developed the concept of “surplus value” in stages.[[90]](#endnote-90) First, responding to the immediate impact that *die Lage* made on him, in July and August 1845, he met with Engels in Manchester and worked at the Chetham Library, then at the British Museum, researching in sources that reported on developments in British industrial society.[[91]](#endnote-91) At the Chetham they worked in a windowed alcove separate from the reading room where they could converse and accumulate materials. One young bearded German youth tutored another young bearded German youth on the use of “liberal” sources that could be used to expose the predations of industrial capitalism.[[92]](#endnote-92) In these libraries Marx’s conversion took place—from the philosophical frameworks he used to analyze “alienation” (Entfremdung) to economic structures that focused on the social relations of production. There began his accumulation of official and unofficial reports that he cited in *das Kapital* and compiled in the book’s extensive bibliography, closely resembling *die Lage’s* reliance on printed British sources.[[93]](#endnote-93)

Twenty years later Marx remembered the theoretical energy of Engels’s book: “What power, what incisiveness and what passion,” he wrote; “you made the reader feel that your theories would become hard facts if not tomorrow then at any rate on the day after.”[[94]](#endnote-94) By then Marx had excavated multiple theories buried in Engels’s thick descriptions. Scholars of the two have attributed to Engels’s book Marx’s materialist conception of history; the nature of class divisions; the inherent instability of industrial capitalism, especially its bourgeois rule; and the inevitability of revolution.[[95]](#endnote-95)

Like Engels, Marx’s reliance on the empirical reports related to factory acts helped him see Parliament’s enactment of factory acts as a class struggle between working-class efforts to reduce exploitation and capitalist efforts to retain exploitation by remaining unregulated. Marx called the enactment of the Ten-Hours Act in 1847, “the first time. . . in broad daylight the political economy of the middle class succumbed to the political economy of the working class.”[[96]](#endnote-96)

Yet Marx’s most important theoretical contribution for Florence Kelley, and seemingly for himself, lay in what he came to call “surplus value.” Not using the phrase “labor theory of value,” he instead invented a Ricardoesque term, “labor power,” which referred to units that could be greater or less, depending on intensity and time. Importantly, these units could measure unpaid units of value that employers pocketed rather than paid to wage-earners. Marx called *those* unpaid units “surplus value” (Mehrwert).[[97]](#endnote-97)

In a section in *das Kapital*, on “Conversion of Surplus-Value into Capital,” Marx explained how surplus value worked in words that closely resembled Engels’s description of how employers pocketed value instead of paying better wages to that wage-earners.

In a factory, suppose that 100 labourers working 8 hours a day yield 800 working-hours. If the capitalist wishes to raise this sum by one half, he can employ 50 more workers; but then he must also advance more capital, not merely for wages, but for instruments of labour. But he might also let the 100 labourers work 12 hours instead of 8, and then the instruments of labour already to hand would be enough.

In this way, “additional labour, begotten of the greater tension of labour-power, can augment surplus-product and surplus-value (*i.e.*, the subject-matter of accumulation), without corresponding augmentation in the constant part of capital.”[[98]](#endnote-98)

 This separation of the wage relationship from the value of the product sustained Florence Kelley’s later combination of Marxian views of wages with marginal-utility views of the relationship between consumers and the value of commodities. Beginning in 1890 she connected the two systems with a moral imperative of what the consumer owed the wage-earning producer.[[99]](#endnote-99)

 More immediately, Marx’s description of the extraction of surplus value from labor power shed new light on the accumulation of capital and the creation of wealth inequality. For example, it offered a new way of seeing increased productivity. “Hand in hand with the increasing productivity of labour,” Marx argued, goes “the cheapening of the labourer, therefore a higher rate of surplus value, even when the real wages are rising. The latter never rise proportionally to the productive power of labour.”[[100]](#endnote-100) Marx’s most radical rendering of his argument was that the wage relationship was “in no way a relation between two magnitudes, independent one of the other: on the one hand, the magnitude of the capital; on the other, the number of the laboring population; it is rather, at bottom, only the relation between the unpaid and the paid labour of the same laboring population.”[[101]](#endnote-101)

 In his letters to Engels in the early 1860s Marx frequently asked for advice about his depiction of “unpaid wages,” and when correspondence between London and Manchester proved cumbersome, asked, “Can’t you come down for a few days?” On the eve of *das Kapital’s* publication, Marx wrote Engels, whom he called “Fred,” “Without you, I would never have been able to bring the work to a conclusion.”[[102]](#endnote-102) Responding to a review of *das Kapital* in 1868, he wrote that “so long as the determination of value by labour time is itself left ‘undetermined’, as it is with Ricardo, it does not make people SHAKY. But as soon as it is brought exactly into connection with the working day and its variations, a very unpleasant new light dawns upon them.” Summarizing the review, he continued, “the fellow has not detected the three fundamentally new elements of the book: 1. that in contrast to all previous political economy . . . I begin by dealing with the general form of surplus value.” 2. that the book shows the importance of speaking of “labour power,” not “labor.” And “3. that for the first time wages are shown as the irrational outward form of a hidden relationship.”[[103]](#endnote-103)

Engels finally retired from factory management in Manchester and moved to an upper middle-class neighborhood in London in 1870, beginning his full time job of working with Marx and supporting Marx’s family. FKW did not know all that we know today about how Marx’s close relationship with Engels shaped *das Kapital’s* argument about surplus value. But by comparing *die Lage* and *das Kapital* she knew that “each helps to the comprehension of the other.” She also knew that Engels, the apprentice factory manager, originated the Marxian view of wages as a coercive relationship that generated both capital and poverty.

\*\*\*

In Heidelberg in the fall of 1884 Florence Kelley Wischnewetzky worked intensively but comfotably. As she wrote Philadelphia friend, May Lewis,

My husband vanishes to his first clinic at nine and is gone three hours during which I translate or read for my degree. Then we have an hour among the English, American and German papers in the Museum. Then dinner at an admirable club in the neighborhood and a two hours chat or quiet reading time over our coffee, in our sunny study. Then come lectures from four until half past seven, during which I again translate or read for my degree. Then tea in the study and a long evening of reading aloud, rarely the theatre or a concert for we are happier together in our nook.[[104]](#endnote-104)

In June 1885, she and Lazare returned to Zurich from Heidelberg and Caroline and Bert finally departed for Philadelphia. Nicholas was born in July. Preparatory to the birth, she wrote May Lewis that she “had not the slightest anxiety for the coming time.” They were “back in the quiet lovely pension where I spent last year, have the same rooms which I had then and the same gentle friendly Swiss family who regard us as their youngest children and spoil us accordingly.” Their schedule was the same—“work, walk, and debate, and make plans”—the difference being that they had several friends in Zurich.

One friend was special. As she wrote May, “I am greatly rejoiced at having Rachel Foster here, settled down for a long quiet study before resuming her active working in America.” Foster, a Philadelphia friend, had inherited a substantial legacy when her father died; he had founded and edited the successful *Pittsburgh Dispatch* in an era when newspapers were powerful, money-making institutions. In 1883 Foster had travelled in Europe with suffragist Susan Anthony, paying Anthony’s expenses as well as her own, and would soon become the private funder of Anthony’s travels as well as a major organizer in the suffrage movement, marrying Cyrus Avery in 1888.[[105]](#endnote-105) Now, in her Zurich sojourn in 1885, she offered to subsidize the publishing expenses of whatever socialist translations Florence Kelley Wischnewetzky wished to complete.

Prompted perhaps by the proximity of Rachel Foster, FKW began to write a series of regular dispatches to woman suffrage periodicals in the United States, thereby creating a place for her new ideas in the social movement that she knew best—woman suffrage. The movement lacked the vast numbers and boiling rage of Chartism, but she nevertheless wrote as if she believed it could champion the moral claims of wage-earners. In a steady flow of articles for *The Woman’s Journal* and other woman suffrage periodicals from January 1885 to October 1886, she established her voice as a vanguard intellectual leader, an advocate of wage-earning women, and a persistent reminder of the suffrage movement’s obligations to working-class women.[[106]](#endnote-106) Although not communicating with her family after September 1885, she nevertheless wrote long, passionate columns for woman-suffrage readers. She clearly intended to shape that movement’s future.

One of her first articles urged the suffrage movement to create a social agenda. “*We need a program,*” she insisted in the *Woman’s Tribune*. The movement should imitate “the German Working Men’s Party” and develop a program that would stand “year after year,” one that could be “modified at succeeding annual conventions,” with a standard that “friends defend and enemies attack--a set of principles clearly formulated and universally acknowledged.”[[107]](#endnote-107) The idea was a good reason why Susan Anthony asked her to work with the suffrage movement, and in a way she now accepted that invitation on her own terms, reflecting the programmatic logic of her new understanding of economics as well as that of the Working Men’s Party.

She continued this theme into the fall of 1885. The movement needed to “prove that we represent the working women;” otherwise, “our movement is proved to have fallen behind the need of the times.” She insisted that “*Equality before the Law* is not enough.” She might also have said, “Equality for women is not enough.” As she explained, widespread inequality among men made “mere equality of the sexes a laughing stock” because it made “each woman (rich or poor) merely equal to the men of her family, or her class.” The movement needed a program that recognized “the sum total of inequality now cursing society,”[[108]](#endnote-108) This was a new voice with new ideas.

She occasionally explored topics inspired by her translation work. In “Child-Labor in Factories,” she educated readers about wage-earning women and the relationship between women’s wages and other economic issues. Child labor, she explained, “is of the greatest importance to the workingwomen of Pennsylvania, where the textile industries are passing rapidly into the hands of women, and where the competition of children is increasingly ruinous to women’s wages.”[[109]](#endnote-109) Phrases from her translation appeared in mid-July in *Woman’s Journal* in a column titled, “Workingmen for Woman Suffrage.” There she deplored “the chasm between the [American] suffrage movement and the movement of the working women,” and insisted that the wage-earning women’s movement “demands not only the ballot, but the abolition of the whole wages-slavery under which men, women, and children are groaning to-day in every civilized country.”[[110]](#endnote-110)

 Two columns on “Zurich for American Women Students” in the summer of 1885 recommended to *Woman’s Journal* readers her own course of study in *Staatswissenschaft* or political science, which she defined as the social foundations of law and economics. To explore the “vast field of modern German research,” which, she assured readers, could not be done in English or American universities, she recommended a two year course in Zurich. This was the occasion when she also recommended extensive reading in British and American political economy. “For journalists, teachers of history and social science, and all those women whose sense of their growing public responsibility leads them to strive towards a comprehension of the countless social problems of our time, this faculty cannot be too strongly recommended,” she wrote. Since “all modern law rests ultimately upon an economic foundation . . . she who would defend, expound, or change the law should study the economic workings of our modern life.” This meant seeing “economic workings” as part of society and seeing society as an organism. “To heal the social organism, she must study it as an organism.”[[111]](#endnote-111)

 She predicted that studies in Zurich would show that “in America, as everywhere else, wages tend to a minimum barely securing existence for the working man and his children.” Readers who doubted that reality could also consult “the reports of the Bureau of Statistics of Massachusetts with special reference to the official statements of its chief, Mr. Carroll D. Wright.[[112]](#endnote-112)

In her Zurich studies, she noted, “the tariff question naturally assumed its proper position as a matter of expediency according to the conditions of any given country at any given time.”[[113]](#endnote-113) This contrasted with “the prevailing American belief that all political economy and the chief functions of government hinge upon the question of free trade or protection.” Her attention to tariffs must have been obscure to many readers, but for her it defined a new departure and announced her own understanding of economic issues as embedded in “the conditions of any given country at any given time”–as historically rather than politically constructed. Tariffs might or might not protect working people; other issues shaped the outcome of that question.[[114]](#endnote-114)

That summer, in addition to giving birth to Nikolas and laboring on the translation, she also read two recent important works by Americans that were generating a wave of anti-capitalist opinion: Henry George’s *Progress and Poverty: an Inquiry into the Cause of Industrial Depressions and of Increase of Want with Increase of Wealth* (1879); and Lawrence Gronlund’s *The Co-Operative Commonwealth: An Exposition of Modern Socialism* (1884). In a column published in *The Woman’s Journal* in July, she reviewed each through the lens of “German researches of the past forty years.” She found the *Progress and Poverty* George useful in a general way, and Gronlund’s “faithful and popular reproduction of the essence of the German investigations” quite important.

 “After Carey, no American name greets the student’s ear so often in Switzerland and Germany as that of Henry George,” she began. Although the word “wages” appears on almost every page of Henry George’s lengthy book, his discussions did not impress her. Nevertheless, she found an essence to praise. “In spite of defects inevitable in the absence of an intimate acquaintance with the master-works of modern German economic research,” she wrote, “Mr. George’s criticism of the developments of the past few years, and his demonstration of the universal nature of the present process of industrial and social development” make him worth reading. She was grateful for his criticism. “Mr. George’s inadequate solution of the problems he has formulated diminishes neither the brilliancy nor the correctness of his criticism.” He exposed as hypocrisy, “that habitual thanking God that America is not as other lands, which makes it so extraordinarily difficult for us to learn from the experience and teachings of European nations.”[[115]](#endnote-115) Happily, she concluded, George’s 1883 book, *Social Problems*, “gives evidence of wider study of the German master-works, and of correspondingly deeper insight.”

Gronlund’s book showed Kelley that modern German economic research could find a place in American life; she highly recommended it to her readers. “In the absence of translations, and of honest, efficient English condensations of the German researches of the past forty years, an especial value attaches to Mr. Lawrence Gronlund’s ‘Cooperative Commonwealth,’” she began, because his “skillful application to American conditions makes it evident that the German works are no more limited in their scientific bearing than the works of Smith and Ricardo.” Gronlund actually showed that the Germans were more relevant because “the English writers had England alone in mind in their generalizations whereas the modern German school recognizes its field of investigation a process of industrial development common to despotic, protective Germany, and parliamentary, free-trade England, to the protective presidential republics, France and America, as well as to the free-trade, democratic little Swiss republic.” All “industrially progressive communities” were struggling with the issues that Gronlund discussed. She found his criticism “less brilliant” than George, but concluded that his “knowledge of the German investigations enabled the ‘Cooperative Commonwealth’ to solve problems for which ‘Progress and Poverty’ offered no adequate solution.”[[116]](#endnote-116)

In a column on “Shorter Hours of Labor,” she discussed the eight-hour movement’s view of the relationship between hours and wages: “So convinced are the workers that a reduction of hours means employment for the unemployed, diminution of competition of the workers among themselves, and consequent increase of wages, that certain Trades Unions are willing to accept a reduction of wages at first and trust to the force of events and their own strength for regaining at least the present standard of payment.”[[117]](#endnote-117)

For many American women of Kelley’s generation, participation in a social movement was a form of higher education; her columns in suffrage periodicals modelled that possibility. They were quite distinctive. Few others explored social issues with the depth and authority of hers. These periodicals had modest circulations; combined, they may have only reached a few thousand.[[118]](#endnote-118) But they carried her voice across North America and many would have found in her columns their first contact with the moral agenda of social democracy.

\*\*\*

 In a letter to Engels in January 1886, FKW thanked him for “looking over the translation” and encouraged him to send the preface that he had agreed to write. Rachel Foster had arranged for the translation’s publication. She was returning to the United States and would “place a part of the ms. in the printers hands for stereotyping.” After “much fruitless correspondence with publishers,” the book had been accepted by New York publisher John Lovell. “I am especially glad to have the book appear in this way,” she told Engels. “Miss Foster, who had undertaken to bear the expense, is the very active secretary of the National Woman Suffrage Ass’n, and will see to it that the book is placed in all the many libraries of that Assn. and so within reach of a very large body of workingwomen, teachers etc. as well as of the thousands of women for whom their movement has hitherto offered chiefly political interest.” She added, “Miss Foster is ready too, to go on publishing socialist works as fast as I translate them.

Engels did not know what to make of Florence Kelley Wischnewetzky or her friend Rachel Foster. He wrote Friedrich Sorge, “I think I have already written you that an American lady, married to a Russian, has gotten it into her head to translate my old book. I looked over the translation, which required considerable work.” He agreed because she told him that “publication was assured and that it had to be done at once, and so I had to go at it.” Referring to socialist party sectarianism, for which FKW and Rachel Foster were unprepared, Engels continued, “Now it turns out that she turned the negotiations over to a Miss Foster, the secretary of a women’s rights society, and the latter committed the blunder of giving it to the Socialist Labor Party. I told the translator what I thought of this, but it was too late.” He was glad that the SLP gentlemen “do not translate anything of mine; it would turn out beautifully. Their German is enough, and then their English!”[[119]](#endnote-119)

German immigrants were at a high point of their membership in the Socialist Labor Party in New York and nationally in 1886. Their resolute and longstanding hostility to Marx and Engels was constructed by Ferdinand Lassalle in the 1860s and maintained thereafter in their daily commitment to political action in German-language groups rather than joining the American trade union movement as Engels and Marx prescribed. Rachel Foster left no record of her interaction with the SLP, but their rejection of Engels probably surprised her as much as her request surprised them. On the book’s copyright page she is listed as the sole copyright holder.

FKW refused to acknowledge the cultural gap between Rachel Foster and German socialism, writing Engels in January, “Miss Foster is ready too, to go on publishing socialist works as fast as I translate them.” Translations will be easier “after the appearance of the English translation of das Kapital” since that book will create “a standard of equivalent terms for many technical words and phrases.”[[120]](#endnote-120) She was glad that “die Lage” will be available in English when the translation of das Kapital appears “because it makes the study of das Kapital so much more fruitful when one reads die Lage before or with it.” She hoped to translate more “minor German essays,” such as “Lange’s Mill and Carey,” among other “short popularizations of socialist ideas.”[[121]](#endnote-121) She could not “understand why they were not translated years ago,” since they “are all quite as well adapted for the English reading as for the German public, and the need of them though increasingly urgent now, is by no means new!” She now judged American critics of capitalism more harshly and found it “painful to contemplate a literature composed of the works of Messrs. Henry George, Ely, Gronlund and Clark as the only one within the reach of the American workingmen in the present crisis.”[[122]](#endnote-122)

FKW’s reference to the “present crisis” in February 1886, referred to newspaper coverage of increasingly violent confrontations between striking workers and police in the United States. Historian David Montgomery found that the number of reported strikes leapt dramatically from 645 in 1885 to 1432 in 1886, most focusing on conflicts over wages, but increasingly also amplified by demands for the eight-hour day, which brought together skilled and unskilled, employed and unemployed, men and women workers.[[123]](#endnote-123)

In March she confirmed her receipt of Engels’s preface (now considered an appendix), which commented on capitalist economic developments in England, Germany and the United States between 1844 and 1884. She thought it “meets in advance all the objection which can honesty be made to the book, and brings it down to date so far as that is possible in such brief compass.” But she had one suggested change, apologetically offered: “The only point in it which seems to me liable not to be understood,--and I feel sure that you will not resent my calling your attention to it, even if you do not agree with me—is the reference to the Polish Jew as the personification of petty trade. I think he is not known in America as in Europe.” She suggested different alternatives. “He is the ‘old clothes man,’ the pedlar [sic] with his pack on his back who never rises to the height of the commission agent, or he is the hated and dreaded coal miner imported under contract for the purpose of displacing the higher priced English or Welsh miners in Pennsylvania.” She wrote out the questionable sentence so he would be sure which one she meant, beginning, “The business tricks of the Polish Jew are antiquated now in Berlin or Hamburg,” and ending “the miserable wiles and subterfuges which are considered the acme of cleverness in his native country.” Not hearing back from Engels, she retained this offensive, anti-Semitic sentence.[[124]](#endnote-124)

Her June letter to Engels described Americans as “on the verge of civil war,” quoting news about Congressman Frank Lawler, “bourgeois ‘radical’ democrat,” who “among the shouts applause and laughter of his colleagues,” declared “that [Jay] Gould be hung to the nearest lamppost as the man whose recklessness had brought the country to the verge of civil war (by pointing out unmistakably the chasm that separates the interest of Capital and Labor).” That growing conflict marked a turning point in American history.

Steadily building since the Great Railway Strike of 1877, the eruption of labor conflicts in the United States between January and May, 1886, ended with cataclysmic eruptions in Chicago and elsewhere around May 1, as demonstrations planned by trade unionists and socialists and anarchists clashed in armed battles with police.[[125]](#endnote-125) The battles of 1886 brought into urban centers and included vastly greater numbers of working people than had fought at railroad terminals in 1877. Viewed within the long nineteenth century as a whole, 1866 in the United States showed that while France, Germany and England evolved institutions that mediated conflicts between capital and labor--arbitration courts in France, national policies that represented labor’s interests in Germany, and respect for workingmen’s self-governing institutions in England--in the United States the absence of such institutions and the inadequacy of American political parties and courts to represent the interests of labor, meant that labor’s struggles were more often fought in the streets.[[126]](#endnote-126)

The American background of 1877 set the stage for 1886. Some thought that 1877 resembled the Paris Commune of 1871.[[127]](#endnote-127) It began with a strike when the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad announced its second wage cut of the year and protesting workers in Baltimore refused to let trains move until the cut was restored. Sympathy strikes spread along the railroads in every direction, from city to city, drawing in workers from other industries. In many cities middle-class proprietors, alienated by the railroads’ monopolistic power, sided with the strikers. In St. Louis a general strike stopped the city for nearly a week. In mid-July, President Hayes appeased railroad executives by making federal troops available to governors. Equipped with Gatling guns, the soldiers traveled from city to city on special railroad cars and upon their arrival in cities put down with militiamen what had become a nationwide rebellion. In Baltimore they fired into a crowd of unarmed men, women and children, killing ten and wounding many other. In Pittsburgh militiamen killed twenty men, women and children. Militia also fired on crowds in Chicago, where, as in other major cities, angry strikers destroyed railroad tracks and buildings worth millions of dollars. In all, about one hundred lives were lost.[[128]](#endnote-128) In New York, NEEDS NUMBERS demonstrators in Union Square were surveilled by armed militiamen on roofs above the crowd. Embodying their fears of social uprising, mansion-dwellers uptown funded the completion in 1879 of the Park Avenue Armory.[[129]](#endnote-129)

A decade later in Chicago, the eight-hour movement became, in the words of historian James Green, a “freedom movement.”[[130]](#endnote-130) Membership in the Knights of Labor soared, along with popular resistance to exploitation generally. A struggle over wage cuts boiled over at the nearby McCormick Reaper Works on May 3, when hundreds of striking workers who had been locked out of the plant for weeks battled police and two were killed by police gunfire. The next day the notorious “Haymarket Massacre” occurred when seven policemen and at least four demonstrators died with the explosion of a bomb and gunfire.

Historians view “Haymarket” as a watershed in American history, with the rising strength of the labor movement beforehand and the repression of labor thereafter. Women’s locals were especially visible in the rising strength of the Knights of Labor before 1886. The repression thereafter led to the precipitous decline of the Knights, which was especially hard on the women’s locals.[[131]](#endnote-131) The labor movement retreated from its embrace of unskilled and semi-skilled, and craft unionism was protected by the American Federation of Labor and the conservative leadership of Samuel Gompers. With the exception of industry-wide unions in textiles and garment-making, industrial unionism was repressed in the United States until the Congress of Industrial Unions formed under the federal protection of the Wagner Act and the New Deal in the 1930s.

In the midst of the drama, in June 1886 Engels wrote optimistically to FKW about developments in the United States, “I only wish Marx could have lived to see it!” He was amazed. “[O]ne thing is certain: the American working class is moving, and no mistake. And after a few false starts, they will get into the right track soon enough. The appearance of the Americans upon the scene I consider one of the greatest events of the year.” He thought “the breaking out of class war in America” disproved the “bourgeois thought that American stood above class antagonisms and struggles.” For Engels, the uprisings of May 1886 marked the end of bourgeois hegemony. “For America after all is the ideal of all bourgeois: a country rich, vast, expanding, with purely bourgeois institutions unleavened by feudal remnants of monarchical traditions, and without a permanent and hereditary proletariat. Here everyone could become, if not a capitalist, at all events an independent man.” That delusion has now ended. “The last Bourgeois Paradise on earth is fast changing into a Purgatorio, and can only be prevented from becoming, like Europe, an Inferno by the go-ahead pace at which the development of the newly fledged proletariat of America will take place. The rapidity of the uprising surprised him. “The way in which they have made their appearance on the scene is quite extraordinary: six months ago nobody suspected anything and now they appear all of a sudden in such organized masses as to strike terror into the whole capitalist class.” [[132]](#endnote-132)

She responded a few days later, reflecting on the Haymarket news and revealing that her own brother had fired on working people in Pennsylvania. “[M]y brother, a militiaman, who is among the first at the shooting down ‘rioters’ in every disturbance,” had been elected assistant city solicitor by workingmen who do not know how to vote their own interests. She felt keenly the American lack of adequate analysis of the relationship of capital and labor. “The actions of the bourgeoisie arouse further the class consciousness of the workers, but it does not enlighten them as they need to be enlightened and I am convinced that much crude action and wasted energy might be spared if we could make the best of our literature available for them.”[[133]](#endnote-133) In comparison to Germans, “the Americans are still so little enlightened that they revile and repudiate everything that bears the name Socialism.” And the bourgeoisie “attributes the whole ‘disturbance’ to ‘foreign Anarchists, Socialists, communists, Nihilists and Atheists.’” Meanwhile, the Knights of Labor leadership responds by demanding “a change in the wool duties!” This was understandable, given “so far from clear are they, as to the source and meaning of the evils that beset them. And how should they be clear, with no literature, with unenlightened leaders, such political training, and a capitalist press perhaps yet more corrupt than the English?” Mr. Powderly was still “preaching of the harmony between capital and labor. And the masses, themselves, re in a state of confusion incredible if it were not proved at every election.”[[134]](#endnote-134)

She thought that the most fundamental principle of “Marxist theory” —“the chasm that separates the interest of Capital and Labor”—was deliberately obscured by capitalists who “preach with increasing energy through press and pulpit, the harmony of interest of Capital and Labor.” Her father was reelected by “a constituency of workingmen” for “the fourteenth time to the twenty-eighth consecutive year of service” even though his “sole wisdom is praise of American protective tariff.” Meanwhile, capitalists have also “taken to organizing, en gros” with “a federation of the largest Iron, Sugar, and Textile interests for common protection.”[[135]](#endnote-135)

In August she wrote from Paris, where she and Lazare and Nikolas traveled before heading to America, reminding Engels that she had time to translate. “The money has been placed at my disposal for publishing any works of yours and Marx which I may translate.”[[136]](#endnote-136) He replied, recommending she create “a series of pamphlets stating in popular language the contents of *Das Kapital*. The theory of surplus value, No. 1; the history of the various forms of surplus value (cooperation, manufacture, modern industry), No. 2; accumulation and the history of primitive accumulation, No. 3; the development of surplus value making in colonies, No. 4.” He thought this “would be specially instructive in America, and might be completed by specially American facts.” Engels qualified this tribute to the talents of his translator with a cautionary note about American readers. “[Y]ou may be sure that it will take some time yet before the mass of the American working people will begin to read socialist literature. . . with the Anglo-Saxon mind, and especially with the eminently practical development it has taken in America, theory counts for nothing until imposed by dire necessity.”[[137]](#endnote-137) With this highlighting of the importance of “surplus value” as a Marxian concept, their correspondence halted until she reached New York.

\*\*\*

Of the many topics touched upon in Florence Kelley’s correspondence with Engels, one was anomalous--her confidence in the receptivity of middle-class American women to socialist ideas, despite his lack of response to her enthusiasm. This began with her trust of Rachel Foster and Foster’s ability to bring the translation of *The Condition of the Working* Class “within reach of a very large body of young workingwomen, teachers etc.”[[138]](#endnote-138) It extended to her writing in suffrage periodicals. In June 1886 she wrote that she wanted to consider translating “Bebel’s Frau,” and had “succeeded in getting it a public by exploiting the organs of the suffrage movement.” Perhaps anticipating his silence, she added that she knew “this consists chiefly of bourgeoises among whom one can only hope to win one or two, here and there.”[[139]](#endnote-139) Nevertheless, she kept telling him about positive signs that she glimpsed among American women. In June she wrote that “if no one has ‘The Origin” in hand and you are willing for me to translate it I shall gladly do so,” referring to Engels’s new book, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (1884), which built on Marx’s notes about the anthropological research of Lewis Henry Morgan among native Americans. “You will be interested to know, she continued, “that a large section of the Suffrage Association in Iowa, took for the subject of its discussions through the winter, Morgan’s works, especially his Ancient Society.”[[140]](#endnote-140)

What had changed for Florence Kelley between writing “Need Our Working Women Despair” in 1882, and completing the translation of Engels in 1886, was not her view of the importance of women--as wage-earners or middle-class activists—but the larger social context in which she saw them. Engels and Marx represented that larger context. She did not yet know how to weave that context into the social movements and social circumstances of American women, but while she had turned away from much that linked her to power in American politics, she did not turn away from the needs and interests of women. If wages constituted the moral center of industrial capitalism, she would show how that center was relevant to women.

In that regard FKW made a trial run with a series of articles for *Sozialdemokrat*, the Zurich journal of the SPD, published in August 1886, which evaluated the party’s policies about wage-earning women. Titled “Die Sozial-demokratie und die Frage der Frauenarbeit: Ein Beitrag zur Programmfrage” (Social Democracy and the Question of Women’s Work: A contribution to the platform question), her articles criticized the party’s policy, declared at the Gotha conference of 1875, of “prohibiting all women’s labor which is detrimental to health and morality.” She recommended the erasure of that paragraph, “which threatens a great number of women workers with unemployment and leaves them at the mercy of their class comrades.” She buttressed her argument in scholarly fashion with long excerpts from the writings of Marx, Engels, and Bebel, saying that the prohibition aimed more to eliminate women’s competition with male workers rather than to protect female workers. The party did not try to eliminate all work detrimental to men’s health and morality, so why do so for women? Domestic service, the occupation from which most prostitutes were recruited, clearly eroded women’s morality, yet the party was not calling for the end to this chief source of women’s employment. Poor relief remained the only alternative for women denied employment by the party platform—an option that improved neither their health nor their morality. Their removal from the labor force would prompt employers to substitute child workers or machines rather than make improvements for men. The burden of family life would become even greater for fathers. “Under today’s circumstances,” she insisted, “it is mainly due to women’s contributions that family life is maintained at all.” Furthermore, “the possibility of an independent income provides proletarian women with an independent position vis-à-vis men” and saved them from the dependency that governed bourgeois marriage.[[141]](#endnote-141)

This tour de force would have created a place for Florence Kelley Wischnewetzky in the SPD if she had wanted to remain in Switzerland and Germany. But it was also a way of saying farewell to the German phase of her preparation for public life. The 1886 crisis in America beckoned. Her studies in Zurich ended without a degree, but they had carried her into one of the most important texts of “modern German economic research” and established her expertise in a discourse of criticism that she could not have mastered in the United States. She had begun to connect the suffrage movement with that discourse, and she had learned to trust her voice in that new mode, which now encompassed the destiny of the whole society. In June she wrote Engels about “whole drama that is playing itself out before our eyes, with its hundred thousands of workingmen.”[[142]](#endnote-142) She very deliberately headed into that drama.
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