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Preface

Volume 23 of the *Collected Works* of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels contains pamphlets, articles, documents of the International Working Men’s Association (the First International) and other items written between October 1871 and July 1874.

These years mark an important stage in the development of the international working-class movement. After the Paris Commune of 1871 the general socio-political situation, and the shifts that had occurred in the movement itself, intensified the need for independent proletarian parties capable of leading the workers’ class struggle in the specific conditions of their own countries. The activities of the First International helped to prepare the ideological and organisational ground for the formation of such parties. And it was to this historic task that Marx and Engels devoted their efforts.

The materials in this volume show the all-round development and promulgation in these years of the basic principles of the scientific proletarian worldview, the struggle waged by Marx and Engels against trends hostile to the proletariat.

Their main thrust is towards the theoretical generalisation of the historical experience of the Paris Commune, a task Marx had begun in his *The Civil War in France* (see present edition, Vol. 22). Basing themselves on the experience of the Commune, Marx and Engels develop and enrich their theory of the state, the position and role of the working class in bourgeois society, the conditions required for its winning of political power, and the functions of the proletarian state. Inseparably linked with these
problems are those relating to the character and tasks of the proletarian parties. And it is precisely these problems that provide the battleground for the fight against the non-proletarian socialist trends—Proudhonism, Lassalleanism, Bakuninism, and others.

The volume begins with the new edition of the "General Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association", drawn up by Marx and Engels soon after the London Conference of 1871 and issued by the General Council in three languages. This document played a crucial role in spreading the ideological and organisational principles of the International in the period following the Paris Commune. In the light of its lessons the programmatic proposition contained in the Rules on the role of political struggle in the emancipation of the working class, which had more than once been distorted in Proudhonist publications, was of especial importance.

Marx's desire to deepen the programme of the International, and to perfect its organisational structure in the spirit of democratic centralism, is expressed in the "Amendments to the General Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association". These Amendments, made in preparation for the Hague Congress, reproduced in substance the resolution passed by the London Conference of the International on political action by the working class. As a result, for the first time ever, a fundamental conclusion arrived at earlier by Marxist thought and confirmed by the analysis of the Paris events of 1871 was incorporated into a programmatic document of the International Working Men's Association—the conclusion that to ensure the victory of the proletarian revolution the working class had to have its own political party.

Marx and Engels never tired of explaining to the working class the world historic significance of the Paris Commune. For example, in the resolutions written in March 1872 for the mass meeting of members of the International and the Commune refugees in London, Marx pointed out that the proletariat would regard the Commune "as the dawn of the great social revolution which will for ever free the human race from class rule" (see this volume, p. 128).

In contrast to the reformists, who tried to gloss over the revolutionary essence of the Commune, and to the anarchists, who interpreted it as an example of the destruction of the state as such, Marxism saw it as the first attempt by the working class not only to break the bourgeois state machine, but to replace it by
a state of a new, proletarian type—an instrument for the socialist transformation of society. Attaching exceptional importance to this historical lesson, Marx and Engels in 1872 found it necessary to make a special addition to the Manifesto of the Communist Party. In the preface to the new German edition they noted that the Commune had proved that “the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery”, and that to achieve its aims it would therefore have to set up a truly democratic state system of an entirely different class nature (p. 175).

In his article “Political Indifferencism” Marx exposed the theoretical bankruptcy and political harmfulness of the Proudhonist doctrine preached by the Bakuninists that the working class should renounce political struggle, and of the anarchist idea of the immediate “abolition of the State”. He showed that in practice these ideas disarm the workers and condemn them to the status of obedient servants of the bourgeoisie. Criticising these anarchist views, Marx demonstrates the historical need to replace the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the revolutionary dictatorship of the working class.

The Marxist propositions on the attitude of the proletarian revolution to the state are also substantiated in the essay “On Authority” by Engels. The essay shows that the anarchists’ repudiation of authority, of any kind of guiding or organising principle, is in deep contradiction to real life, to the actual conditions of material production. Organisation of modern industry, transport and agriculture, Engels observes, is impossible without authority. There is also an obvious necessity for authority in the future socialist society, which must be based on highly developed, scientifically organised production requiring strict regulation and control.

Engels demonstrated the anti-scientific and anti-revolutionary essence of the anarchist idea that political authority should be abolished as the first act of the social revolution, that the political state should be “abolished at one stroke”, even before the destruction of all the social relations that engendered it. “A revolution is certainly the most authoritarian thing there is; it is the act whereby one part of the population imposes its will upon the other part by means of rifles, bayonets and cannon—authoritarian means, if such there be at all... Would the Paris Commune have lasted a single day if it had not made use of this authority of the armed people against the bourgeois? Should we not, on the contrary, reproach it for not having used it freely enough?” (p. 425).

One of the sources that enriched revolutionary theory was the
experience of the bourgeois revolution in Spain, 1868-74, especially the culminating stage of its development. During this stage the republican system was established at the beginning of 1873 and cantonal revolts were instigated in the summer of that year by the extremist group of the left-wing bourgeois republicans, the "Intransigents", and their Bakuninist allies. The article by Engels "The Republic in Spain" and his series of articles The Bakuninists at Work analyse these events. Both works are a contribution to Marxist theory on working-class tactics in the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

In the first of these works, while opposing idealisation of the bourgeois republic, Engels nevertheless argues that this type of republic is in a certain sense more advantageous to the proletariat than to the bourgeoisie because it is "the type of state that frees the class struggle from its last fetters" (p. 419). An indispensable condition for successful opposition to the rule of the bourgeoisie, he notes, is the ideological maturity of the working-class movement, a maturity which the Spanish workers had not at that time achieved. Warning against precipitate action, Engels insistently advises the workers to use the republican system to consolidate and organise their ranks. If they did so, the bourgeois republic would have prepared "the ground in Spain for a proletarian revolution" (p. 420).

In his series of articles The Bakuninists at Work Engels notes that one of the most pernicious aspects of Bakuninist tactics was that they ignored the bourgeois-democratic tasks of the revolution. The Bakunists, who at that time had the support of a considerable section of the Spanish proletariat, were incapable of evolving a correct political orientation and in practice were inevitably destined to fall in with the extremist wing of the bourgeois republicans. It was their fault that the Spanish workers, who represented a real force, capable of influencing the course of events in a democratic spirit, were drawn into the adventuristic actions of the instigators of local revolts. The result was a grievous defeat. "The Bakunists in Spain," Engels stressed, "have given us an unparalleled example of how a revolution should not be made" (p. 598).

To the Bakuninist position Engels contrasts the tactical line that should have been adopted by the advanced workers in a country where the conditions for the transference of power to the working class had not yet matured. He believed that energetic participation in the democratic revolution and intense political activity by the proletarian masses could accelerate the maturing
process, that representatives of the working class should enter the revolutionary government in order to coordinate popular action from below with the actions of the revolutionary organs of power from above. Since matters had got to the point of armed struggle, Engels noted, the struggle should have been waged according to the rules of military art, without which no armed uprising could succeed. Above all, it was essential to prevent the insurgent forces from splitting up and getting out of touch, to establish centralised leadership and, by means of offensive action, to prevent the concentration of government troops and spread the uprising across the whole country.

Some essential aspects of the theory of socialist revolution were highlighted in the speech made by Marx in Amsterdam on September 8, 1872, at the meeting of members of the International that followed the Hague Congress. When choosing the tactical means and forms of struggle for establishing working-class power and building a socialist society, Marx said, one had to take into consideration the specific historical conditions proceeding from general revolutionary principles—"the institutions, customs and traditions in the different countries must be taken into account" (p. 255). Developing the thesis he had proposed in the 1850s, on the possibility of different roads—non-peaceful and peaceful—for the advance of the proletarian revolution, Marx admitted that in some countries where at that time there was no powerful military-bureaucratic state apparatus, specifically, in Britain and the USA, the proletariat could achieve its class aims by peaceful means. On the other hand, taking into account the situation obtaining in the majority of European countries at that time, Marx emphasised, "it is force which must be the lever of our revolution" (ibid.). He also envisaged the possibility of a situation in which the peaceful course of a revolution in Britain or other similarly placed countries might be interrupted by the resistance of the exploiting classes with the result that the working class would have to wage an armed struggle with its enemies.

Engels' *The Housing Question*, one of the most important works of scientific socialism, substantiates and defends a number of fundamental propositions of Marxist theory. Written in polemical form, this work is aimed both against the petty-bourgeois ideologists who saw the housing shortage as the basic evil of the whole capitalist system, and against the bourgeois social reformists who thought they could save and perpetuate the existing system of exploitation by relieving the workers of the
worst consequences of capitalist development, specifically by improving their living conditions. Engels scathingly criticised the views of the German Proudhonist Mülberger, who had advanced the utopian idea of turning every worker into the owner of his dwelling as a means of solving the social problem in the spirit of the Proudhonist ideal of "eternal justice". Revealing the flaws in this remedy, Engels shows the petty-bourgeois nature and anti-scientific nature of the views held by Proudhon and his followers. In this work Engels thus continued the criticism of Proudhonism, which Marx had begun in his *The Poverty of Philosophy*, characterising Proudhonism as one of the most typical expressions of petty-bourgeois socialism; Engels also struck a blow at its other varieties. He considered the tendency to camouflage defence of the capitalist system with apparent concern for the good of the working people as a characteristic feature of many bourgeois studies of the housing question, and regarded their authors as representatives of bourgeois socialism. Like the petty-bourgeois ideologists, he wrote, the bourgeois socialists are deeply hostile to the revolutionary working-class movement, sidetrack the workers away from the class struggle, and preach the false idea of the harmony of class interests. "Bourgeois socialism extends its hand to the petty-bourgeois variety" (p. 340).

The housing shortage, Engels tells us, is a logical consequence of the capitalist system. It does not become any less acute with the development of capitalism. However, while affecting the vital interests of the workers and also many categories of the middle strata, the housing question is not the main and decisive social problem. The crucial contradictions of capitalism are to be sought not in the sphere of the relations between the tenant and the house-owner. They are rooted in the sphere of production, in the conditions of the exploitation of labour power by the capitalists. To prove these truths Engels expounds in simple terms the main propositions of *Capital*. As in a number of his other works, he writes as an indefatigable propagandist of Marx's economic theory. He stresses that to do away with the housing shortage, solve the housing question and other social questions generated by the capitalist system, the capitalist mode of production must be abolished and the conditions for the exploitation of wage labour removed. This means that the working class has to win political power, and that the political and economic domination of the bourgeoisie must be eliminated. To achieve these aims the proletariat needs an independent political party armed with the theory of scientific socialism and pursuing a consistent class policy (see p. 372).
Dealing with the question of the possible roads towards the socialist transformation of society, Engels put forward the fruitful idea that these roads would depend on the specific historical conditions of the given country. These conditions would, in particular, determine how and in what form the socialisation of the instruments and means of production owned by the capitalists would be effected by the victorious proletariat (see pp. 385-87).

Engels linked the socialist transformation of society with the problem of eliminating the antithesis between town and country. Arguing against Mülberger's proposition that this antithesis is "natural", and that the desire to get rid of it "utopian", Engels shows that the abolition of the exploiting classes as a result of the socialist revolution will clear the road towards the complete solution of this problem. In socialist society the close intrinsic connection between industrial and agricultural production will lift the rural population out of its millennia of isolation and backwardness.

In "The Nationalisation of the Land", one of Marxism's programmatic documents on the agrarian question, Marx showed that the economic development, growth and concentration of the population would by natural necessity demand the use of collective labour in agriculture. A stable expansion of agricultural production could be attained only on the basis of broad application of the achievements of science and technology. "...The scientific knowledge we possess," Marx stressed, "and the technical means of agriculture we command, such as machinery, etc., can never be successfully applied but by cultivating the land on a large scale" (p. 132).

In defining the socio-economic significance of the nationalisation of the land, Marx proceeded from analysis of the peculiarities of the agrarian systems in various countries. For Britain, where the land was not owned by peasants but concentrated in large estates, land nationalisation had become, in Marx's view, "a social necessity". At the same time, Marx exposed the reformist notions that the agrarian question could be completely solved within the framework of capitalist society by means of land nationalisation. Only in a state where the working class held power, he emphasised, would "agriculture, mining, manufacture, in one word, all branches of production ... gradually be organised in the most adequate manner. National centralisation of the means of production will become the national basis of a society composed of associations of free and equal producers, carrying on the social business on a common and rational plan" (p. 136).
Many of the works and documents included in this volume expose the sectarian activity of the Bakuninists, who had become particularly active at that time. Expressing the moods of the petty bourgeoisie who were going bankrupt and thrown into the ranks of the proletariat, especially in such economically backward countries as Italy and Spain, and peddling the “leftist” phrases that went down well in such circles, the Bakuninists made a fresh bid to impose their dogmas on the working-class movement and take over its leadership. Their activities created a serious threat to the unity and solidarity of the International and could have weakened its resistance to the all-round offensive launched by the forces of reaction. The danger became particularly acute when the Bakuninist attacks on the leadership of the International and its line were backed by other sectarian and reformist trends—the Belgian Proudhonists, the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois reformists in the USA, the British reformists, and the German followers of Lassalle.

The struggle between the Marxist trend in the International and anarchism flared up after the London Conference (1871), whose resolution on the need for the working class to win political power and set up independent working-class parties had been furiously opposed by Bakunin’s followers. In November 1871, the Bakuninist congress in Sonvillier countered this resolution with the doctrine that the workers should abstain from political activity, and put forward the principle of complete autonomy and repudiation of discipline. As Engels noted in his article “The Congress of Sonvillier and the International”, the Bakuninist dogmas tended to deprive the proletariat of any organisation of its own. The incompatibility of Bakunin’s ideas with the aims of the International, with the task of creating independent political parties of the proletariat, made the ideological defeat of anarchism in the working-class movement a matter of great urgency.

The General Council’s private circular, *Fictitious Splits in the International*, which was written by Marx and Engels, struck a blow at Bakuninism. This work was designed to uphold proletarian party principles in contrast to anarchist sectarianism. The actions of the Bakuninist Alliance of Socialist Democracy, states the circular, are imbued with the spirit of bellicose sectarianism and aimed at undermining the International—the true militant organisation of the proletarians of all countries, “united in their common struggle against the capitalists and the landowners” (p. 107). Marx and Engels showed that sectarianism was a characteristic feature of the
early, immature stage of the working-class movement, and regarded the Bakuninists' attempt to revive it as thoroughly retrograde.

Exposing the anarchists' pseudo-revolutionary phraseology, Marx and Engels show that their programme "is nothing but a heap of pompously worded ideas long since dead" (ibid.). All the basic tasks of the working-class struggle for emancipation—the winning of state power and using it to build a classless society with the further prospect of the withering away of the state—were ignored by the anarchists, who proposed beginning the revolution by destroying all state apparatus. Most damaging of all for the working-class movement was the attempt to sow anarchy in the ranks of the movement itself, a tactic which amounted to disarming the proletariat in their struggle with the exploiters, who had at their disposal all the power of the state apparatus. The Bakuninist attacks on the principles of democratic centralism and party discipline, their demand that the functions of the General Council be reduced to the role of a mere correspondence and statistical bureau, which amounted to robbing the International of centralised leadership, were fraught with disorganisation. The campaign that Marx and Engels waged against the anarchists on the question of the functions and powers of the General Council was, in essence, a campaign for the organisational principles of the proletarian party.

After *Fictitious Splits in the International* had been published, the campaign against the Bakuninists entered a new phase. Marx and Engels began receiving information to the effect that the Alliance of Socialist Democracy which the Bakuninists claimed to have disbanded had in fact been kept going as a strictly conspiratorial society. The very people who accused the General Council of "authoritateness", Engels observed, "in practice, constitute themselves as a secret society with a hierarchical organisation, and under a, not merely authoritative, but absolutely dictatorial leadership" (p. 206).

The existence within the International Working Men's Association of a secret international organisation of Bakuninists with its own rules and programme meant that Bakunin and his supporters were in practice splitting the Association. "For the first time in the history of the working-class struggles," Engels wrote, "we stumble over a secret conspiracy plotted in the midst of that class, and intended to undermine, not the existing capitalist régime, but the very Association in which that régime finds its most energetic opponent" (p. 209). The task of the leaders of the International now was not only to bring about the ideological defeat of the Bakuninist Alliance but also
to substantiate and carry out organisational measures to rid the Association's ranks of this alien body.

As can be seen from a number of documents published in this volume, specifically, the appeal "The General Council to All the Members of the International Working Men's Association" and the "Report on the Alliance of Socialist Democracy Presented in the Name of the General Council to the Congress at The Hague", Marx and Engels acted promptly to expose the true face of the secret Bakuninist Alliance before all members of the International, to show the harm that was being done to the working-class organisation by the illegal existence within its ranks of this secret society. They both attached especial importance to unmasking the Bakuninists in the eyes of the workers of Spain and Italy. In their appeal "To the Spanish Sections of the International Working Men's Association" they explained that the aims and character of the Alliance, its activities, were in glaring contradiction to the spirit and letter of the Rules of the International. The attempt by anarchistic groups in Italy to usurp the name of the International was rebuffed in the address written by Engels to the Italian sections concerning the Rimini Conference (see p. 217), and other documents.

While exposing the anti-proletarian activity of the Bakuninists, Marx and Engels and their supporters also had to wage a campaign to root out other elements alien to the revolutionary working-class movement who were trying to use the International Working Men's Association for their own purposes. When such an attempt was made by the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois reformists in the USA, for example, Marx and Engels resolutely opposed these forays against the proletarian character of the International. Their position on this question was reflected in the "Resolutions on the Split in the United States' Federation Passed by the General Council of the I.W.A. in Its Sittings of 5th and 12th March, 1872", written by Marx, in his manuscript "American Split", and in Engels' article "The International in America" (see pp. 124-26, 636-43 and 177-83).

Marx and Engels also had to beat off the attacks by bourgeois politicians and journalists who were trying to distort the aims and purposes of the International Working Men's Association and to discredit its leaders. In the statements with which the General Council reacted to the speeches of the British M.P., Alexander Cochrane, in letters to The Eastern Post of December 20, 1871, Le Corsaire of September 12, 1872, and in the article "Stefanoni and the International Again" and other documents, they exposed the
dishonest slanders of the working-class movement put about in bourgeois circles.

The documents and articles connected with the Congress of the International at The Hague (September 2-7, 1872) form one of the most important group of items in the volume.

The Hague (fifth) Congress of the I.W.M.A. was a crucial landmark in the long struggle waged by Marx and Engels and advanced workers in various countries to establish the foundations of the revolutionary proletarian worldview in the international working-class movement. Through 1872 Marx and Engels did an enormous amount of work in preparation for the Congress, and the agenda and dates of the Congress were those that they proposed.

The Congress assembled more than a year after the fall of the Paris Commune, when international reaction was on the rampage. The Congress proceedings enjoyed the direct guidance of Marx and Engels and their most active participation. An acute ideological conflict developed between the advocates of the revolutionary proletarian line, grouped round Marx and Engels, and the anarchist delegates, who were supported by the British reformists. The discussion centred on two inseparably connected issues: open recognition, as a programmatic proposition of the International, of the idea that the proletariat should win state power, and proclamation as a guiding principle of the international working-class movement that political mass parties of the proletariat should be set up independently of the bourgeois parties. The solution of these problems in the spirit of the proposals made by Marx and Engels and their comrades meant that the key ideas of Marxism were embodied in the I.W.M.A. programme and marked the victory of Marxist theory over anarchist and reformist ideology.

The report that Marx presented to the Congress on behalf of the General Council gave a profound analysis of the situation facing the International after the Commune, and the qualitative changes that had taken place in the working-class movement as a result of I.W.M.A. activities (see pp. 219-27).

Most of the resolutions of the Hague Congress were written by Marx and Engels; the rest were based on proposals they made at the General Council meetings during preparations for the Congress. By decision of the Congress the basic content of the above-mentioned resolution of the London Conference on working-class political action was incorporated in the General Rules of the International, and the articles specifying and expanding the
powers of the General Council were included in the Administrative Regulations. The resolution on the Bakuninist Alliance of Socialist Democracy in fact declared this organisation incompatible with the International and expelled the Alliance leaders—Bakunin and Guillaume—from the International Working Men’s Association.

At the proposal of Marx and Engels, who based themselves on the actual historical situation that had taken shape in the Europe of the early 1870s, a resolution was passed transferring the seat of the General Council to New York (see p. 240). This step was also prompted by the danger that if it remained in London, the Council might be saddled with a majority of British reformists, or émigré Blanquists bent on adopting adventurous conspiratorial tactics.

Taken together, the Congress decisions defined the tasks and prospects of the working-class movement in the new historical conditions. They laid the theoretical foundation for the formation in the immediate future of mass proletarian parties within the framework of the national states.

Directly related to the documents of the Hague Congress is the group of articles written by Marx and Engels in order to publicise the key decisions of the Congress. They include the above-mentioned speech by Marx at the meeting of International members in Amsterdam, the articles by Engels “On the Hague Congress of the International”, “The Congress at The Hague (Letter to Enrico Bignami)”, “Letters from London.—II. More about the Hague Congress”, and “Imperative Mandates at the Hague Congress”.

In their published writings on the Hague Congress, Marx and Engels showed its historical significance and revealed the essence of the struggle that had taken place there between the revolutionary-proletarian trend and the anarchist-reformist bloc.

They summed up the results of the battle against the Bakuninists in the pamphlet *The Alliance of Socialist Democracy and the International Working Men’s Association*, written at the request of the Hague Congress. On the basis of numerous documents this pamphlet presented an exhaustive picture of the Bakuninist Alliance’s disorganising activities within the International and exposed the intrigues and subterfuges to which the leaders of the Alliance had resorted in order to assert their dominance in the I.W.M.A.

After making a critical analysis of the programmatic documents of the Alliance and what its leaders were publishing in the press, the authors of the pamphlet revealed the futility of the Bakuninists’
ideological arsenal, their petty-bourgeois levelling notions of the future society in the spirit of "barrack communism", their calls for rebellion and general destruction, and their orientation on the déclassé sections of society as allegedly the most revolutionary force. Marx and Engels regarded as totally unworthy of revolutionaries the contempt which the Alliance leaders showed for the ethical standards accepted in the working-class movement, their indiscriminate choice of methods of struggle, their use of mystification and deceit, and their actions based on the principle of "the end justifies the means".

The chapter "The Alliance in Russia" demonstrated the harm that Bakunin's and Nechayev's adventuristic activities had done to the Russian revolutionary movement. Marx and Engels contrasted to the Bakuninists' line the Russian revolutionary trend that was taking shape under the influence of Nikolai Chernyshevsky, of whom they wrote with great respect. As we see from his correspondence, it was at this time that Marx had the idea of writing a biography of that Russian revolutionary democrat and socialist.

The pamphlet noted that after the Hague Congress the anarchistic sectarians had launched a hostile campaign aimed at discrediting its decisions and openly refused to submit to them at their separate congresses and local rallies. Their example was followed by the British reformists. The answer to these splitting actions came with the resolutions passed on January 26 and May 30, 1873, by the New York General Council, which signalled the final organisational disassociation from the anarchists. According to these resolutions, all federations, sections and individuals who refused to recognise the decisions of the Hague Congress were declared to have placed themselves outside the ranks of the International Working Men's Association.

A substantial body of materials included in the volume reflect the systematic support that the founders of Marxism gave to the activities of the International's national organisations. Before the Hague Congress they had performed this work mainly as corresponding secretaries of the General Council for several countries—Marx for Germany and Russia, Engels for Italy, Spain, and Portugal. In this capacity they wrote numerous documents and appeals addressed to the sections of the International and individual members, explaining the various tasks that faced the international proletarian organisation and publicising its decisions (see pp. 54-56, 60-61, 74-76, 137-38, 153, 168-69, 184, 211-13, 217, 288-93). At
meetings of the General Council Marx and Engels reported regularly on the state of the working-class movement in various countries. After the Congress in The Hague and the General Council’s move to New York these activities did not cease, although they assumed a different character. Marx and Engels constantly helped the Council as its representatives in Europe and supplied it with important information (see, for example, the “Notes for the General Council” compiled by Engels, pp. 414-16).

Because of the great moral authority they enjoyed, they exerted a direct influence on the working-class movement in various countries. They strengthened their connections with the leaders of national contingents of the working class, and their correspondence with them became even more intensive.

The contribution of the founders of Marxism to the working-class press of various countries, their journalistic writings continued to play an important part in rallying and providing revolutionary training for those who participated in the proletariat’s struggle. Articles and despatches from Marx and Engels were published in the German newspaper Der Volksstaat, and in the Arbeiter Zeitung, which came out in German in the USA, in the British papers The Eastern Post and The International Herald, in the Spanish La Emancipacion, the Portuguese O Pensamento Social, the Italian La Plebe, Gazzettino Rosa, and others.

The contributions that Engels made to the Italian paper La Plebe, for example, were of great importance in establishing the Italian working-class movement. His articles about English agricultural labourers’ strike, the Hague Congress, the actions of the Irish members of the International in defence of arrested Fenians, and the situation in Spain (see pp. 148-50, 283-84, 294-96, 298-300), published under the general title of “Letters from London”, kept Italian workers informed about the proletarian movement in other countries and helped Italy’s working class to strengthen its international ties and overcome anarchist influence.

Some of the documents published in this volume are connected with the part Marx and Engels continued to play in those years in the British working-class movement. The position of the International, which openly declared its solidarity with the Paris Commune, brought about the final break between the General Council and a number of trade union leaders who had taken part in the founding and activities of the International Working Men’s Association but were negative in their attitude to the Commune. The British Federal Council, set up in October 1871 by decision of
the London Conference of the International, gave Marx and Engels a stronghold in the struggle for the broad masses of the British working class from 1871 to 1873. Making every effort to boost the revolutionary trend in the British working-class movement, they helped the British Federal Council to consolidate its ties with the workers, popularised the ideas of scientific socialism through its members, and guided the struggle against the reformist elements that had infiltrated the Council.

Marx and Engels did all they could to draw the participants in the Irish working-class movement into the International. They supported the idea of creating an independent Irish organisation of the International, regarding it as the basis for the future formation of an Irish working-class party independent of the bourgeois nationalists. Marx and Engels fought hard to overcome the hostility between English and Irish workers that was being artificially inflamed by the English bourgeoisie, and to dispel the chauvinistic prejudices spread by the English reformist leaders. "If members of a conquering nation called upon the nation they had conquered and continued to hold down to forget their specific nationality and position, to 'sink national differences' and so forth, that was not Internationalism, it was nothing else but preaching to them submission to the yoke, and attempting to justify and to perpetuate the dominion of the conqueror under the cloak of Internationalism," Engels said at the meeting of the General Council on May 14, 1872 (p. 155).

For Marx and Engels, one of the crucial means of influencing the British workers in the struggle against reformist ideology was their contributing to the newspaper The International Herald, which was in practice the organ of the British Federal Council. In an effort to use this paper to broaden the outlook of British working-class readers and awaken their interest in the emancipation struggle of their class brothers in other countries, Engels published in several of its issues in 1873 the "Communication from the Continent" and "News on the International Labour Movement".

Actions by the reformist elements against the decisions of the Hague Congress brought the internal conflict in the British Federation to a higher pitch, and in December 1872 this led to a split in the British Federal Council. A number of documents reflect the efforts of Marx and Engels to rally the revolutionary forces in the British organisations of the International. The "Address of the British Federal Council to the Sections, Branches, Affiliated Societies and Members of the International Working Men's
Association", and the "Reply to the Second Circular of the Selfstyled Majority of the British Federal Council", both of which were written by Marx, and the appeal composed by Engels and entitled "The Manchester Foreign Section to All Sections and Members of the British Federation" showed up the splitting activities of the reformists who had been expelled from the International. Marx and Engels helped to consolidate the victory over the reformists at the Manchester Congress of the British Sections, held in June 1873. The decisions of this congress—recognition of the need to set up a working-class party, and to nationalise all the means of production, recognition of the workers' right to offer armed resistance to the exploiters, proclamation of the red banner, the banner of the British organisations in the International, etc.—testified to the acceptance of Marxist ideas by the vanguard of Britain's working class. Engels pointed out that "no English workers' congress has ever advanced such far-reaching demands" (p. 449). The activities of the British Federation of the International, guided by Marx and Engels, kept alive the revolutionary tendency in the British working-class movement, despite the temporary dominance of reformism in the movement.

Marx and Engels saw the causes of the increasing influence of reformist ideology on union-organised British workers in the peculiar development of British capitalism, in the economic situation in Britain at that time. In his article "The English Elections", written in February 1874, Engels noted that "no separate political working-class party has existed in England since the downfall of the Chartist Party in the fifties. This is understandable in a country in which the working class has shared more than anywhere else in the advantages of the immense expansion of its large-scale industry. Nor could it have been otherwise in an England that ruled the world market..." (p. 613). Emphasising that, in the mass, the English workers participated in political struggle "almost exclusively as the extreme left wing of the 'great Liberal Party'", Engels pointed out that the English proletariat was confronted with the task of organising a strong independent working-class party.

Marx and Engels attached exceptional importance to developing the German proletariat's emancipation struggle. The course of events after the Franco-Prussian war and the Paris Commune increasingly confirmed Marx's and Engels' conclusion that the centre of the European working-class movement was shifting from France to Germany, where the first ever national
working-class party to accept the revolutionary principles of the International had been operating since 1869. They saw the German Social-Democratic Workers’ Party as a bastion for rallying the forces of the international working class, as its vanguard contingent. In current conditions it was a task of utmost urgency to get German Social-Democracy on to a sounder theoretical basis, to inoculate it against petty-bourgeois tendencies, and strengthen its ties with the masses. Marx and Engels maintained permanent contact with Bebel, Liebknecht and other party leaders, and helped them to work out a tactical platform and to overcome individual mistakes; they became regular contributors to the party’s central organ—*Der Volksstaat*. Engels was a particularly frequent contributor. He explained to the German workers the situation in the international working-class movement and exposed the Lassalleans’ slanderous attempts to misrepresent the campaign waged by the revolutionary proletarians against the Bakuninists at the Hague Congress and after it (see “From the International”, “On the Articles in the *Neuer Social-Demokrat*”, “The International and the *Neuer*”, etc.).

Engels used the opportunities afforded by the Social-Democratic press as a means of training the German working class and its party to be irreconcilable towards the reactionary internal system and the aggressive foreign policy of the ruling classes, towards militarism and chauvinism. In his articles “The ‘Crisis’ in Prussia” and “The Imperial Military Law” he showed that the German Empire, created in 1871 under the aegis of the Prussia of the Junkers, was a military police state, a forcing ground for the arms race and preparations for new wars of aggression. Engels noted the hostility towards the masses, especially the proletariat, of the policy pursued by Bismarck’s government, its desire to provide maximum protection for the interests of the most reactionary class—the Junkers, who were clinging to their feudal privileges. Engels poured scorn on the liberal bourgeoisie and its crawling subservience to Bismarck. “The Prussian bourgeoisie,” he wrote, “does not want political dominance; rotten without having reached maturity, ... it has already arrived, without ever having ruled, at the same stage of degeneration that the French bourgeoisie has attained after eighty years of struggles and a long period of dominance” (p. 405).

In his works of those years Engels laid bare the Bonapartist nature of the state system of the German Empire and the policies of its upper crust. He noted that the form of state that had developed in Prussia, and in Germany’s imperial structure which
was built according to the same pattern, "is pseudo-constitutionalism, a form which is at once both the present-day form of the dissolution of the old absolute monarchy and the form of existence of the Bonapartist monarchy" (p. 363). Taking as an example the Prussian-Bismarckian version of the Bonapartist state, Engels singled out the essential features of Bonapartism: manoeuvring between the main contesting classes of bourgeois society, concentration of power in the hands of the military-bureaucratic caste, apparent independence of the state apparatus, decay and corruption of the ruling clique, etc.

A profound analysis of the socio-political situation that had arisen in the Germany of the early 1870s is to be found in the supplement Engels wrote in 1874 to the Preface of 1870 for The Peasant War in Germany. Proceeding from this analysis, Engels formulated the tasks confronting the advanced German workers. Lenin described the thoughts he expressed in this connection as "recommendations to the German working-class movement, which had become strong, practically and politically" (V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 5, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 370). Engels showed the immense importance of revolutionary theory for the socialist working-class movement. He pointed out that the proletarian party could fulfil its historic mission only if it were armed with the theory of scientific socialism and had learned to dovetail this theory with the practice of revolutionary struggle. "...Socialism," Engels wrote, "since it has become a science, demands that it be pursued as a science, that is, that it be studied. The task will be to spread with increased zeal among the masses of workers the ever more lucid understanding thus acquired and to knit together ever more strongly the organisation both of the party and of the trade unions" (p. 631). Defining the three inseparably linked directions in which the working-class struggle should be pursued— theoretical, political and economico-practical—Engels stressed that the warrant of success lay in the unity of these three forms of class struggle.

Engels put a high priority on implanting the ideas of proletarian internationalism among the German workers. He indicated that German Social-Democracy, as the most highly organised contingent of the international working-class movement, bore a special responsibility. He urged it "to safeguard the true international spirit, which allows no patriotic chauvinism to arise and which readily welcomes every new advance of the proletarian movement, no matter from which nation it comes" (ibid.).

Linked with the published works of Engels are his manuscript
“Varia on Germany”, which emerged from an unaccomplished plan to write a detailed historical study that would help the German workers to draw correct lessons from their country’s past. In these “Varia” the Marxist conception of German history from the late Middle Ages is expounded in compact form. Engels reveals the causes of Germany’s fragmentation, its political and economic backwardness, and the historical roots of reaction. The adventuristic, anti-popular policy of the ruling classes of the German states, particularly Junker Prussia, the inability of the German burghers and their heirs, the bourgeoisie, to find a revolutionary solution in the struggle with feudalism had resulted in Germany’s being unable right up to the middle of the 19th century to complete the process of bourgeois reforms. Engels compared Germany’s historical development with that of several other European countries and offered profound thoughts on the process of the formation of nations and national states, and also on German culture, literature and philosophy.

Looking into the future, Engels predicted the collapse of the Prussian-German militarist state.

By the autumn of 1873, during preparations for the Congress of the International in Geneva, Marx and Engels came to the conclusion that the International Working Men’s Association, as an organisation for uniting the militant forces of the proletariat, no longer measured up to the new historical conditions. They were both as free of dogmatism over matters concerning the organisation of the proletarian struggle as they were in other matters. They believed that the very process of its development generated the need to change its organisational forms. This development virtually brought the activities of the International Working Men’s Association to an end in late 1873, although it was not officially disbanded until 1876. “The First International had played its historical part, and now made way for a period of a far greater development of the labour movement in all countries in the world, a period in which the movement grew in scope, and mass socialist working-class parties in individual national states were formed” (V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 21, 1977, p. 49).

The First International, guided by Marx and Engels, performed its historical tasks. It gave an enormous impulse to the development of the working-class struggle for emancipation and rallied tens of thousands of proletarians in Europe and America round the banner of proletarian internationalism. For the first time, the working-class movement emerged on the international
scene as a powerful factor of social progress, as a standard-bearer in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism. Thanks to the efforts of Marx and Engels and their comrades, an important step was taken towards imbuing the broad masses with the ideas of scientific socialism. During the years of the International the ideological arsenal of revolutionary theory was itself notably enriched with new conclusions and generalisations. Various kinds of pre-Marxist petty-bourgeois socialism were defeated and losing their influence. A revolutionary proletarian party was founded in Germany and the ground was prepared for the setting up of similar parties in other countries. A whole galaxy of proletarian revolutionaries—organisers, journalists, propagandists—was formed in the ranks of the International Working Men's Association under the guidance of Marx and Engels. The International performed a great service in evolving the tactics of proletarian organisations, in establishing trade unions, and in developing the working-class press. Its revolutionary traditions of solidarity action by the workers of different countries in defence of the economic and political interests of the working people, of opposing aggressive wars and supporting national-liberation movements have been of enduring value to subsequent generations of proletarian fighters. “It is unforgettable, it will remain for ever in the history of the workers' struggle for their emancipation” (V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 29, 1977, p. 240).

* * *

The volume contains 110 works by Marx and Engels. Of these, 40 were written in English, 25 in German, 16 in French, 20 in Italian, and 8 in Spanish; one work was written in the mixture of English, French and German. Twenty-eight works are published in English for the first time.

Any misprints or slips of the pen have been corrected in the text with explanations in footnotes where necessary.

Foreign words and expressions in the text of the original have been preserved in the form in which they were used by the authors, and are given in italics, with the translation usually supplied in a footnote. The English words and expressions used by Marx and Engels in texts written in German, French and other languages, are given in small caps; large passages written in English are marked with initial and closing asterisks.
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[GENERAL RULES AND ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION]¹

GENERAL RULES
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

Considering,

That the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves; that the struggle for the emancipation of the working classes means not a struggle for class privileges and monopolies, but for equal rights and duties, and the abolition of all class-rule;

That the economical subjection of the man of labour to the monopolizer of the means of labour, that is the sources of life, lies at the bottom of servitude in all its forms, of all social misery, mental degradation, and political dependence;

That the economical emancipation of the working classes is therefore the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means;

That all efforts aiming at that great end have hitherto failed from the want of solidarity between the manifold divisions of labour in each country, and from the absence of a fraternal bond of union between the working classes of different countries;

That the emancipation of labour² is neither a local nor a national, but a social problem, embracing all countries in which modern society exists, and depending for its solution on the concurrence, practical and theoretical, of the most advanced countries;

That the present revival of the working classes in the most industrious countries of Europe, while it raises a new hope, gives solemn warning against a relapse into the old errors, and calls for

---

¹ The German edition has "the emancipation of the working class".—Ed.
the immediate combination of the still disconnected movements;

For these Reasons—
The International Working Men's Association has been founded.

It declares:
That all societies and individuals adhering to it will acknowledge truth, justice, and morality, as the basis of their conduct towards each other and towards all men, without regard to colour, creed, or nationality;
That it acknowledges no rights without duties, no duties without rights;
And in this spirit the following rules have been drawn up.

1. This Association is established to afford a central medium of communication and co-operation\footnote{The German edition has "systematic co-operation".—Ed.} between Working Men's Societies existing in different countries and aiming at the same end; viz., the protection, advancement, and complete emancipation of the working classes.

2. The name of the Society shall be "The International Working Men's Association".

3. There shall annually meet a General Working Men's Congress, consisting of delegates of the branches of the Association. The Congress will have to proclaim the common aspirations of the working class, take the measures required for the successful working of the International Association, and appoint the General Council of the Society.

4. Each Congress appoints the time and place of meeting for the next Congress. The delegates assemble at the appointed time and place without any special invitation. The General Council may, in case of need, change the place, but has no power to postpone the time of meeting. The Congress appoints the seat and elects the members of the General Council annually. The General Council thus elected shall have power to add to the number of its members.

On its annual meetings, the General Congress shall receive a public account of the annual transactions of the General Council. The latter may, in cases of emergency, convene the General Congress before the regular yearly term.

5. The General Council shall consist of working men from the different countries represented in the International Association. It shall from its own members elect the officers necessary for the
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transaction of business, such as a treasurer, a general secretary, corresponding secretaries for the different countries, etc.

6. The General Council shall form an international agency between the different national and local groups of the Association, so that the working men in one country be constantly informed of the movements of their class in every other country: that an inquiry into the social state of the different countries of Europe be made simultaneously, and under a common direction; that the questions of general interest mooted in one society be ventilated by all; and that when immediate practical steps should be needed—as, for instance, in case of international quarrels—the action of the associated societies be simultaneous and uniform. Whenever it seems opportune, the General Council shall take the initiative of proposals to be laid before the different national or local societies. To facilitate the communications, the General Council shall publish periodical reports.

7. Since the success of the working men’s movement in each country cannot be secured but by the power of union and combination, while, on the other hand, the usefulness of the International General Council must greatly depend on the circumstance whether it has to deal with a few national centres of working men’s associations, or with a great number of small and disconnected local societies; the members of the International Association shall use their utmost efforts to combine the disconnected working men’s societies of their respective countries into national bodies, represented by central national organs. It is self-understood, however, that the appliance of this rule will depend upon the peculiar laws of each country, and that, apart from legal obstacles, no independent local society shall be precluded from directly corresponding with the General Council.

8. Every section has the right to appoint its own secretary corresponding with the General Council.

9. Everybody who acknowledges and defends the principles of the International Working Men’s Association is eligible to become a member. Every branch is responsible for the integrity of the members it admits.

10. Each member of the International Association, on removing his domicile from one country to another, will receive the fraternal support of the Associated Working Men.

11. While united in a perpetual bond of fraternal co-operation,

---

*The French edition has “in a common spirit”.—Ed.*
the working men's societies joining the International Association
will preserve their existent organizations intact.

12. The present rules may be revised by each Congress,
provided that two-thirds of the delegates present are in favour of
such revision.

13. Everything not provided for in the present rules will be
supplied by special regulations, subject to the revision of every
Congress.

ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS,
REVISED IN ACCORDANCE
WITH THE RESOLUTIONS PASSED
BY THE CONGRESSES (1866 TO 1869),
AND BY THE LONDON CONFERENCE (1871)

I

The General Congress

1. Every member of the International Working Men's Associa-
tion has the right to vote at elections for, and is eligible as, a
delegate to the General Congress.

2. Every branch, whatever the number of its members, may
send a delegate to the Congress.

3. Each delegate has but one vote in the Congress.

4. The expenses of the delegates are to be defrayed by the
branches and groups which appoint them.

5. If a branch be unable to send a delegate, it may unite with
other neighbouring branches for the appointment of one.

6. Every branch or group consisting of more than 500 members
may send an additional delegate for every additional 500 mem-
bers.

7. Only the delegates of such societies, sections, or groups as
form parts of the International, and shall have paid their
contributions to the General Council, will in future be allowed to
take their seats and to vote at Congresses. Nevertheless, for such
countries where the regular establishment of the International
may have been prevented by law, delegates of trades' unions and
working men's co-operative societies will be allowed to participate
in Congress debates on questions of principle, but not to discuss,
or to vote on, administrative matters.

8. The sittings of the Congress will be twofold—administrative
sittings, which will be private, and public sittings, reserved for the
discussion of, and the vote upon, the general questions of the Congress programme.

9. The Congress programme, consisting of questions placed on the order of the day by the preceding Congress, questions added by the General Council, and questions submitted to the acceptance of that Council by the different sections, groups, or their committees, shall be drawn up by the General Council.

Every section, group, or committee which intends to propose, for the discussion of the impending Congress, a question not proposed by the previous Congress, shall give notice thereof to the General Council before the 31st of March.

10. The General Council is charged with the organization of each Congress, and shall, in due time, through the medium of the Federal Councils or Committees, bring the Congress programme to the cognizance of the branches.

11. The Congress will appoint as many committees as there shall be questions submitted to it. Each delegate shall designate the committee upon which he may prefer to sit. Each Committee shall read the memorials presented by the different sections and groups on the special question referred to it. It shall elaborate them into one single report, which alone is to be read at the public sittings. It shall moreover decide which of the above memorials shall be annexed to the official report of the Congress transactions.

12. In its public sittings, the Congress will, in the first instance, occupy itself with the questions placed on the order of the day by the General Council, the remaining questions to be discussed afterwards.

13. All resolutions on questions of principle shall be voted upon by division (appel nominal).

14. Two months at latest before the meeting of the annual Congress, every branch or federation of branches shall transmit to the General Council a detailed report of its proceedings and development during the current year. The General Council shall elaborate these elements into one single report, which alone is to be read before Congress.

II

The General Council

1. The designation of General Council is reserved for the Central Council of the International Working Men's Association.

---

a The French edition has “one month”.—Ed.
The Central Councils of the various countries, where the International is regularly organized, shall designate themselves as Federal Councils, or Federal Committees, with the names of the respective countries attached.

2. The General Council is bound to execute the Congress Resolutions.

3. As often as its means may permit, the General Council shall publish a **bulletin** or report embracing everything which may be of interest to the International Working Men's Association.

For this purpose it shall collect all the documents to be transmitted by the Federal Councils or Committees of the different countries and such others as it may be able to procure by other means.

The **bulletin**, drawn up in several languages, shall be sent gratuitously to the Federal Councils or Committees, which are to forward one copy to each of their branches.

In case the General Council should be unable to publish such **bulletins**, it shall every three months send a written communication to the different Federal Councils or Committees, to be published in the newspapers of their respective countries, and especially in the International organs.

4. Every new branch or society intending to join the International, is bound immediately to announce its adhesion to the General Council.

5. The General Council has the right to admit or to refuse the affiliation of any new branch or group, subject to appeal to the next Congress.

Nevertheless, wherever there exist Federal Councils or Committees, the General Council is bound to consult them before admitting or rejecting the affiliation of a new branch or society within their jurisdiction; without prejudice, however, to its right of provisional decision.

6. The General Council has also the right of suspending, till the meeting of next Congress, any branch of the International.

7. In case of differences arising between societies or branches of the same national group, or between groups of different nationalities, the General Council shall have the right of deciding such differences, subject to appeal to the next Congress, whose decision shall be final.

8. All delegates appointed by the General Council to distinct missions shall have the right to attend, and be heard at, all meetings of Federal Councils or Committees, district and local
Committees, and local branches, without, however, being entitled to vote thereat.

9. English, French, and German editions of the General Rules and Regulations are to be reprinted from the official texts published by the General Council. All versions of the General Rules and Regulations in other languages shall, before publication, be submitted to the General Council for approval.

III

Contributions to Be Paid to the General Council

1. An annual contribution of One Penny* per member shall be levied from all branches and affiliated societies for the use of the General Council. This contribution is intended to defray the expenses of the General Council, such as the remuneration of its General Secretary, costs of correspondence, publications, preparatory work for Congresses, etc. etc.

2. The General Council shall cause to be printed uniform adhesive stamps representing the value of one penny each, to be annually supplied, in the numbers wanted, to the Federal Councils or Committees.

3. These stamps are to be affixed to a special sheet of the livret or to a copy of the Rules which every member of the Association is held to possess.\(^b\)

4. On the 1st of March of each year, the Federal Councils or Committees of the different countries\(^c\) shall forward to the General Council the amounts of the stamps disposed of, and return the unsold stamps remaining on hand.

5. These stamps, representing the value of the individual contributions, shall bear the date of the current year.

---

* The French and German editions have "10 centimes" and "one groschen" respectively.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) In the German and French editions Article 3 reads as follows: "The Federal Councils or Committees shall provide the local Committees, or, in their absence, their respective branches, with the number of stamps corresponding to the number of their members." Then follow articles 4, 5 and 6 which correspond to articles 3, 4 and 5 in the English edition.—*Ed.*

\(^c\) The French edition has "of the different countries or localities".—*Ed.*
IV

Federal Councils or Committees

1. The expenses of the Federal Councils or Committees shall be defrayed by their respective branches.
2. The Federal Councils or Committees shall send one report at least every month to the General Council.
3. The Federal Councils or Committees shall transmit to the General Council every three months a report on the administration and financial state of their respective branches.
4. Any Federation may refuse to admit or may exclude from its midst societies or branches. It is, however, not empowered to deprive them of their International character, but it may propose their suspension to the General Council.

V

Local Societies, Branches, and Groups

1. Every branch is at liberty to make rules and bye-laws for its local administration, adapted to local circumstances and the laws of its country. But these rules and bye-laws must not contain anything contrary to the General Rules and Regulations.
2. All local branches, groups, and their committees are henceforth to designate and constitute themselves simply and exclusively as branches, groups, and committees of the International Working Men's Association, with the names of their respective localities attached.
3. Consequently, no branches or groups will henceforth be allowed to designate themselves by sectarian names,—such as Positivists, Mutualists, Collectivists, Communists, etc., or to form separatist bodies, under the name of sections of propaganda, etc., pretending to accomplish special missions distinct from the common purposes of the Association.
4. Art. 2 of this division does not apply to affiliated Trades' Unions.
5. All sections, branches, and working men's societies affiliated to the International are invited to abolish the office of President of their respective branch or society.
6. The formation of female branches amongst the working class is recommended. It is, however, understood that this resolution
does not at all intend to interfere with the existence, or formation of branches composed of both sexes.

7. Wherever attacks against the International are published, the nearest branch or committee is held to send at once a copy of such publication to the General Council.

8. The addresses of the offices of all International Committees and of the General Council are to be published every three months in all the organs of the Association.

VI

General Statistics of Labour

1. The General Council is to enforce Article 6 of the Rules\(^a\) relating to general statistics of the working class, and the Resolutions of the Geneva Congress, 1866, on the same subject.

2. Every local branch is bound to appoint a special Committee of Statistics, so as to be always ready, within the limits of its means, to answer any question which may be put to it by the Federal Council or Committee of its country or by the General Council.

It is recommended to all branches to remunerate the secretaries of the Committees of Statistics, considering the general benefit the working class will derive from their labour.

3. On the 1st of August of each year the Federal Councils or Committees will transmit the materials collected in their respective countries to the General Council, which, in its turn, is to elaborate them into a general report, to be laid before the Congresses or Conferences annually held in the month of September.\(^b\)

4. Trades' Unions and International branches refusing to give the information required, shall be reported to the General Council, which will take action thereupon.

5. The Resolutions of the Geneva Congress, 1866, alluded to in Article 1 of this division are the following.\(^c\)

One great International combination of efforts will be a statistical inquiry into the situation of the working classes of all civilized countries\(^c\) to be instituted by the working classes

---


\(^b\) The words "annually held in the month of September" are omitted in the French edition.—*Ed.*

\(^c\) The French edition has "of different countries".—*Ed.*
themselves. To act with any success, the materials to be acted upon must be known. By initiating so great a work, the working men will prove their ability to take their own fate into their own hands.

The Congress therefore proposes that in each locality where branches of our Association exist, the work be immediately commenced, and evidence collected on the different points specified in the subjoined scheme of inquiry; the Congress invites the working men of Europe and the United States of America to co-operate in gathering the elements of the statistics of the working class; reports and evidence to be forwarded to the General Council. The General Council shall elaborate them into a report, adding the evidence as an appendix. This report, together with its appendix, shall be laid before the next annual Congress, and after having received its sanction, be printed at the expense of the Association.

General scheme of inquiry, which may of course be modified by each locality. 1. Industry, name of. 2. Age and sex of the employed. 3. Number of the employed. 4. Salaries and wages; (a) apprentices; (b) wages by the day or piece work; scale paid by middle men. Weekly, yearly average. 5. (a) Hours of work in factories. (b) The hours of work with small employers and in home work, if the business be carried on in those different modes. (c) Nightwork and daywork. 6. Meal-times and treatment. 7. Sort of workshop and work; overcrowding, defective ventilation, want of sunlight, use of gaslight, cleanliness, etc. 8. Effect of employment upon the physical condition. 9. Moral condition. Education. 10. State of trade: whether season trade, or more or less uniformly distributed over the year, whether greatly fluctuating, whether exposed to foreign competition—whether destined principally for home or foreign consumption, &c.

APPENDIX

The Conference held at London from 17th to 23rd September, 1871, has charged the General Council to issue a new, authentic and revised edition, in English, French, and German, of the "General Rules and Regulations of the International Working Men's Association"; for the following reasons:—

---

a The rest of the sentence is omitted in the French edition.— Ed.
b The French and German editions add Point 11: "Particular laws on the relations between the worker and the employer". The German edition has Point 12: "The dietary and housing conditions of the workers".— Ed.
I. General Rules

The Geneva Congress (1866) adopted, with a few additions, the Provisional Rules of the Association, published at London in November, 1864. It also decided (see “Congrès ouvrier de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs, tenu à Genève du 3 au 8 Septbre., 1866”, Genève, 1866, p. 27, note), that the General Council should publish the official and obligatory text of the Rules as well as of the Regulations voted by the Congress. The General Council was prevented from executing this order by the seizure, on the part of the Bonapartist Government, of the minutes of the Geneva Congress on their transit through France. When at last, through the intercession of Lord Stanley, then British Foreign Secretary, the minutes were recovered, a French edition had already been issued at Geneva, and the text of the Rules and Regulations contained in it was at once reproduced in all French-speaking countries. This text was faulty in many respects.

1. The Paris edition of the London Provisional Rules had been accepted as a true translation; but the Paris Committee to which this translation is due, had not only introduced most important alterations in the preamble of the Rules which, on the interpellation of the General Council, were represented as changes unavoidable under the existing political state of France. From an insufficient acquaintance with the English language, it had also misinterpreted some of the articles of the Rules.

2. The Geneva Congress having to give a final character to the Provisional Rules, the Committee appointed for this purpose simply struck out all passages in which anything of a provisional nature was alluded to, without noticing that several of these passages contained most important matter of no provisional character whatever. In the English edition published after the Lausanne Congress (1867) the same omissions are repeated.

II. Administrative Regulations

The Administrative Regulations hitherto published conjointly with the Rules, are but those voted by the Geneva Congress (1866). It thus became necessary to codify the further regulations voted by subsequent Congresses and by the late London Conference.

---

The following publications have been made use of for the present revised edition:


"Congrès ouvrier de l’Association Internationale des Travailleurs, tenu à Genève du 3 au 8 Septbre., 1866”. Genève, 1866.\(^a\)

"Procès-verbaux du Congrès de l’Association Internationale des Travailleurs, réuni à Lausanne, du 2 au 8 Septbre., 1867”. Chaux-de-Fonds. 1867.


For the Basel Congress, the German report of the Congress proceedings, published in fly-sheets at Basel, and the notes taken during the Congress by the General Secretary,\(^b\) have also been consulted.

How these various sources have been made use of for the purposes of the present revised edition will appear from the following statement.\(^c\)

\(^{a}\) The French edition has an additional source: “Compte-rendu du Congrès de Genève” (publié d'après les procès-verbaux par le Conseil général dans le Courrier international, Londres, mars et avril 1867).—Ed.

\(^{b}\) J. G. Eccarius.—Ed.

\(^{c}\) In the French edition this paragraph reads as follows: “In the following report, next to the articles of the present Rules and Regulations, the corresponding articles of previous editions are indicated, as well as information relating to administrative resolutions, compiled here for the first time. The changes in the French text, made by the decision of the Conference, to bring it into accord with the English one, have not been indicated.”—Ed.
GENERAL RULES

Preamble.—After the words, “For these reasons”, there have been restored the words, “the International Working Men’s Association has been founded”. See Provisional Rules, p. 13.\(^a\)

The passage, “They hold it the duty of a man”, &c., has been omitted, because there exist two equally authentic versions of it, irreconcilable with each other. The true meaning of it is, besides, already contained in the passage immediately preceding, and in that immediately following: “No rights without duties”, &c.\(^5\)

Art. 3 is restored from Art. 3 of Provisional Rules.

Art. 4.—Part of Art. 3 and the whole of Art. 4 of Rules, London, 1867.

Art. 5.—Introductory part of Art. 3, Rules, 1867. The words “a president” have been omitted, in agreement with Administrative Resolution I. of Basel Congress.\(^6\)

Art. 6.—Art. 5, Rules, 1867. The words “Co-operating Associations” have been changed into “national and local groups of the Association”, because the expression, in some translations, has been misinterpreted as meaning co-operative societies.\(^b\)

Art. 7.—Art. 6, Rules, 1867.

Art. 8.—Art. 10, Rules, 1867.

Art. 10.—Art. 8, Rules, 1867.

Art. 12 forms Art. 13 of the Administrative Regulations in “Rules, 1867”.\(^c\)

Art. 13.—Art. 12, Rules, 1867.

Art. 7, Rules, 1867, has been omitted, because its insertion was contrary to a resolution of the Lausanne Congress. See “Procès-verbaux du Congrès de Lausanne”, p. 36.\(^d\)

ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

I. The General Congress

Art. 1.—Art. 11 of Regulations voted by Geneva Congress (“Congrès de Genève”, Genève, 1866, p. 26, [27] &c); Art. 10, Rules, &c, 1867, which is incomplete.

\(^a\) See present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 14-15. The reference to the “Provisional Rules” is omitted in the German edition.—Ed.
\(^b\) The sentence is omitted in the French edition.—Ed.
\(^c\) The French edition refers to another source: “Règlement administratif. Art. 15, Congrès ouvrier de Genève”.—Ed.
\(^d\) This point is omitted in the French edition.—Ed.
Art. 2.—Art. 9, Congrès de Genève; Art. 6, Rules, &c, 1867.
Art. 3.—Art. 13, Congrès de Genève; Art. 11, Rules, &c, 1867.
Art. 4.—Art. 10, Congrès de Genève; Art. 9, Rules, &c, 1867.
Art. 5.—Art. 9, Congrès de Genève; Art. 7, Rules, &c, 1867.
Art. 6.—Art. 12, Congrès de Genève; Art. 8, Rules, &c, 1867.
Art. 7.—Basel Administrative Regulations, VIII.
Art. 8.—For this article the Guide pratique pour le Congrès de l'Internationale (Compte-rendu du Congrès de Bâle, Bruxelles, 1869) has been completed by the other materials on the Basel Congress, quoted above.
Art. 9.—First part as for Art. 8. Second part, Resolution of Lausanne Congress (Procès-verbaux, p. 74, 1).
Art. 10.—Art. 1b, Congrès de Genève; Art. 1b, Rules, &c, 1867.
Art. 11.—Guide Pratique, Basel Congress, Art. 3 and 11.
Art. 12.—Guide Pratique, &c, Art. 10.
Art. 13.—Guide Pratique, &c, Art. 7.
Art. 14.—Guide Pratique, &c, Art. 4.

II. The General Council

Art. 1.—London Conference, 1871, II. 1.
Art. 2.—Congrès de Genève, Art. 1; Rules, &c, 1867, Art. 1.
Art. 3.—The two first Alineas, Art. 2 and Art. 1a; Congrès de Genève, and Rules, &c, 1867. Third Alinea, Art. 3, Congrès de Genève. Last Alinea, Lausanne Congress, Procès-verbaux, p. 37, Art. 2.
Arts. 4 to 7.—Basel Administrative Resolutions, IV. to VII.
Art. 8.—London Conference, III.
Art. 9.—Resolution of London Conference, sittings of 18th and 22nd September.

III. Contributions to Be Paid to the General Council

Art. 1.—First Alinea, Lausanne Congress, Procès-verbaux, p. 37, 3; and Art. IX., Basel Administrative Resolutions. Second Alinea, Art. 4, Congrès de Genève, and Rules, 1867.
Arts. 2 to 6.—London Conference, IV., 1 to 5.

IV. Federal Councils or Committees

Art. 1.—Art. 6, Congrès de Genève, and Rules, 1867.
Art. 2.—Art. 5, ditto.
Art. 3.—Brussels Congress, "Compte-rendu Officiel", p. 50, Appendix, Séances Administratives, Resolution № 3.
Art. 4.—Art. VI., Basel Administrative Resolutions.

V. Local Societies, Branches, and Groups

Art. 1.—Art. 14, Congrès de Genève; Art. 12, Rules, &c, 1867.
Arts. 2 to 4.—London Conference, II., 2 to 4.
Art. 5.—Art. I., Basel Administrative Resolutions.
Art. 6.—London Conference, V.
Art. 7.—Art. II., Basel Administrative Resolutions.
Art. 8.—Art. III., ditto.

VI. General Statistics of Labour

Arts. 1 to 4.—London Conference, VI., 1 to 4.

By order, and in the name of the London Conference, 1871,

The General Council


Corresponding Secretaries

Leo Frankel, for Austria and Hungary; A. Herman, Belgium; T. Mottershead, Denmark; A. Serraillier, France; Karl Marx, Germany and Russia; Charles Rochat, Holland; J. P. McDonnell, Ireland; Fred. Engels, Italy and Spain; Walery Wróblewski, Poland;

a Both the French and German editions have the names of Ant. Arnaud, F. Courget and G. Ranvier among the General Council members, and the German edition, Vitale Regis as well; besides that the words "(on mission)" after the name of Eugène Dupont are omitted in the German edition.—Ed.
Hermann Jung, Switzerland; J. G. Eccarius, United States; Le Moussu, for French Branches of United States.

Charles Longuet, Chairman
Hermann Jung, Treasurer
John Hales, General Secretary

256, High Holborn, W.C., London,
24th October, 1871

Drawn up in October 1871

First published as pamphlets in English and French in November-December 1871, and in German in February 1872

Reproduced from the English pamphlet checked with the French and German editions
Frederick Engels

[RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL
EXPPELLING GUSTAVE DURAND
FROM THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S
ASSOCIATION] 7

The General Council having received full evidence that Gustave Durand, working jeweller of Paris, ex-delegate of the jewellers to the Federal Chamber of Paris Working Men, 8 ex-chief of Battalion of the National Guards, ex-chief cashier at the Delegation of Finance under the Commune, passing as a refugee in London, has served, and is now serving, as a spy for the French police upon the Communal refugees and especially upon the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, and has already received 725 francs for his services.

The said Gustave Durand is therefore branded as infamous a and expelled from the International Association.

This resolution to be published in all the organs of the International.

Adopted by the General Council on October 7, 1871

First published in The Eastern Post, No. 159 and Der Volksstaat, No. 83, on October 14, 1871

Reproduced from the Minute Book of the General Council checked with the newspapers

a Der Volksstaat has "a traitor" instead of "infamous".— Ed.
Frederick Engels

[TO ENRICO BIGNAMI, EDITOR OF LA PLEBE] ⁹

London, October 13 [1871]

Citizen Editor of La Plebe,

The General Council has entrusted me with sending you the enclosed resolution⁹ and requesting that you publish it in the columns of your esteemed newspaper.

I remain yours sincerely,

Frederick Engels,
Secretary for Italy

First published in La Plebe, No. 122, October 19, 1871
Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the Italian

⁹ F. Engels, “Resolution of the General Council Expelling Gustave Durand from the International Working Men’s Association” (see this volume, p. 21).—Ed.
International Workingmen's Association

The Conference of the Delegates of the International Workingmen's Association, assembled at London from the 17th to the 23d September 1871, has charged the General Council to declare public:

that Netschajeff has never been a member or an agent of the International Workingmen's Association;

that his assertions\(^a\) to have founded a branch at Brussels and to have been sent by a Brussels branch on a mission to Geneva, are false;

that the above said Netschajeff has fraudulently used the name of the International Workingmen's Association in order to make dupes and victims in Russia.

By order of the General Council, etc.

14 October 1871

Adopted by the General Council on October 16, 1871

First published in *Qui vive!*, No. 14, October 18, 1871 and in *Der Volksstaat*, No. 88, November 1, 1871

\(^a\) Der Volksstaat has the following words inserted here: "(made known through the political process in St. Petersburg)". — *Ed.*
Karl Marx

[RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL ON THE RULES OF THE FRENCH SECTION OF 1871]\textsuperscript{11}

International Working Men's Association
256, High Holborn, London.—W.C.

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL
ADOPTED AT THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 17, 1871
TO CITIZEN MEMBERS OF THE FRENCH SECTION OF 1871

Citizens,

Considering the following articles of the administrative resolutions voted on by the Basle Congress: Article 4. “Every new section or society which comes into existence and wishes to join the International must immediately notify the General Council of its adherence.”

Article 5. “The General Council is entitled to accept or to refuse the affiliation of every new society or group, etc.”\textsuperscript{a}

The General Council confirms the Rules of the French Section of 1871 with the following modifications:

I. That in Article 2 the words “justify his means of existence” be erased and that it should simply be said: in order to be admitted as member of the section a person must present guarantees of morality, etc.

Article 9 of the General Rules states:

“Everybody who acknowledges and defends the principles of the International Working Men’s Association is eligible to become a member. Every branch is responsible for the integrity of the members it admits.”\textsuperscript{b}

\textsuperscript{a} Compte-rendu du IV\textsuperscript{e} Congrès international, tenu à Bâle en septembre 1869, Brussels, 1869, p. 172.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} Here and further on Marx quotes the 1867 English edition of the General Rules and Regulations, published in accordance with the Geneva Congress decisions—\textit{Rules of International Working Men’s Association}, London [1867] (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 444). In the manuscript the last sentence in this paragraph is repeated in English in brackets.—\textit{Ed.}
In dubious cases a section may well take information about means of existence as "guarantee of morality", while in other cases, like those of the refugees, workers on strike, etc., absence of means of existence may well be a guarantee of morality. But to ask candidates to justify their means of existence as a general condition to be admitted to the International, would be a bourgeois innovation contrary to the spirit and letter of the General Rules.

II. (1) Considering that Article 4 of the General Rules states: "The Congress elects the members of the General Council with power to add to their numbers"; that consequently the General Rules only recognise two ways of election for General Council members: either their election by the Congress, or their co-option by the General Council; that the following passage of Article 11 of the Rules of the French Section of 1871: "One or several delegates shall be sent to the General Council" is therefore contrary to the General Rules which give no branch, section, group or federation the right to send delegates to the General Council.

That Article 12 of the Regulations prescribes: "Every section is at liberty to make Rules and Bye-Laws for its local administration, suitable to the peculiar circumstances and laws of the different countries. But these Bye-Laws must not contain anything contrary to the General Rules." \(b\)

For these reasons:

The General Council cannot admit the above-mentioned paragraph of the Rules of the "French Section of 1871".

(2) It is quite true that the different sections existing in London had been invited to send delegates to the General Council which, so as not to violate the General Rules, has always proceeded in the following manner:

It has first determined the number of delegates to be sent to the General Council by each section, reserving itself the right to accept or refuse them depending on whether it considered them able to fulfil the general functions it has to perform. These delegates became members of the General Council not by virtue of the fact that they were delegated by their sections but by virtue of the right of co-opting new members accorded to the Council by the General Rules.

Having acted up to the decision taken by the last Conference

---

\(a\) Cf. this volume, p. 4 and present edition, Vol. 20, p. 442. In the manuscript this sentence is in English; it is repeated in French in brackets.—Ed.

\(b\) Cf. present edition, Vol. 20, p. 446.—Ed.
both as the General Council of the International Working Men's Association and as the Central Council for England,\(^\text{12}\) the Council in London thought it useful to admit, besides the members that it co-opted directly, members originally delegated by their respective sections.

It would have been a big mistake to identify the electoral procedure of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association with that of the Paris Federal Council which was not even a national Council nominated by a national Congress like, for example, the Brussels Federal Council or that of Madrid.

The Paris Federal Council being only a delegation of the Paris sections, the delegates of these sections could well be invested with an imperative mandate on a council where they had to defend the interests of their section. The General Council's electoral procedure is, on the contrary, defined by the General Rules and its members would not accept any other imperative mandate than that of the General Rules and Regulations.

(3) The General Council is ready to admit two delegates from the "French Section of 1871" on the terms prescribed by the General Rules and never contested by the other sections existing in London.

III. In Article 11 of the Rules of the "French Section of 1871", this paragraph appears:

"Each member of the section should not accept any delegation to the General Council other than that of his section."

Interpreted literally, this paragraph could be accepted since it says only that a member of the "French Section of 1871" should not present himself to the General Council as delegate from another section.

But if we take into consideration the paragraph that precedes it, Article 11 means nothing else but completely changing the General Council's composition and making out of it, contrary to Article 3 of the General Rules, a delegation of London sections where the influence of local groups would be substituted for that of the whole International Working Men's Association.

The meaning of the paragraph in Article 11 from the Rules of the "French Section of 1871" is clearly confirmed by the obligation which it imposes for opting between the title of member of the Section and the function of member of the General Council.

For these reasons the General Council cannot admit the above-mentioned paragraph since it is contrary to the General
Rules and deprives it of its right to recruit forces everywhere in the general interest of the International Working Men's Association.

IV. The General Council is sure that the "French Section of 1871" will understand the necessity for the proposed modifications and will not hesitate to bring its Rules into conformity with the letter and spirit of the General Rules and Regulations and that it will thereby forestall any discord which, in the present circumstances, could only hinder the progress of the International Working Men's Association.

Greetings and equality.
In the name and by order of the General Council

Auguste Serrailier,
Corresponding Secretary for France

Adopted by the General Council on October 17, 1871

Printed according to A. Serrailier's manuscript
Translated from the French
Frederick Engels

[ON THE PROGRESS
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S
ASSOCIATION IN ITALY AND SPAIN

ENGELS' RECORD OF HIS REPORT
AT THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING OF OCTOBER 17, 1871] 13

The news from Italy was of a most cheering character, the spread of the Association being really wonderful in that country. Three months ago Mazzini stated that there was only one town in Italy, where the International counted numerous adherents. a Now, from one end of the country to the other, it is fully established. It is represented in the press by one, if not two, daily papers in Rome; a daily paper in Milan; a semi-weekly one in Turin; weekly papers in Ravenna, Lodi, Pavia, Girgenti, and Catania, besides a number of other papers published in smaller localities. These papers are subject to incessant Government prosecutions; one of them the Proletario Italiano of Turin had six consecutive numbers seized by the Police, and one or more actions at law brought against it for each number seized; nevertheless, these papers continue undaunted in their crusade against the Priests, the capitalists, and Mazzini, who has been attacking the International because it was not religious. b The Government has dissolved two International sections in Florence and Naples, but the result has only been the immediate formation of new sections all over the country. In Girgenti, the new section has just published its rules, c preceded by the translation of the Statutes, published by the General Council, d in Ravenna six Republican and Working Men's Societies, have organised themselves into sections of the International, with a common Council.

a G. Mazzini, "Agli operai italiani", La Roma del Popolo, No. 20, July 13, 1871.— Ed.
b Ibid.—Ed.
c Statuto e Regolamento della Società Internazionale degli Operai seguiti dal Regolamento interno della Sezione Girgentina, Girgenti, 1871.— Ed.
d Statuts et règlements. 1866, London [1866].—Ed.
Garibaldi's letters, in which he gives his adhesion to the Association, are everywhere reprinted and commented on, and have evidently helped a great many waverers to make up their minds in favour of the International. The power of Mazzini over the workmen of Italy is thoroughly broken.

In Spain the progress of the Association has been as rapid as in Italy. The Spanish trades' unions, having been created almost exclusively by the International, form an essential part of its organisation. The trades' unions of each locality have a local trades' council, corresponding directly with the Spanish Federal Council at Madrid, on general matters relating to the International; while each trade all over the country again is under the direction of a Central Board, corresponding with the Spanish Federal Council on all matters relating to its trade.

This organisation, as finally settled by the Conference of Valencia, held from the 10th to the 18th of September, 1871, is now being carried out all over Spain. There is scarcely a single large town in Spain without its local "Trades' Council", and a great many small towns are organized upon the same principle. New sections are forming everywhere, and individual adhesions are coming in by hundreds. The Republican party, which only a short time ago attacked the International as a party of "Jesuits", has been made to feel its power acutely. The rising of the Commune in Paris had already split the Republican party in two camps. The middle class section took the side of Versailles, while the younger elements and the Republican working men, supported the Commune. This latter section has been drawn, naturally, nearer and nearer to the International, and will soon enter its ranks, thus strengthening it by the adhesion of numerous and valuable new elements. The Republican papers belonging to this section begin to advocate the nationalization of the land, and other socialistic tenets; to these belong La Asociacion, of Leon; El Comunero, of Madrid; La Justicia, of Malaga; El Trabajo, of Ferrol, and others. At a great Republican meeting, held in Madrid October 15th, the proposal for joint action with the International was cheered enthusiastically.

First published in The Eastern Post, Reproduced from the newspaper No. 160, October 21, 1871

---

* The reference is to G. Garibaldi's letters of August 20, 1871 to the editorial boards of Il Romagnolo and Il Proletario Italiano, and to his letter of September 20, 1871 to The Echo in London, which were reprinted by other newspapers.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

[TO THE EDITORS OF THE GAZZETTINO ROSA

COVERING LETTER TO THE "DECLARATION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL ON NECHAYEV'S MISUSE OF THE NAME OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION"]

In the trial, known by the name of Nechayev, conducted several months ago before the Court of Assizes of St. Petersburg, a number of assertions relating to the International Working Men's Association were made, assertions which naturally attracted the attention of the Conference of Delegates of this Association in session in London.

The Conference consequently took the following decision, ordering it to be published in the organs of the International.¹

London, October 20, 1871

Certified copy
Frederick Engels,
Secretary for Italy

First published in Gazzettino Rosa, No. 306, November 3, 1871 and in L'Eguaglianza, No. 18, November 12, 1871

Printed according to Gazzettino Rosa

Translated from the Italian

Published in English for the first time

¹ This is followed by the text of the "Declaration of the General Council on Nechayev's Misuse of the Name of the International Working Men's Association" in Engels' translation (see p. 23 of this volume).—Ed.
Frederick Engels

[STATEMENT BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL CONCERNING ALEXANDER BAILLIE COCHRANE’S LETTER]¹⁵

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EASTERN POST

Sir,—A letter appeared in The Times on October 31st on the International, signed Alexander Baillie Cochrane, which I ask space to reply to in your columns. In the first instant, Mr. A. B. C. is

“ignorant whether Mr. Odger is still president of the English branch of this society”.

Ever since September, 1867, the office of president of the General Council of the International, which Mr. A. B. C. calls the English branch of this society, has been abolished.¹⁶ It is well-known that after the publication of our manifesto on the civil war in Franceᵃ (in June last) Mr. Odger withdrew from the General Council.

Having read some continental gossip about the composition of our conference of delegates, held in London last September, Mr. A. B. C. applies this information to the public meeting held in St. Martin’s Hall, on the 28th September, 1864. At that meeting, as the writer in The Times of October 27th correctly stated,ᵇ the provisional council of the International Working Men’s Association was elected, but not “Mr. Odger elected president, Mr. Cremer and Mr. Wheeler, Secretary” as Mr. A. B. C. says.

ᵃ K. Marx, The Civil War in France.— Ed.
Mr. A. B. C. then proceeds to prove the trustworthiness of his information by the following “authentic document”—

Firstly—

“The red flag is the symbol of universal love.”

This authentic document is nothing but the preamble of one of the innumerable forgeries, lately published, in the name of the International by the Paris police, and disowned at the time by the General Council.

Secondly—

“The programme of Geneva, under the presidency” (it is rather hard to make out how a programme can be under a presidency) “of the Russian Michael Bakounine was accepted by the General Council of London, July 1869.”

This programme of Geneva is nothing else but the statutes of the “Alliance de la Démocratie Socialiste”, of Geneva, already quoted in Jules Favre’s circular on the International. Now, in reply to that circular I stated, (see The Times, of June 13th) the General Council never issued such a document. On the contrary, it issued a document which quashed the original statutes of the Alliance.

I may now add that the conference, lately held at London, has finally disposed of the Alliance, founded by Michael Bakounine, and that the Journal de Genève, this worthy representative of the party tenets of Mr. A. B. C., has taken up the defence of the Alliance against the International.

Thirdly—Mr. A. B. C. pulls out of his bundle of “authentic documents” some garbled extract from private letters written by our friend Eugène Dupont, long since published by the Bonapartist ex-procurer Oscar Testut. Before Mr. A. B. C. set out for the Continent in search of this “trustworthy information”, it had already gone the round of the English Press.

---


b K. Marx, “The International Working Men’s Association and the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy”.—Ed.


Mr. Alexander Baillie Cochrane calls our society “infamous”. How am I to call a society which instructs the business of law-making to that same Alexander Baillie Cochrane?

I am, Sir,
Yours obediently,

John Hales,
General Secretary

International Working Men’s Association
256, High Holborn

Written on October 31, 1871          Reproduced from the newspaper

Adopted by the General Council on
October 31, 1871

First published in *The Eastern Post*,
No. 163, November 11, 1871
Frederick Engels

[ON THE COMPANY SWINDLE IN ENGLAND]

London, November 4.—We here are now in the full swing of prosperity and thriving business—we, i.e., official England, the big capitalists. There is a surplus of capital on the market and it is looking everywhere for a profitable home; bogus companies, set up for the happiness of mankind and the enrichment of the entrepreneurs, are shooting up out of the ground like mushrooms. Mines, asphalt quarries, horse-drawn tramways for big cities, and iron works seem to be the most favoured at the moment. Mines are being offered for sale on the Volga and in New Mexico; people are buying asphalt quarries in Savoy, the Jura and Hanover; Lisbon and Buenos Aires are to have horse-drawn tramways, and so on. The sole aim of all these joint-stock companies is, of course, briefly to raise the value of the stock so the entrepreneurs can rid themselves of their share at a profit; what then becomes of the stockholders does not bother them: “After us the deluge!”3 In three or four years, five-sixths of these companies will have gone the way of all flesh and, with them, the money of the ensnared stockholders. As always, it will be mainly small people who put their savings into these “most reliable and profitable” enterprises and always, when the swindle has forced the stock up to its peak on the market—and it serves them right. The stock exchange swindle is one of the most effective ways of transferring the ostensibly, and in part probably genuinely, self-earned assets of the small people into the pockets of the big capitalists, so even the most stupid can see that, in the social order of today, there can be no such thing as capital “earned by one's

3 These words are attributed to Louis XV and Mme. de Pompadour.—Ed.
own labour"; that all existing capital is nothing other than the fruit of other people's work taken without payment. And if the practice of swindling people out of their money by setting up bogus companies has, of late, got really into its stride in Germany and Austria, if princes and Jews, imperial chancellors and petty clerics are in joint pursuit of the savings of the small people, we can only welcome this.

This deluge of capital on the money market reflects, however, only the way big industry is blossoming. In almost all branches of production work is going ahead at a brisker pace than it has for many a year. This is the picture in England's two main industries, where iron and cotton are the raw materials.

At last, the Lancashire spinners again have enough cotton to be able to extend their mills on a massive scale; and they will not let the opportunity slip. In the small town of Oldham alone there are fifteen new mills under construction, with an average of fifty thousand spindles each—a total of 750,000 spindles, almost as many as there are (excluding Alsace) in the whole of the Customs Union! A corresponding number of weaving-loom is being provided, and the picture is the same in the other Lancashire towns. The machine factories have work for months ahead, in some cases a year, and can demand any price, if only they can deliver. In short, things again look as they did in 1844, after the Chinese market was opened up, when the manufacturers' only fear was that they might not be able to satisfy the huge demand. As they said at the time, they had to make clothes for 300 million people! Then came the reverses of 1845 and 1847, when it suddenly turned out that the 300 million Chinese had, so far, been making their own clothing, thank you very much, and huge surpluses of English-made goods accumulated on all markets, with no one to buy them, while the manufacturers and speculators went bankrupt in their hundreds. That is what will happen again this time; these people never learn anything, and even if they do, they are forced by the intrinsic law of capitalist production constantly to repeat the old, familiar cycle of boom, overproduction and crisis, and to repeat it on an ever-increasing scale until, finally, the proletariat rises and liberates society from enduring this absurd cycle.

In the Volksstaat, one Herr Schwitzguébel demands, on behalf of some federal committee in Romance Switzerland of which I have

---

a A. Schwitzguébel, "An die Redaktion des Volksstaat in Leipzig", Der Volksstaat, No. 81, October 7, 1871.—Ed.
no knowledge, that I explain what I published in the *Volksstaat* concerning Herr *Elpidin*. I have had no dealings whatsoever with Herr Schwitzguébel and cannot be answerable in this matter to just any third party who chooses to take issue with me. If, however, Herr Elpidin himself should contact the editor's office on this matter, I shall place myself at his disposal and, in that event, shall ask the editor of the *Volksstaat* to inform Herr Elpidin of my address, so he may contact me directly.

Written on November 4, 1871
First published in *Der Volksstaat*, No. 91, November 11, 1871

Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time

---

a F. Engels, "The Address *The Civil War in France and the English Press*, *Der Volksstaat*, No. 54, July 5, 1871 (Elpidin was accused of espionage in the last paragraph of the article).— *Ed.*
Karl Marx

[RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL ON THE FRENCH SECTION OF 1871]^{20}

International Working Men's Association

RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL
ADOPTED AT ITS MEETING
OF NOVEMBER 7, 1871

I. Preliminary remarks

The General Council considers that the ideas expressed by the "French Section of 1871" about a radical change to be made in the articles of the General Rules concerning the constitution of the General Council have no bearing on the question which it ought to discuss.

With regard to the insulting references to the General Council made by that section, these will be judged for what they are worth by the councils and federal committees of the various countries.

The Council merely wishes to note:

That three years have not yet elapsed since the Basle Congress (which met on September 6-11, 1869), as the above-mentioned section deliberately asserts;

That in 1870, on the eve of the Franco-Prussian war, the Council addressed a general circular to all the federations, including the Paris Federal Council, proposing that the seat of the General Council be transferred from London^{a};

That the replies received were unanimously in favour of retaining the present seat of the Council and of prolonging its term of office;

That in 1871, as soon as the situation permitted, the General Council summoned a Conference of Delegates, this being the only action possible in the given circumstances;

That at this Conference delegates from the Continent gave voice^{b} to the misgivings in their respective countries that the

^{a} See K. Marx, Confidential Communication to All Sections.—Ed.

^{b} In the second manuscript this sentence begins as follows: "That at this Conference, held in London on September 17-23, 1871, delegates from the Continent, as members of the French section are fully aware, gave voice...".—Ed.
co-option of too large a number of French refugees would destroy the international character of the General Council;

That the Conference (see its "Resolutions, etc." XV*) "leaves it to the discretion of the General Council to fix, according to events, the day and place of meeting of the next Congress or Conference which might replace it".

With regard to the said section's claim to exclusive representation of "the French revolutionary element", because its members include ex-presidents of Paris workers' societies, the Council remarks:

The fact that this or that person has in the past been president of a workers' society may well be taken into account by the General Council, but does not in itself constitute the "right" to a seat on the Council or to represent the "revolutionary element" on that body. If this were so, the Council would be obliged to grant membership to M. Gustave Durand, former President of the Paris Jewellers' Society and secretary of the French section in London. Moreover, members of the General Council are bound to represent the principles of the International Working Men's Association, rather than the opinions and interests of this or that corporation.

II. Objections presented by the "French Section of 1871" at the General Council meeting of October 31 to the resolutions of October 17

1) With respect to the following passage from Article 2 of the section's Rules:

"In order to be admitted as member of the section, a person must justify his means of existence, present guarantees of morality, etc."

the section remarks:

"The General Rules make the sections responsible for the morality of their members and, as a consequence, recognise the right of sections to demand the guarantees they think necessary."

On this argument, a section of the International founded by TEETOTALERS could include in its own rules this type of article: "To be admitted as member of the section, a person must swear to abstain from all alcoholic drinks." In short, it would be always possible for individual sections to impose in their local rules the most absurd

and incongruous conditions of admittance into the International, under the pretext that they “think it necessary in this way” to discharge their responsibility for the integrity of their members.

In its Resolution I of October 17, the General Council stated that there may be “cases in which the absence of means of existence may well be a guarantee of morality”. It is of the opinion that the section repeated this point unnecessarily when it said that “refugees” are “above suspicion by virtue of the eloquent proof of their poverty”.

As to the phrase that strikers’ “means of existence” consist of “the strike fund” this might be answered by saying, first, that this “fund” is often fictitious.\(^a\)

Moreover, official English inquiries have shown that the majority of English workers who, generally speaking, enjoy better conditions than their brothers on the Continent, are forced as a result of strikes and unemployment, or because of insufficient wages or terms of payment and many other causes, to resort incessantly to pawnshops or to borrowing, that is, to “means of existence” about which one cannot demand information without interfering in an unqualified manner in a person’s private life.

There are two alternatives.

Either the section sees “means of existence” purely as “guarantees of morality”,\(^b\) in which case the General Council’s proposal that “to be admitted as member of the section a person must present guarantees of morality” serves the purpose since it assumes (see Resolution I of October 17) that “in dubious cases a section may well take information about means of existence as guarantee of morality”.

Or in Article 2 of its Rules the section deliberately refers to the furnishing of information about “means of existence” as a condition for admission, over and above the “guarantees of morality” which it is empowered to require, in which case the General Council affirms that “it is a bourgeois innovation contrary to the letter and spirit of the General Rules”.

2) With respect to the General Council’s rejection of the following clause of Article 11 of the section’s Rules:

“One or several delegates shall be sent to the General Council”

---

\(^a\) The second manuscript continues as follows: “and is it not the case that strikes invariably result in deprivation and suffering for the strikers, which fact appears to have been ignored by the 1871 Section.” — Ed.

\(^b\) The second manuscript continues as follows: “in order to avoid its responsibility”. — Ed.
the section states:

"We are not unaware ... that the literal sense of the General Rules confers on it" (the General Council) "the right to accept or reject delegates."

This is a patent demonstration of the fact that the section is not familiar with the literal sense of the General Rules.

In actual fact, the General Rules, which recognise only two ways of election to the General Council, namely, election by the Congress or co-option by the Council itself, nowhere state that the Council has the right to accept or reject delegates from the sections or groups.

The admission of delegates initially proposed by the London sections has always been a purely administrative measure on the part of the General Council, which in this case only made use of its power of co-option (see Resolution II, 2, of the General Council of October 17). The exceptional circumstances which led the General Council to have recourse to co-option of this kind were explained at sufficient length in its resolutions of October 17. In the same resolution (II, 3) the Council declared that it would admit delegates from the “French Section of 1871” on the same conditions as those from the London sections. It cannot, however, be expected to give serious consideration to a demand that would grant this section a privileged position contrary to the General Rules.

By the inclusion of the following paragraph in Article 11 of its Rules:

“One or several delegates shall be sent to the General Council”,

the “French Section of 1871” is claiming the right to send delegates to the General Council allegedly basing itself on the General Rules. It acted as though fully convinced that it possessed this imaginary right, and even before the section had been recognised by the General Council (see Article VI of the Administrative Resolutions of the Basle Congress\(^b\)), it did not hesitate to send “by right” to the General Council meeting of October 17 two delegates,\(^c\) armed with “imperative mandates” in the name of the 20 full members of the section. Finally, in its latest communication it again insists on “the duty and right to send delegates to the General Council”.

---

\(^a\) The second manuscript continues as follows: “on this point as on many others”.— Ed.

\(^b\) Compte-rendu du IV\(^e\) Congrès international, tenu à Bâle, en septembre 1869, Brussels, 1869, p. 172.— Ed.

\(^c\) Chautard and Camélina.— Ed.
The section attempts to justify its claims by seeking a precedent in the position of Citizen Herman on the General Council. It pretends to be unaware of the fact that Citizen Herman was co-opted into the General Council at the recommendation of the Belgian Congress, and in no way represents a Liège section.

3) With respect to the General Council’s refusal to recognise the following passage in the section’s Rules:

“Each member of the section should not accept any delegation to the General Council other than that of his section”,

the section states:

“In response to this, we shall limit ourselves to the observation that our Rules pertain to our section alone; our agreements are of no concern or relevance to anyone but ourselves, and this claim in no way contradicts the General Rules which include no provision on this subject.”

It is difficult to comprehend how the Rules which include no provision on the right of delegation to the General Council, should suddenly specify the conditions of this delegation. On the other hand, it is not so difficult to see that the section’s own Rules do not apply outside its field of competence. Nevertheless, it cannot be admitted that the specific rules of any section “are of no concern or relevance to anyone but that section alone”. For were the General Council to approve Article 11 of the Rules of the “French Section of 1871”, for example, it would be obliged to insert it into the rules of all the other sections, and this article, once it began to apply generally, would completely nullify the right of co-option conferred on the Council by the General Rules.

For these reasons:

I) The General Council reaffirms in their entirety its resolutions of October 17, 1871;
II) In the event of these resolutions not being accepted by the section before the Council's meeting on November 21, the corresponding secretaries should bring the following documents to the notice of the Federal Councils or Committees of the various countries or, where these do not exist, to the notice of the local groups: the Rules of the "French Section of 1871", the mandate of that section's delegates presented to the General Council at its meeting on October 17, the General Council's resolutions of October 17, the reply of the "French Section of 1871" presented to the General Council at its meeting on October 31, and the Council's final resolutions of November 7.

London, November 7, 1871

In the name and by order of the General Council


Printed according to Marx's manuscript checked with Delahaye's manuscript (second manuscript)

Translated from the French

---

*a In the second manuscript there follow the signature and the addressee: "Corresponding Secretary for France Auguste Serraillier. To Citizen Members of the French Section of 1871."—Ed.*
The news from Italy was of a peculiar interest, letters were received from a number of Italian cities, amongst whom were Turin, Milan, Ravenna, and Girgenti. These confirmed in every respect the immense strides with which the Association was advancing in Italy. The working-classes, in the towns at least, were rapidly abandoning Mazzini, whose denunciations of the International had no effect whatever upon the masses. But Mazzini's denunciations had produced one good effect; they had caused Garibaldi, not only to pronounce himself entirely in favour of our Association, but also, on this very question, to come to an open rupture with Mazzini. In a long letter addressed to M. Petroni, a Sardinian lawyer, who has been since elected president of the Italian Working Men's Congress, now sitting at Rome, Garibaldi expresses his indignation that the Mazzinians should venture to speak of him as of an old fool, who always had done what ever the men surrounding him, his satellites and flatterers, had persuaded him to do. Who were these satellites, he asks? Were they the men of his staff that came with him from South America in 1848, those he found at Rome in '49, or those of his staff of '59 and '60, or those who fought with him recently against the Prussians? If so, he maintains they were men whose names will for ever live in the memory of grateful Italy. But let them re-enter these satellites and flatterers.


b G. Garibaldi's letter was published in La Favilla, No. 255, October 31, 1871, and other newspapers.—Ed.
"I repeat it, you have not even the merit of originality, when you dig up again my satellites and flatterers have always led that grey-headed baby from Nice by the nose. And while you, Petroni, were suffering for eighteen years in the prisons of the Inquisition, the people of your sect (the Mazzinians) were the very men accused by the Royalists, of being my satellites and followers. Read all the dynastic trash published especially since 1860, and there you will find Garibaldi might be good for something if he had not the misfortune of being led by Mazzini, and to be surrounded by the Mazzinians. This is all false, and you may ask those that have known me more closely and more intimately, whether they ever found a man more obstinate than myself when I had made up my mind to do something which I had recognised to be right. Ask Mazzini himself, whether he has found me to be easily persuaded whenever he attempted to draw me over to some of his impracticable realities. Ask Mazzini whether the origin of our disagreement is not this, that, in 1848, I told him he was doing wrong in holding back in the city, under one pretext or another, the youth of Milan, while our army was fighting the enemy on the Mincio. And Mazzini is a man who never forgives if any one touches his infallibility."

Garibaldi then states that Mazzini, in 1860, did everything in his power to frustrate and to render abortive the general's expedition to Sicily, which ended in the unification of Italy; that when Mazzini heard of Garibaldi's success, he insisted upon the latter proclaiming the Republic in Italy, a thing absurd and utterly foolish under the circumstances, and he finally reproaches "the great exile, whom everybody knew to be in Italy", with his meanness in bespattering the fallen of Paris, the only men who in this time of tyranny, of lies, of cowardice and degradation have waved high, even while dying, the sacred banner of rights and justice. He continues,

"You cry anathema upon Paris, because Paris destroyed the Vendôme Column and the house of Thiers. Have you ever seen a whole village destroyed by the flames for having given shelter to a volunteer, or a franc-tireur? And that not only in France, the same in Lombardy, in Venetia. As to the palaces set fire to in Paris by petroleum, let them ask the priests who, from their intimate acquaintance with the hell-fire about which they preach, ought to be good judges, what difference there is between petroleum fire and those fires which the Austrians lit in order to burn down the villages in Lombardy and Venetia, when those countries were still under the yoke of the men who shot Ugo Bassi, Ciceruacchio and his two sons, and thousands of Italians who committed the sacrilege of demanding a free Rome and a free Italy.

"When the light of day shall once have dispersed the darkness which covers Paris, I hope that you, my friend, will be more indulgent for the acts caused by the desperate situation of a people which, certainly, was badly led, as it generally happens to nations, who allow themselves to be authored by the phraseology of the doctrinaires, but who, in substance, fought heroically for their rights. The detractors

---

G. Garibaldi.—Ed.

G. Mazzini, "Il Comune di Francia", La Roma del Popolo, No. 9, April 26, 1871.—Ed.
of Paris may say what they like, they will never succeed in proving that a few 
miscreants and foreigners—as they said of us in Rome in 1849—have resisted for 
three months against a grand army, backed as it was by the most potent armies of 
Prussia.

"And the International? What need is there to attack an Association almost 
without knowing it? Is that Association not an emanation of the abnormal state of 
society all over the world? A society where the many have to slave for bare 
subsistence, and where the few, by lies and by force, appropriate the greater 
portion of the produce of the many, without having earned it by the sweat of their 
brow, must not such a society excite the discontent, and the vengeance of the 
suffering masses.

"I wish that the International should not fare as did the people of Paris—that is 
to allow itself to be circumvented by the concoctors of doctrines which would drive 
it to exaggerations, and finally to ridicule; but that it should well study, before 
trusting them, the character of the men who are to lead it on the path of moral 
and material improvement."

He returns for a moment to Mazzini,

"Mazzini and I, we are both old; but no one speaks of reconciliation between 
him and me. Infallible people die, but they do not bend. Reconciliation with 
Mazzini? there is only one possible way for it—to obey him; and of that I do not 
feel myself capable."

And finally the old soldier proves by referring to his past, that 
he has always been a true International, that he has fought for 
liberty everywhere and anywhere, first in South America, then 
offering his services to the Pope\(^a\) (aye, even to the Pope, when he 
played the liberal), then under Victor Emmanuel, lastly in France, 
under Trochu and Jules Favre—and he concludes,

"I and the youth of Italy are ready to serve Italy, also side by side with you, the 
Mazzinians, if it should be necessary."

This crowning letter of Garibaldi’s, coming as it does after a 
number of others, in which he has plainly expressed his 
sympathies for the International, but abstained from speaking 
plainly as to Mazzini, has had an immense effect in Italy, and will 
induce many recruits to rally round our banner.

It was also announced that a full report of the working men’s 
Congress at Rome would be laid before the next meeting of the 
Council.\(^b\)

First published in *The Eastern Post*, Reproduced from the newspaper 
No. 163, November 11, 1871

\(^a\) Pius IX.—Ed.

\(^b\) On November 14, 1871.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

[WORKING MEN'S CONGRESS AT ROME.—
BEBEL'S SPEECHES IN THE REICHSTAG
ENGELS' RECORD OF HIS REPORT
AT THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING
OF NOVEMBER 14, 1871]\(^{25}\)

From Italy numerous communications had again come to hand. From them it appeared that the so-called Working Men's Congress at Rome was but a dodge of Mazzini's, intended to deceive the public as to the giant strides with which the International is advancing in Italy. In the course of last summer the local leaders of the well-organised Mazzinian party in many large Italian towns, for the first time, and quite unexpectedly, became aware of the fact that they were losing the absolute hold they had hitherto possessed over the working-classes. The sound instinct of the Italian working men had enabled them to see that the working men of Paris, under the Commune, execrated as they were by the common voice of the ruling classes of Europe, had been in reality but the champions of the cause of the whole proletariat; and when Mazzini gave the word to his followers to join in the general middle-class outcry against the people of Paris,\(^a\) he himself destroyed the foundation of his hitherto almost undisputed sway over the Italian workmen. The working people of the Italian towns then began to see that they had class interests reaching beyond Mazzini's republic; that these interests were the same for all workmen all over the civilised world; and that there was a vast society in existence for the upholding of these common interests—the International. Moreover, they had been tired, for some time, of Mazzini's religious preachings, quite out of place as they were in the most priest-ridden country in Europe, and of his everlastingly reminding them that the grand object of their lives was the

\(^a\) G. Mazzini, "Il Comune di Francia", *La Roma del Popolo*, No. 9, April 26, 1871.—*Ed.*
performance of duties, while he never spoke of their rights. Mazzini thought it best to nip this counter-movement in the bud. He had, for the last twenty years, virtually directed the mutual benefit societies of working-men, the Oddfellows, Foresters, and Druids of Italy, societies in which politics were officially forbidden, and where even the commonest objects of an ordinary trades' union were rigorously excluded. The presidents, secretaries, and boards of these societies were generally Mazzinian, and with their help some demonstration in favour of decrying Mazzinianism might be got up. Now, up to 1864 these societies had held annual Congresses; the last was held in Naples in the above year, when an act of fraternization was agreed to, embodying a kind of constitution, with a central committee for common affairs, &c. But since then no Congress had been called. By the assistance of the societies in Liguria, Mazzini now had a new Congress called, which met at Rome, on the 1st of November. How this Congress was composed is best shown by what happened in the Roman Working Men's Society. There the board happened to be anti-Mazzinian, and, because the invitation of the Ligurians had called upon the Congress to discuss political questions, this board refused to send delegates because the discussion of politics was against the general rules. In fact, wherever the boards of the workmen's societies were not composed of Mazzinians, no delegates were sent, as the Mazzinian papers themselves aver; from which it is pretty clear that the delegates sent were elected, not by the members, but by the boards of the various societies. Under these circumstances the mass of the Italian Internationals protested against this Congress if it should pretend to represent the mass of the Italian working men. A few only assisted at its meetings, in order to be able to watch the proceedings.

The Congress opened its sittings on the 1st November. Mazzini and Garibaldi were elected honorary presidents, and that a week after Garibaldi's letter to Petroni appeared, in which he had finally broken with Mazzini! Then the act of fraternisation of the Naples Congress was re-discussed. On this occasion a delegate proposed that it should be amended by adding a declaration that the Congress adhered expressly to the principles of Giuseppe Mazzini. The debate was long, but the old Mazzinian organisation at last prevailed. Thirty-four voted yes, nineteen no, six abstained, ten were absent. By a majority of fifteen upon the number of votes given, but by a minority of one upon the total number of

---

a See this volume, pp. 43-45.—Ed.
delegates sent to the Congress, the Italian Oddfellows and Druids have bound themselves, for the space of one year, to whatever Mazzini may say or do. Needless to say that the three representatives of International sections retired under protest immediately.\(^a\)

We may add that already in the first preliminary meeting of Congress it had been privately settled that neither the question of the International nor any religious question should be discussed. The standing orders were to be suspended in favour of Mazzini only!

The other votes of the Congress were of interest to the Mazzinians alone. They represent attempts to galvanise back into life the dying influence of Mazzini, attempts utterly fruitless in presence of the immense International movement now pervading the Italian working class. The Radical Italian press in Rome, especially \textit{La Capitale} and \textit{Il Tribuno},\(^b\) severely blame the Congress for its implicit note of confidence in Mazzini. The latter paper says:

"This vote was a verdict upon the plot between Mazzini and Garibaldi; between the theological notions of the high priest, and the downright affirmations of the working man's rights." It was intended to say to Garibaldi:—"You are wrong in denying the principles of Mazzini, which are those of the Italian working class; it was intended to say to the vanquished of the Commune that the Royalist squires of Versailles were right in shooting them down; it was intended to say to the International that the various Governments did right in trying to kill it, and that Italy would oppose a dam to the torrents coming down upon privilege and monopoly. It would have been well if the Italian workmen, in Congress united, had thoroughly discussed, and well examined every proposition, but instead of this the exceptions taken even before the questions themselves arose, the Ait Philosophus,\(^c\) the word of the master accepted as a gospel, constitutes acts damaging no one but that party which was compelled to recur to similar means in order to get rid of a propaganda it could not otherwise vanquish."

The same paper has a remarkable article on the Agricultural labours or small peasants in Italy, which demanded that all the immense estates now uncultivated or left in the state of bogs, should be declared the property of the labouring class, unless reclaimed and cultivated by their owners within a limited time.

In the German Parliament, our friend Bebel has spoken twice.\(^d\) In the first speech, he attacked the increasing military expenditure.

\(^a\) C. Cafiero, G. Montel and A. Tucci.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^b\) Ciceruacchio, \textit{Il Tribuno}.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^c\) Said the philosopher.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^d\) A. Bebel's speeches at the Reichstag sittings of October 30 and November 8, 1871, \textit{Der Volksstaat}, Nos. 91 and 92, November 11 and 15, 1871.—\textit{Ed.}
All this vast army, he said, is needed principally against the working people at home. But you, gentlemen of the middle class, with the rapid increase of your factories and workshops, you yourselves created such a rapid increase of the numbers of the working-class that you will never be able to increase your army at the same rate.

In the second speech, upon the Liberal motion that all German States should be bound to have representative institutions, Bebel said that all constitutions of the German States, great and small, were not worth the paper upon which they were written; the Prussian Executive Government were supreme and did what they liked all over Germany, and he wished that all the small states, falsely supposed to be the last refuges of liberty, were swallowed up by Prussia, so as to place the people for once face to face with their true enemy, the Prussian Government. Upon his declaring that he did not except the constitutions of the German Empire from this sweeping condemnation, the House, upon the motion of the speaker, stopped him in the midst of his speech.

This is liberty of discussion, as understood by the aristocrats, bureaucrats, capitalists, and lawyers of the German Parliament. The one working-man amongst them is so much a match for the whole of the rest that they have to put him down by main force.

First published in *The Eastern Post*, Reproduced from the newspaper No. 164, November 18, 1871; reprinted in the second issue, November 19, 1871

---

a Dr. Simpson.—*Ed.*
I Karl Marx of 1 Maitland park Road Haverstock Hill in the County of Middlesex, Secretary for Germany of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows

1) That the German Social Democratic Working Men's Party whose Committee in the beginning of September One thousand eight hundred and seventy was still seated at Brunswick has never demanded to be enrolled as part and parcel or as a Section of the International Working Men's Association.

2) That for this reason such an enrolment has never taken place.

3) That many members of the aforesaid German Social Democratic Working Men's Party have on their demand been individually admitted as Members of the International Working Men's Association.

4) That this Declaration is made at the request of Wilhelm Bracke a Merchant at Brunswick and himself a Member of the International Working Men's Association.

And I make this solemn Declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the provisions of an Act made and passed in the Session of Parliament of the fifth and sixth years of the reign of His late Majesty King William the Fourth, intituled "An Act to Repeal an Act of the present Session of Parliament intituled An Act for the more effectuell abolition of Oaths and Affirmations taken and made in various departments of the State, and to substitute Declarations in lieu thereof, and for the more entire suppression of voluntary and extra judicial Oaths
and Affidavits and to make other provisions for the abolition of unnecessary Oaths."

Subscribed and Declared at the Mansions House in the City of London this seventeenth day of November 1871.

Karl Marx

Before me Sills John Gibbons, Lord Mayor

First published, in English, in Der Proceß gegen den Ausschuß der Socialdemokratischen Arbeiterpartei, Brunswick, 1871, p. 151

Reproduced from the book
On page 2 of the Frankfurter Zeitung, No. 326, is a report, dated London, November 18, which runs as follows:

"At its last meeting the London section of the International passed the following resolution: 'The outstanding services of Sir Charles Dilke to the people's cause give him the right to recognition by the people; therefore he is invited to accept the title of honorary member of the international working men's union.' At an earlier meeting Kossuth was elected member."

The International does not recognise any honorary membership. In all probability the above-mentioned decision relates to a small London society, which first called itself "The International Democratic Association" and later changed its name to the "Universal Republican League". It has no connection whatsoever with the International.

In the name of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association

Corresponding Secretary for Germany,

Karl Marx

Written on November 24, 1871

First published in Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt, No. 333, November 28, 1871

Printed according to the newspaper checked with the manuscript
London, November 25, 1871

Since the return of Citizen Lorenzo from the last conference we have not had any news from you. I have written two letters to you; the last one, dated the eighth of this November, which was registered, asked you to write to us immediately to explain this long silence. We have not yet received any answer but we have heard that a small minority of members of the International, seeking to sow divisions in the ranks of the association, is conspiring against the resolutions of the Conference and the General Council, spreading calumnies of all sorts. We have no doubt that your mysterious silence is caused by your having received letters of this type. If this is the case, we want you to inform us of the accusations and insinuations expressed against us, as is your duty, so that we can refute them.

In any case, you cannot prolong this silence which is contrary to our General Rules which instruct you to send us regular reports. We ask for an immediate reply to this letter; if you do not reply to it, we shall have to conclude that your silence is deliberate and that you believe the calumnies which we have mentioned, without having the courage to inform us of them. And we shall have to proceed in that case in the manner which the interest of the International will dictate.
Frederick Engels

TO THE EDITORS
OF IL PROLETARIO ITALIANO

Citizens,

In your issue No. 39 you publish an announcement by Turin workers which contains the following:

"We hereby publicly announce that the decision of the Grand Council in London to subordinate socialism to politics was communicated to us by the editors of the Proletario immediately after it was made and that the decision was not of an official nature since it was withdrawn by the Grand Council in view of the fact that many European associations would have rejected it outright, as would we."

This assertion obliges the General Council to declare:
1) that it never took any decision to subordinate socialism to politics,
2) that it therefore could not have withdrawn such a decision,
3) that no European or American association could reject such a decision, or has indeed rejected any other decision of the General Council.

The position of the General Council as regards the political action of the proletariat is sufficiently well defined.

It is defined:
1) By the General Rules, in which the fourth paragraph of the preamble runs: "That the economical emancipation of the working classes is the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means."\(^a\)
2) By the text of the Inaugural Address of the Association (1864), this official and essential commentary on the Rules, which says:

\(^a\) See this volume, p. 3.—*Ed.*
"The lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies. So far from promoting, they will continue to lay every possible impediment in the way of the emancipation of labour... To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the working classes."^{a}

3) By the resolution of the Congress of Lausanne (1867) to the effect that: "The social emancipation of the workmen is inseparable from their political emancipation."^{b}

4) By Resolution IX of the London Conference (September 1871) which, in agreement with the above, reminds the members of the International that in the struggle of the working classes their economical movement and their political action are indissolubly united.\(^c\)

The Council has always followed the line of conduct thus prescribed and will do so in future. It therefore declares the above communication made by persons unknown to the editors of the *Proletario* to be false and slanderous.

By order and in the name of the General Council
Secretary for Italy,

F. E.

P. S. I have just received *La Révolution Sociale* from Geneva which says that a small group in the Jura has rejected the decisions of the London Conference.\(^{32}\) The General Council has received no official communication as yet. As soon as it does, it will take the necessary measures.

November 29, 1871


Printed according to the rough manuscript

Translated from the Italian

\(^{a}\) See present edition, Vol. 20, p. 12.— *Ed.*  
\(^{b}\) *Procès-verbaux du Congrès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs réuni à Lausanne du 2 au 8 septembre 1867*, La Chaux-de-Fonds, 1867, p. 19.— *Ed.*  
\(^{c}\) See present edition, Vol. 22, pp. 426-27.— *Ed.*
Frederick Engels

[CREDENTIADS FOR GIUSEPPE BORIANI]33

November 30, 1871

Citizen Giuseppe Boriani is accepted member of the International Working Men's Association and is authorised to admit new members and form new sections, on condition that he, and the members and sections newly admitted, recognise as obligatory the official documents of the Association, namely:

The General Rules and Administrative Regulations,
The Inaugural Address,
Resolutions of the Congresses,
The resolutions of the London Conference of September 1871.

By order and in the name of the General Council
Secretary for Italy,

Frederick Engels

First published in: Max Nettlau, Bakunin e l'Internazionale in Italia dal 1864 al 1872,
Geneva, 1928

Printed according to the manuscript
Translated from the Italian

---

Frederick Engels

[THE POSITION OF THE DANISH MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION

ENGELS' RECORD OF HIS REPORT AT THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING OF DECEMBER 5, 1871]

A report was received from Denmark referring chiefly to the condition of the agricultural labourers, and the agitation taking place amongst them. In Denmark there are but two official political parties—the "Doctrinaires" who represent the capitalist class, and the "Peasants Friends", as they call themselves, who represent the landed proprietors including the landed nobility, and the large peasant owner. They also pretend to represent the agricultural labourers, but as a matter of course nothing was ever done for them. The nobility are comparatively powerless in Denmark, so the large peasant holders form the bulk of the "Peasants Friends" party. The small farmers and labourers have hitherto been led by them, for though a few representatives of the latter class had been elected to Parliament, they acted under the influence of the large peasant holders, and were used as mere instruments by them.

The International aims at freeing the small peasants and agricultural labourers from this submission to the men who grow rich out of their labour, and is endeavouring to form them into an independent party—distinct from the so-called "Peasants Friends", but in intimate union with the working men of the towns. This new labourer’s party starts with the basis laid down by the Congress of Basle, the Nationalisation of the Land.35

“It is a truth more and more acknowledged,” says Socialisten, our Copenhagen organ, “that the land is the common property of the people, that the people ought to cultivate it in common, enjoy its common produce, and hand over its excess (rent) to the state for common purposes.”

a L. Fio, “Om vore Landboforhold”, Socialisten, No. 17, November 4, 1871.—Ed.
But as the land in Denmark is principally the property of a numerous class of Peasant Proprietors, each holding from 50 to 100 acres of good soil, the immediate expropriation of such a considerable body would be impossible. A plan has therefore been proposed, which offers many advantages to the holder as well as to the labourers, that is, to establish Agricultural Co-operative Societies consisting of peasant holders and labourers, for the common cultivation of the land, now cultivated by them individually. The small and medium farms would thus be replaced by farms of 500 acres and upwards, and would allow of the introduction of agricultural implements, steam culture, and other modern improvements, which cannot be taken advantage of, when agriculture is conducted on a small scale. The necessary capital is to be advanced by the state on the security of the land belonging to each association; these propositions are necessarily of a very elementary character, but they appear to be well adapted to the intellect and capacity of the agricultural population, whilst the constant reference to the *Nationalisation of the land as the ultimate end of the movement*, will powerfully assist in breaking up that political subserviency in which the large landowners, with the help of the parson, the village schoolmaster, and the government official, have hitherto held the agricultural labourers.

First published in *The Eastern Post*, Reproduced from the newspaper No. 167, December 9, 1871
Frederick Engels

[ON THE POSITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL'S SECTIONS IN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES]³⁶

With regard to the Conference's resolution on politics,¹ I am pleased to announce that the Spanish federation has fully accepted it, as can be seen from the latest issues of the Emancipacion of Madrid and the Federacion of Barcelona (December 3).² The transformation of the International in Spain into a distinct and independent political party is now secure. We are doing wonderfully in Spain: from 19 to 20,000 new members in under three months! In Denmark the International has only been in existence for three months and it has 2,000 members in the capital alone, a smaller city than Milan. The peasants are joining in large numbers too, and a big campaign is being prepared for the forthcoming elections, which promise to give us a strong and respectable representation in the Danish Parliament.

We are doing well in Germany and Holland. In France we have 26 newspapers and the sections are re-forming behind M. Thiers' back.

Written between December 5 and 10, 1871

First published in La Plebe, No. 144, December 12, 1871

Printed according to the newspaper

Translated from the Italian

Published in English for the first time


² "La politica de la Internacional", La Emancipacion, No. 24, November 27, 1871; reprinted in La Federacion, No. 120, December 3, 1871.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

[DECLARATION SENT BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE EDITORS OF ITALIAN NEWSPAPERS CONCERNING MAZZINI'S ARTICLES ABOUT THE INTERNATIONAL] 37

INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION,
256, High Holborn, London.—W.C.
December 6, 1871

TO THE EDITOR OF LA ROMA DEL POPOLO

Dear Sir,

I count on you having the honesty to publish the enclosed declaration. If we are going to fight, let's fight honestly.

Yours most respectfully,

F. Engels,
General Council Secretary for Italy

INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

TO THE EDITORS OF LA ROMA DEL POPOLO

In number 38 of La Roma del Popolo Citizen Giuseppe Mazzini publishes the first of a series of articles entitled "Documents about the International". Mazzini notifies the public:

"I ... have gathered from all the sources I was able to refer to all its resolutions, all the spoken and written declarations of its influential members."

And these are the documents he intends publishing. He begins by giving two samples.

I. "The abstention" (from political action) "went so far that some of the French founders [of the International] promised Louis Napoleon that they would renounce all political action provided he grant the workers I don't know what sum of material aid."

---

37 Published on November 16, 1871; the next two articles of the series appeared in La Roma del Popolo, Nos. 39 and 41, November 23 and December 7, 1871.—Ed.
We defy Citizen Mazzini to prove this assertion which we regard as calumnious.

II. "In a speech at the Berne Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom in 1868, Bakunin said: 'I want the equalisation of individuals and classes: without this an idea of justice is impossible and peace will not be established. The worker must no longer be deceived with lengthy speeches. He must be told what he ought to want, if he doesn't know himself. I'm a collectivist, not a communist, and if I demand the abolition of inheritance rights, I do so to arrive at social equality more quickly'."

Whether Citizen Bakunin pronounced these words or not is quite immaterial for us. What is important for the General Council of the International Working Men's Association to establish is:

1) that these words, as Mazzini himself asserts, were spoken at a congress not of the International but of the bourgeois League of Peace and Freedom;

2) that the International congress, which met at Brussels in September 1868, disavowed this same congress of the *League of Peace and Freedom* by a special vote[38];

3) that when Citizen Bakunin pronounced these words, he was not even a member of the International;

4) that the General Council has always opposed the repeated attempts to substitute for the broad programme of the International Working Men's Association (which has made membership open to Bakunin's followers) Bakunin's narrow and sectarian programme, the adoption of which would automatically entail the exclusion of the vast majority of members of the International;

5) that the International can therefore in no way accept responsibility for the acts and declarations of Citizen Bakunin.

As for the other documents about the International, which Citizen Mazzini intends to publish shortly, the General Council hereby declares that it is only responsible for its official documents.

By order and in the name of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association,

Secretary for Italy,

*Frederick Engels*

First published in *La Plebe*, No. 144, December 12, 1871; *Gazzettino Rosa*, No. 345, December 12, 1871; *La Roma del Popolo*, No. 43, December 21, 1871

Printed according to *La Roma del Popolo* checked with Engels' rough manuscript

Translated from the Italian
Karl Marx

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EASTERN POST

Sir,—In his last epistle to you, Mr. Charles Bradlaugh makes the report of the sitting of the General Council of December 12th,—a sitting from which I was absent in consequence of illness—the pretext for discharging upon me his ruffianism. He says,

"I feel indebted to Karl Marx for his enmity."  

My enmity to Mr. Charles Bradlaugh! Ever since the publication of the "Address on the Civil War in France", Mr. Bradlaugh’s voice has chimed in with the world-wide chorus of slander against the "International" and myself. I treated him, like the other revilers, with contemptuous silence. This was more than the grotesque vanity of that huge self-idolater could stand. I "calumniated" him because I took no notice of his calumnies. My silence drove him mad; in a public meeting he denounced me as a Bonapartist because, in the "Address on the Civil War", I had, forsooth, laid bare the historic circumstances that gave birth to the Second Empire. He now goes a step further and transforms me into a police agent of Bismarck. Poor man! He must needs show that the lessons he has recently received at Paris from the infamous Emile de Girardin and his clique are not lost upon him. For the present, I shall “betray him” to the German public by giving the greatest possible circulation to his epistle. If he be kind enough to

---

a J. Hales, "International Working Men’s Association", The Eastern Post, No. 168, December 16, 1871.—Ed.

b C. Bradlaugh, "To the Editor of The Eastern Post", The Eastern Post, No. 168 (second edition), December 17, 1871.—Ed.
clothe his libels in a more tangible shape, I shall “betray him” to an English law-court.

I am, Sir,
Yours obediently,

Karl Marx

London, December 20th

First published in *The Eastern Post*, Reproduced from the newspaper No. 169, December 23, 1871
Frederick Engels

THE CONGRESS OF SONVILLIER
AND THE INTERNATIONAL

It is hardly necessary to enlarge upon the present position of the International Working Men's Association. On the one hand, owing to the tremendous events in Paris, it has become stronger and more widespread than ever before; on the other we find almost all the European governments united against it—Thiers and Gorchakov, Bismarck and Beust, Victor Emmanuel and the Pope, Spain and Belgium. A general drive against the International has been launched, all the powers of the old world, the courts-martial and civil courts, the police and the press, squires from the backwoods and bourgeois, vie with each other in persecuting it, and there is hardly a spot on the entire continent where every means is not used to outlaw this fear-inspiring great brotherhood of workers.

At this very moment of general and inevitable disorganisation caused by the forces of the old society, when unity and solidarity are more indispensable than ever, at this very moment a small number of the Internationals—whose number by their own admission is steadily diminishing—in some corner of Switzerland has chosen to throw an apple of discord in the shape of a public circular among the members of the International. These people— they call themselves the Federation of the Jura—are essentially the same who under the leadership of Bakunin have continuously undermined the unity in the French-speaking part of Switzerland for more than two years and who through their assiduous private correspondence with kindred notabilities in various countries have

---

a The proletarian revolution of March 18, 1871 and the Paris Commune.— Ed.
b Pius IX.— Ed.
obstructed concerted action in the International. So long as these intrigues were confined to Switzerland or done on the quiet we did not want to give them wide publicity, but this circular compels us to speak.

Because this year the General Council has not convened a Congress but a Conference, a circular to all sections of the International has been adopted by the Federation of the Jura at its Congress at Sonvillier on November 12. Large numbers of the circular were printed and mailed in all directions requesting all sections to press for the immediate convocation of a Congress. Why a Conference had to take the place of a Congress is perfectly clear, at least to us in Germany and Austria. If we had been represented at a Congress our delegates on their return would have been immediately apprehended and placed into safe custody, and the delegates from Spain, Italy and France would have been in the same position. But a Conference which held no public debates but only committee meetings could very well take place, for the names of the delegates would not be published. It had the disadvantage that it could not decide fundamental issues or make any changes in the General Rules, that it had no legislative power at all and could pass merely administrative decisions designed to facilitate the putting into practice of the organisational measures laid down by the General Rules and Congress resolutions. But nothing more was required under the circumstances, it was merely a question of adopting measures to deal with the present emergency, and a Conference was sufficient for the purpose.

The attacks on the Conference and its decisions, however, were merely a pretext. In fact, the present circular only makes passing mention of them. It considers, on the contrary, that the evil is far more deep-rooted. It asserts that according to the General Rules and the original Congress resolutions the International is nothing but "a free federation of autonomous" (independent) "sections", whose aim is the emancipation of the workers by the workers themselves

"without any directing authority, even if set up by voluntary agreement".

The General Council therefore was nothing but "a simple statistical and correspondence bureau". But this original basis was very soon distorted, first by conferring on the General Council the right to co-opt new members, and even more by the resolutions of

---
a The London Conference of the International held on September 17-23, 1871.—Ed.
the Basle Congress, which gave the General Council the right to suspend individual sections till the next Congress and to decide controversies provisionally until the Congress adopted a relevant resolution. This placed dangerous powers in the hands of the General Council and turned the free association of independent sections into a hierarchical and authoritarian organisation of "disciplined sections", so that

"the sections are entirely under the control of the General Council, which can arbitrarily either refuse to admit them or suspend their work".

To our German readers, who know only too well the value of an organisation that is able to defend itself, all this will seem very strange. And this is quite natural, for Mr. Bakunin's theories, which appear here in their full splendour, have not yet penetrated into Germany. A workers' association which has inscribed upon its banner the motto of struggle for the emancipation of the working class is to be headed, not by an executive committee, but merely by a statistical and correspondence bureau! For Bakunin and his companions, however, the struggle for the emancipation of the working class is a mere pretext; their real aim is quite different.

"The future society should be nothing but a universalisation of the organisation which the International will establish for itself. We must therefore try to bring this organisation as close as possible to our ideal... The International, embryo of the future human society, must henceforth be the faithful image of our principles of liberty and federation, and must reject any principle leading to authoritarianism, to dictatorship."

We Germans have earned a bad name for our mysticism, but we have never gone the length of such mysticism. The International is to be the prototype of a future society in which there will be no executions à la Versailles, no courts-martial, no standing armies, no inspection of private correspondence, and no Brunswick criminal court! Just now, when we have to defend ourselves with all the means at our disposal, the proletariat is told to organise not in accordance with requirements of the struggle it is daily and hourly compelled to wage, but according to the vague notions of a future society entertained by some dreamers. Let us try to imagine what our own German organisation would look like according to this pattern. Instead of fighting the government and the bourgeoisie, it would meditate on whether each paragraph of our General Rules and each resolution passed by the Congress

---

a Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association, Held at Basle, in Switzerland. From the 6th to the 11th September 1869, London [1869], p. 21.—Ed.
presented a true image of the future society. In place of our executive committee there would be a simple statistical and correspondence bureau; it would have to deal as best it knew with the independent sections, which are so independent that they can accept no steering authority, be it even one set up by their own free decision; for they would thus violate their primary duty—that of being a true model of the future society. Co-ordination of forces and joint action are no longer mentioned. If in each individual section the minority submits to the decision of the majority, it commits a crime against the principles of freedom and accepts a principle which leads to authority and dictatorship! If Stieber and all his associates, if the entire black cabinet, if all Prussian officers were ordered to join the Social-Democratic organisation in order to wreck it, the committee, or rather the statistical and correspondence bureau, must by no means keep them out, for this would amount to establishing a hierarchical and authoritarian organisation! And above all, there should be no disciplined sections! Indeed, no party discipline, no centralisation of forces at a particular point, no weapons of struggle! But what, then, would happen to the model of the future society? In short, where would this new organisation get us? To the cowardly, servile organisation of the early Christians, those slaves, who gratefully accepted every kick and whose grovelling did indeed after 300 years win them the victory of their religion—a method of revolution which the proletariat will surely not imitate! Like the early Christians, who took heaven as they imagined it as the model for their organisation, so we are to take Mr. Bakunin's heaven of the future society as a model, and are to pray and hope instead of fighting. And the people who preach this nonsense pretend to be the only true revolutionaries!

As far as the International is concerned, all this is still a long way off. Until the Congress passes new decisions it is the duty of the General Council to carry out the Basle resolutions and it will do its duty. Just as it did not hesitate to expel the Tolains and Durands, so it will see to it that admission to the International will remain barred for the Stiebers & Co., even if Mr. Bakunin should consider this dictatorial.

But how did these reprehensible Basle resolutions come into being? Very simply. The Belgian delegates proposed them, and no one supported them more ardently than Bakunin and his friends, especially Schwitzguébel and Guillaume, who signed the circular in question! But then matters were of course quite different. These gentlemen then hoped to secure a majority and that the General
Council would be dominated by them. At that time they wanted to make the General Council as strong as possible. And now—now it is quite a different matter. Now the grapes are sour, and the Council is to be reduced to a simple statistical and correspondence bureau, so that Bakunin's chaste future society should not have to blush.

These people, professional sectarians, who, with all their mystical early-Christian doctrines, form an insignificant minority in the International, have the effrontery to reproach the General Council and its members with wanting

"to make their particular programme, their personal tenets the predominant ones in the International; they regard their private ideas as the official theory which alone should be entitled to full recognition in the Association".

This is indeed bold language. Anyone who has been able to follow the internal history of the International knows that for nearly three years now these people have been mainly occupied in trying to force their sectarian doctrine on the Association as its general programme, and having failed in this they underhandedly seek to pass off Bakunin's phrases as the general programme of the International. Nevertheless, the General Council protested only against this insinuation but has so far never challenged their right to belong to the International or freely to propagate their sectarian humbug as such. How the General Council will look upon their latest circular is yet to be seen.

These people have themselves brilliantly demonstrated what they have achieved by their new organisation. Wherever the International did not encounter the violent resistance of reactionary governments, it has made enormous advances since the Paris Commune. What do we see, on the other hand, in the Swiss Jura, where these gentlemen were free to run things their own way during the last eighteen months? Their own report to the Sonvillier Congress (printed in the Geneva journal *La Révolution Sociale* of November 23) says:

"These terrible events could not but exert a partly demoralising and partly beneficial influence on our sections... Then the gigantic struggle which the proletariat has to wage against the bourgeoisie will begin, and that makes people think ... some withdraw (*s'en vont*) and hide their cowardice, others rally closer than ever in support of the regenerating principle of the International.—This is at present the dominant fact of the internal history of the International in general and of our Federation in particular."a

---
What is new here is the statement that this happened in the International in general, where just the opposite took place. It is true that this happened in the Jura Federation. According to these gentlemen themselves, the Moutier section has suffered least of all, but has achieved nothing:

"Though no new sections were set up, it is to be hoped that, etc." ... and this section was after all "in a particularly favourable position because of the excellent temper of the population" ... "the Grange section has been reduced to a small nucleus of workers".

Two sections in Biel never answered the letters of the Committee, and the same applies to the sections in Neuchâtel and one in Locle; the third section in Biel

"is for the time being dead" ... although "there is still some hope of the International in Biel reviving".

The Saint-Blaise section is dead; that of Val de Ruz has vanished, no one knows how; after a prolonged agony the central section at Locle was dissolved, but has managed to reconstitute itself, evidently for the purpose of the Congress elections; that of La Chaux-de-Fonds is in a critical position; the watch-makers' section in Courtelary is now transforming itself into a trades association and adopting the rules of the association of Swiss watch-makers; it thus adopts the rules of an organisation which is not part of the International; the central section at the same district has suspended its activities because its members have formed separate sections at Saint-Imier and Sonvillier (which has not prevented this central section from sending two delegates to the Congress, in addition to the delegates from Saint-Imier and Sonvillier); after an outstanding career the Catébat section had to dissolve itself as a result of intrigues by the local bourgeois, and the same happened to the Corgémont section; finally in Geneva one section is still in existence.

That is what in eighteen months the representatives of a free federation of independent sections headed by a statistical and correspondence bureau have done to a flourishing, though not widespread or numerous, Federation. And that in a country where they had complete freedom of action and at a time when everywhere else the International had made gigantic advances. And at the very moment when they themselves exhibit this picture of their miserable failure, when they utter this cry of helplessness and dissolution, they demand that we should divert the International from the course it has hitherto followed, a
course which has made it what it is now, and lead it along the path which brought the Jura Federation from a comparatively flourishing state to complete dissolution.

Written not later than January 3, 1872
First published in Der Volksstaat, No. 3, January 10, 1872

Printed according to the newspaper
**Karl Marx**

**TO THE EDITOR OF THE EASTERN POST**

Sir,—In *The National Reformer* of January 7th, Mr. Charles Bradlaugh says:

"We only meant to allege that Dr. Marx had, in former times, given information to his own Government."a

I simply declare that this is a calumny, as ridiculous as it is infamous. I call upon Mr. Bradlaugh to publish any fact that could afford him even the slightest pretext for his statement. For his personal tranquility I add that he shall not be "challenged".

I am, Sir, yours obediently,

*Karl Marx*

January 16th

First published in *The Eastern Post*, Reproduced from the newspaper No. 173, January 20, 1872

---

a C. Bradlaugh, "Rough Notes and Readings", *The National Reformer*, No. 1, January 7, 1872.—*Ed.*
Karl Marx

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EASTERN POST

Sir,—In his immortal poem, Dante says that one of the most cruel tortures of an exile is the necessity of having to rub elbows with all sorts of people. I have deeply felt the truth of his complaint when being forced to enter for a moment into a public controversy with men like Messrs. Charles Bradlaugh and Co. I shall, however, no longer allow him to turn the quarrel he has fastened upon me into the cheap and convenient means of advertising himself abroad.

He published against me an accusation which, if published in Germany, would have made him the laughing-stock of all parties. I thereupon challenged him to publish such facts as might have lent him the slightest pretext for a calumny as ridiculous as it is infamous. I did so in order, not to justify myself, but to expose him. With the low cunning of a solicitor’s clerk he tries to escape this liability by inviting me to a “Court of Honour”.

Does he really fancy that a Bradlaugh, or the editors of the Paris demi-monde Press, or those of the Bismarckian papers at Berlin, or the Tages-Presse at Vienna, or the Criminal-Zeitung at New York, or the Moscow Gazette, have only to slander me, in order to make me amenable to clear my public character, and even to do so before a “Council of Honour”, of which the friends of those “honourable” gentlemen must form part?

---

a The letter is provided with the editor’s headline: “Dr. Karl Marx and Mr. Bradlaugh”.—Ed.
b Dante, The Divine Comedy, Paradise, Canto XVII.—Ed.
c See this volume, p. 71.—Ed.
d Московские ведомости.—Ed.
I have done with Mr. Charles Bradlaugh, and leave him to all the comforts he may derive from the quiet contemplation of his own self.

I am, Sir,

Yours obediently,

Karl Marx

Written before January 28, 1872

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The Eastern Post*,
No. 174, January 28 (second edition), 1872
Frederick Engels

[LETTER TO THE EDITORS
OF THE GAZZETTINO ROSA] 45

INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION
256, High Holborn, London.— W. C.
London, February 7

TO THE CITIZEN EDITOR OF THE GAZZETTINO ROSA

Citizen,

For several months now, the Libero Pensiero of Florence has not ceased to attack the International, as if the great workers' association could get jealous of the society of rationalist prebendaries promoted by this newspaper. Up till now it seemed superfluous for me to reply to these attacks, but when the aforementioned publication sinks to the level of spreading rumours of a Bismarckian sort in Italy against the International and its General Council, it is time to protest. I have therefore sent the following letter to the Libero Pensiero, and I should like you to publish it in the Gazzettino Rosa as well.

Fraternal greetings,

F. Engels,

General Council Secretary for Italy

TO MR. LUIGI STEFANONI, EDITOR OF IL LIBERO PENSIERO

Dear Sir,

Issue number 1 of the Libero Pensiero, January 4, 1872, contains an article, “L'Internazionale ed il Consiglio supremo di Londra”, to which I must submit a brief reply.

It says in the article:

"We should like to ask what mandate Mr. Engels has to represent Italy."

I do not claim and have never claimed to represent Italy. I have the honour of being, in the General Council, the secretary with
special responsibility for corresponding with Italy, a capacity in which it is my duty to represent the Council, not Italy.

The article then gives translations of several items of correspondence from London taken from the Neuer Social-Demokrat of Berlin, items which are full of the most infamous slanders against the General Council and the whole International. To these I shall not reply. One does not engage in dispute with that newspaper. It is well known throughout Germany what the Neuer Social-Demokrat is: a newspaper funded by Bismarck, the organ of Prussian governmental socialism. If you require more detailed information about this paper, write to your correspondent Liebknecht in Leipzig and you will get all you want. Allow me merely to add that if you are keen to have such slanders against the International you will find them in abundance in the Figaro, Gaulois, Petit-Journal and the other newspapers of the Parisian demi-monde, in the London Standard, the Journal de Genève, the Vienna Tages-Presse and the Moscow Gazette,* authorities which will relieve you of having to quote this poor devil Schneider.

In an editorial note it says:

"Perhaps this alludes to the communist secret society set up by Karl Marx in Cologne in 1850; when it was uncovered, as usual, many poor devils fell into the clutches of the Prussian police, while the principal organisers fled in safety to London."

Whoever told you this was lying. I was a member of this society.44 It was founded neither by Marx, nor in 1850, nor in Cologne. It was already in existence at least ten years previously. Marx and I had already been in England for a year, exiles driven out by the Prussian government, when the Cologne section, through its own imprudence, fell into police hands. If you want further information you can ask Mr. Becker, mayor of Dortmund and member of the Prussian and German parliaments; Klein, doctor and municipal councillor in Cologne; Bürgers, editor of the Wiesbadener Zeitung; Lessner, tailor and member of the General Council of the International in London. All of these were sentenced in this trial against the communists.45

I beg you to publish this correction in your next issue.

Yours sincerely,

Frederick Engels

First published in Gazzettino Rosa, No. 50, February 20, 1872 and in Il Libero Pensiero, February 22, 1872

Printed according to the Gazzettino Rosa

Translated from the Italian

---

* Московские ведомости.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

TO THE SECTION OF COMMERCIAL EMPLOYEES
IN BARCELONA

Citizens,

In reply to your letter of January 23, I regret that I cannot give you the addresses of the sections of your occupation because no such sections are known to us. What you say, relating to your country, about commercial employees being very opposed to proletarian progress also applies to other countries: this class generally consists of lackeys of the bourgeoisie who expect sooner or later to become bourgeois themselves. There are many honourable exceptions; but I believe that you are the first to succeed in forming a section of your profession.

If you also want to send me about twenty copies of your circular, I will disseminate them in the big commercial cities of Europe and America and it will serve well for propaganda.

Greetings and Social Revolution.

Written on February 16, 1872

Printed according to the rough manuscript
Translated from the Spanish
Published in English for the first time

---

a In the rough manuscript there is a note in Engels' hand: "Barcelona 23 January 72. Section of commercial employees. Answered. 16 February. The reply enclosed."—Ed.
The Swiss authorities have thought proper, upon a simple reclamation of the Russian Foreign Office, sent in violation of the Federal Constitution direct to a magistrate at Iverdun, to search the house of Citizen Outine at Geneva, under the infamous pretext that he might be implicated in the forgery of Russian paper money—a scandalous affair, in which, wonderful to say, the Russian State Councillor, Kamensky, charged to prosecute the forgers, figures at the same time as their ringleader. They seized the papers of Outine, and exposed all his Russian, German, and English correspondence to the scrutiny of a Russian translator, whose very name they refused to give. Citizen Outine, up to December 1871, was editor of the International organ, L'Égalité, and consequently his correspondence was for the greater part that of the International, and provided with the stamps of its different committees. Had it not been for the interference of his legal adviser, Citizen Ambery, to whom the Council tenders its best thanks, Outine's papers and himself would have been handed over to the Russian Government, with which Switzerland has not even a treaty of extradition.

The Russian Government, met at home by a daily growing opposition, has taken advantage of the sham conspiracies of men like Netchayeff, who did not belong to the International, to prosecute opponents at home under the pretext of being Internationals. Now it takes another step in advance. Supported by its faithful vassal, Prussia, it commences an intervention in the internal concerns of Western nations by calling upon their magistrates to hunt down in its service the International. It opens its campaign in a Republic, and the Republican authorities
hastened to make themselves the humble servants of Russia. The General Council considers it sufficient to denounce the designs of the Russian Cabinet, and the subserving of its Western helpmates, to the workmen of all nations.

Written on February 20, 1872

Reproduced from *The Eastern Post*

First published in *The Eastern Post*, No. 178, February 24, 1872 (second edition) and in *The International Herald*, No. 1, March 2, 1872
Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

FICTITIOUS SPLITS IN THE INTERNATIONAL

PRIVATE CIRCULAR FROM THE GENERAL COUNCIL
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

 Until now the General Council has completely refrained from any interference in the International's internal conflicts and has never replied publicly to the overt attacks launched against it during more than two years by some members of the Association.

But if the persistent efforts of certain meddlers to deliberately maintain confusion between the International and a society\(^a\) which has been hostile to it since its origin allowed the General Council to maintain this reserve, the support which European reaction finds in the scandals provoked by that society at a time when the International is undergoing the most serious crisis since its foundation obliges it to present a historical review of all these intrigues.

I

After the fall of the Paris Commune, the General Council's first act was to publish its Address on *The Civil War in France*\(^b\) in which it came out in support of all the Commune's acts which, at the moment, served the bourgeoisie, the press and the governments of Europe as an excuse to heap the most vile slander on the vanquished Parisians. A part of the working class still failed to realise that their cause was lost. The Council came to understand

---

\(^a\) International Alliance of Socialist Democracy.— *Ed.*

\(^b\) K. Marx, *The Civil War in France.*— *Ed.*
the fact, among other things, by the resignation of two of its members, Citizens Odger and Lucraft, who repudiated all support of the Address. It may be said that the unity of views among the working class regarding the Paris events dates from the publication of the Address in all the civilised countries.

On the other hand, the International found a very powerful means of propaganda in the bourgeois press and particularly in the leading English newspapers, which the Address forced to engage in the polemic kept going by the General Council’s replies.49

The arrival in London of numerous refugees from the Commune made it necessary for the General Council to constitute itself as a Relief Committee and for more than eight months perform this function, which lay quite outside its regular duties.50

It goes without saying that the vanquished and exiles from the Commune had nothing to hope for from the bourgeoisie. As for the working class, the appeals for aid came at a difficult moment. Switzerland and Belgium had already received their contingent of refugees whom they had either to support or send on to London. The funds collected in Germany, Austria and Spain were sent to Switzerland. In England, the big fight for the nine-hour working day, the decisive battle of which was fought at Newcastle,51 had exhausted both the workers’ individual contributions and the funds set up by the Trades Unions, which could be used, incidentally, according to the rules, only for labour conflicts. Meanwhile, by tireless work and active correspondence, the Council succeeded in raising, bit by bit, a certain amount of money, which it distributed weekly. The American workers responded more generously to its appeal. It is unfortunate that the Council could not avail itself of the millions which the terrified bourgeoisie believed the International to have amassed in its safes!

After May 1871, some of the Commune’s refugees were asked to join the Council,52 in which, as a result of the war, the French side was no longer represented. Among the new members were some old Internationals and a minority composed of men known for their revolutionary energy whose election was an act of homage to the Paris Commune.

Along with all these preoccupations, the Council had to prepare for the Conference of Delegates that it had just called.53

The violent measures taken by the Bonapartist government against the International had prevented the holding of the Congress at Paris, which had been provided for by a resolution of
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Title page of Marx's and Engels' pamphlet *Fictitious Splits in the International*
the Basle Congress. Using the right conferred upon it by Article 4 of the Rules, the General Council, in its circular of July 12, 1870, convened the Congress at Mainz. In letters addressed at the same time to the various federations, it proposed that the General Council should transfer its seat from England to another country and asked that the delegates be provided with imperative mandates to that effect. The federations unanimously insisted that it should remain in London. The Franco-Prussian war, which broke out a few days later, made holding of any congress impossible. It was then that the federations which we consulted authorised us to fix the date of the next Congress depending on the course of events.

As soon as the political situation permitted, the General Council called a private Conference, acting on the precedents of the 1865 Conference and the private administrative meetings of each Congress. A public Congress was impossible and could only have resulted in the continental delegates being denounced at a moment when European reaction was celebrating its orgies; when Jules Favre was demanding from all governments, even the British, the extradition of refugees as common criminals; when Dufaure was proposing to the Rural Assembly a law banning the International, a hypocritical counterfeit of which was later presented by Malou to the Belgians; when, in Switzerland, a Commune refugee was put under preventative arrest while awaiting the federal government’s decision on the extradition order; when hunting down members of the International was the ostensible basis for an alliance between Beust and Bismarck, whose anti-International clause Victor Emmanuel was quick to adopt; when the Spanish Government, putting itself entirely at the disposal of the butchers of Versailles, was forcing the Madrid Federal Council to seek refuge in Portugal; at a time, lastly, when the International’s prime duty was to strengthen its organisation and to accept the gauntlet thrown down by the governments.

All sections in regular contact with the General Council were invited in good time to the Conference, which, even though it was not to be a public meeting, nevertheless faced serious difficulties. In view of the internal situation France was, of course, unable to elect any delegates. In Italy, the only organised section at the time

---


b A. E. Razoua.— Ed.
was that of Naples; but just as it was about to nominate a delegate it was broken up by armed force. In Austria and Hungary, the most active members were imprisoned. In Germany, some of the more well-known members were persecuted for the crime of high treason, others landed in gaol, and the party's funds were spent on aid to their families. The Americans, though they sent the Conference a detailed Memorandum on the situation of the International there, employed the delegation's money for maintaining the refugees. All federations, in fact, recognised the necessity of substituting the private Conference for a public Congress.

After meeting in London from September 17 to 23, 1871, the Conference authorised the General Council to publish its resolutions; to codify the Administrative Regulations and publish them with the General Rules, as reviewed and corrected, in three languages; to carry out the resolution to replace membership cards with stamps; to reorganise the International in England; and, lastly, to provide the necessary money for these various purposes.

Following the publication of the Conference proceedings, the reactionary press of Paris and Moscow, of London and New York, denounced the resolution on working-class policy as containing such dangerous designs—The Times accused it of "a cold and calculating judgment"—that it was necessary to outlaw the International with all possible speed. On the other hand, the resolution that dealt a blow at the fraudulent sectarian sections gave the international police a long-awaited excuse to start a noisy campaign ostensibly for the unrestricted autonomy of the workers whom it professed to protect against the despicable despotism of the General Council and the Conference. The working class felt itself so "heavily oppressed", indeed, that the General Council received from Europe, America, Australia and even the East Indies, reports regarding the admission of new members and the formation of new sections.

II

The denunciations in the bourgeois press, like the lamentations of the international police, found a sympathetic echo even in our Association. Some intrigues, directed ostensibly against the Gener-

---

* The Times, No. 27200, October 21, 1871, p. 7.—Ed.
al Council but in reality against the Association, were hatched in its midst. At the bottom of these intrigues was the inevitable *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, fathered by the Russian Mikhail Bakunin. On his return from Siberia, the latter began to write in Herzen's *Kolokol* preaching the ideas of Pan-Slavism and racial war, conceived out of his long experience. Later, during his stay in Switzerland, he was nominated to the steering Committee of the League of Peace and Freedom founded in opposition to the International. When this bourgeois society's affairs went from bad to worse, its president, Mr. G. Vogt, acting on Bakunin's advice, proposed to the International's Congress which met at Brussels in September 1868 to conclude an alliance with the League. The Congress unanimously proposed two alternatives: either the League should follow the same goal as the International, in which case it would have no reason for existing; or else its goal should be different, in which case an alliance would be impossible. At the League's Congress held in Berne a few days after, Bakunin made an about-face. He proposed a makeshift programme whose scientific value may be judged by this single phrase: "economic and social equalisation of classes". Backed by an insignificant minority, he broke with the League in order to join the International, determined to replace the International's General Rules by his makeshift programme, which had been rejected by the League, and to replace the General Council by his personal dictatorship. To this end, he created a special instrument, the *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, intended to become an International within the International.

Bakunin found the necessary elements for the formation of this society in the relationships he had formed during his stay in Italy, and in a small group of Russian emigrants, serving him as emissaries and recruiting officers among members of the International in Switzerland, France and Spain. Yet it was only after repeated refusals of the Belgian and Paris Federal Councils to recognise the *Alliance* that he decided to submit for the General Council's approval his new society's rules, which were nothing but a faithful reproduction of the "misunderstood" Berne programme. The Council replied by the following circular dated December 22, 1868:

---

*a* М. А. Бакунинъ, «Русскимъ, польскимъ и всѣмъ славянскимъ друзьямъ», *Колоколь*, No. 122/123, February 15, 1862, supplement.— *Ed.*
The General Council
to the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy

Just about a month ago a certain number of citizens formed in Geneva the Central Initiative Committee of a new international society named The International Alliance of Socialist Democracy, stating it was their "special mission to study political and philosophical questions on the basis of the grand principle of equality, etc."

The programme and rules published by this Initiative Committee were communicated to the General Council of the International Working Men's Association only on December 15, 1868. According to these documents, the said Alliance is "absorbed entirely in the International", at the same time as it is established entirely outside the Association. Besides the General Council of the International, elected successively at the Geneva, Lausanne and Brussels congresses, there is to be, in line with the rules drawn up by the Initiative Committee, another General Council in Geneva, which is self-appointed. Besides the local groups of the International, there are to be local groups of the Alliance, which through their national bureaus, operating independently of the national bureaus of the International, "will ask the Central Bureau of the Alliance to admit them into the International"; the Alliance Central Committee thereby takes upon itself the right of admittance to the International. Lastly, the General Congress of the International Working Men's Association will have its counterpart in the General Congress of the Alliance, for, as the rules of the Initiative Committee state, at the annual working men's congress the delegation of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy, as a branch of the International Working Men's Association, "will hold its meetings in a separate building".

Considering,
that the existence of a second international body operating within and outside the International Working Men's Association would be the surest means of its disorganisation;
that every other group of individuals, anywhere, would have the right to imitate the Geneva initiative group, and, under more or less plausible excuses, to bring into the International Working Men's Association other international associations with other special missions;
that the International Working Men's Association would thereby soon become a plaything of any meddlers of whatever nationality or party;
that the Rules of the International Working Men's Association
furthermore admit only local and national branches into its membership (see Article I and Article VI of the Rules);

that sections of the International Working Men's Association are forbidden to adopt rules or administrative regulations contrary to the General Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association (see Article XII of the Administrative Regulations);

that the Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association can be revised by the General Congress only, provided two-thirds of the delegates present vote in favour of such a revision (see Article XIII of the Administrative Regulations);

that a decision on this question is already contained in the resolutions against the League of Peace, unanimously passed at the General Congress in Brussels;

that in these resolutions the Congress declared that there was no justification for the existence of the League of Peace since, according to its recent declarations, its aim and principles were identical with those of the International Working Men's Association;

that a number of members of the initiative group of the Alliance, as delegates to the Brussels Congress, had voted for these resolutions;

The General Council of the International Working Men's Association unanimously resolved at its meeting of December 22, 1868, that:

1) All articles of the rules of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy, defining its relations with the International Working Men's Association, are declared null and void;

2) The International Alliance of Socialist Democracy may not be admitted as a branch of the International Working Men’s Association.

G. Odger, Chairman of the meeting
R. Shaw, General Secretary

London, December 22, 1868

A few months later, the Alliance again appealed to the General Council and asked whether, yes or no, it accepted its principles. If yes, the Alliance was ready to dissolve itself into the International's sections. It received a reply in the following circular of March 9, 1869: 86:

According to Article I of our Rules, the Association admits all working men's societies aiming at the same end, viz., *the mutual protection, progress and complete emancipation of the working class.*

The sections of the working class in the various countries finding themselves in different conditions of development, it follows necessarily that their theoretical opinions, which reflect the real movement, should also differ.

The community of action, however, established by the International Working Men's Association, the exchange of ideas facilitated by the public organs of the different national sections, and, lastly, the direct debates at the General Congresses, are sure gradually to engender a common theoretical programme.

Consequently, it is not the function of the General Council to subject the programme of the Alliance to a critical examination. We have not to inquire whether, *yes or no,* it is an adequate expression of the proletarian movement. All we have to establish is whether it may contain anything contrary to the general tendency of our Association, that is, *the complete emancipation of the working class.*

There is one sentence in your programme which fails in this respect. Article 2 reads:

"It" (Alliance) "seeks, above all, the political, economic, and social equalisation of classes."

The *equalisation of classes,* literally interpreted, means *harmony between Capital and Labour* so persistently preached by the bourgeois socialists. It is not the logically impossible *equalisation of classes,* but on the contrary the *abolition of classes,* this true secret of the proletarian movement, which forms the great aim of the *International Working Men's Association.*

Considering, however, the context, in which the phrase *equalisation of classes* occurs, it seems to be a mere slip of the pen. The General Council feels confident that you will be anxious to remove from your programme a phrase which may give rise to such dangerous misunderstandings. The principles of our Association

---

a In accordance with the General Council's demand Article 2 of the programme of the Alliance was amended as follows: "It aims above all at the complete and final abolition of classes and the political, economic and social equalisation of men and women."—*Ed.*
permit every section freely to shape its own theoretical programme, except in cases when the general policy of our Association is contradicted.

There exists, therefore, no obstacle to the transformation of the sections of the Alliance into sections of the International Working Men's Association.

The dissolution of the Alliance, and the entrance of its sections into the International once settled, it would, according to our Regulations, become necessary to inform the Council of the seat and the numerical strength of each new section.

*Meeting of the General Council of March 9, 1869*

Having accepted these conditions, the Alliance was admitted to the International by the General Council, misled by certain signatures affixed to Bakunin's programme and supposing the Alliance was recognised by the Romance Federal Committee in Geneva which, on the contrary, had always refused to have any dealings with it. Thus, it had achieved its immediate goal: to be represented at the Basle Congress. Despite the dishonest means employed by his supporters, means used on this and solely on this occasion, in an International Congress, Bakunin was deceived in his expectation of seeing the Congress transfer the seat of the General Council to Geneva and give an official sanction to the old Saint-Simonian rubbish, to the immediate abolition of hereditary rights which he had made the practical point of departure of socialism. This was the signal for the open and incessant war which the Alliance waged not only against the General Council but also against all International sections which refused to adopt this sectarian clique's programme and particularly the doctrine of total abstention from politics.

Even before the Basle Congress, when Nechayev came to Geneva, Bakunin got together with him and founded, in Russia, a secret society among students. Always hiding his true identity under the name of various "revolutionary committees", he sought autocratic powers based on all the tricks and mystifications of the time of Cagliostro. The main means of propaganda used by this society consisted in compromising innocent people in the eyes of the Russian police by sending them communications from Geneva in yellow envelopes stamped in Russian on the outside "Secret Revolutionary Committee". The published accounts of the Nechayev trial bear witness to the infamous abuse of the
International's name.*

The Alliance commenced at this time a public polemic directed against the General Council, first in the Locle Progrès, then in the Geneva Égalité, the official newspaper of the Romance Federation, onto which several members of the Alliance had wiggled their way following Bakunin. The General Council, which had scorned the attacks published in the Progrès, Bakunin's personal organ, could not ignore those from the Égalité, which it was bound to believe were approved by the Romance Federal Committee. It therefore published the circular of January 1, 1870, which said:

"We read in the Égalité of December 11, 1869:

"It is certain that the General Council is neglecting extremely important matters. We remind it of its obligations under Article 1 of the Regulations: The General Council is commissioned to carry the resolutions of the Congress into effect, etc. We could put enough questions to the General Council for its replies to make up quite a long report. They will come later... Meanwhile, etc. ..."

"The General Council does not know of any article, either in the Rules, or the Regulations, which would oblige it to enter into correspondence or into polemic with the Égalité or to provide 'replies to questions' from newspapers. The Federal Committee of Geneva alone represents the branches of Romance Switzerland vis-à-vis the General Council. When the Romance Federal Committee addresses requests or reprimands to us through the only legitimate channel, that is to say through its secretary, the General Council will always be ready to reply. But the Romance Federal Committee has no right either to abdicate its functions in favour of the Égalité and Progrès, or to let these newspapers usurp its functions. Generally speaking, the General Council's administrative correspondence with national and local committees cannot be published without greatly prejudicing the Association's general interests. Consequently, if the other organs of the International were to follow the example of the Progrès and the Égalité, the General Council would be faced with the alternative of either discrediting itself publicly by its silence or violating its obligations by replying publicly. The Égalité joins the Progrès in inviting the Travail (Paris paper) to denounce, on its part, the General Council. That is almost a League of Public Welfare."

* An extract from the Nechayev trial will be published shortly. The reader will find there a sample of the maxims, both stupid and infamous, which Bakunin's friends have laid at the door of the International.

Meanwhile, before having read this circular, the Romance Federal Committee had already expelled supporters of the Alliance from the editorial board of the Égalité.

The January 1, 1870 circular, like those of December 22, 1868 and March 9, 1869, was approved by all International sections.

It goes without saying that none of the conditions accepted by the Alliance have ever been fulfilled. Its sham sections have remained a mystery to the General Council. Bakunin sought to retain under his personal direction the few groups scattered in Spain and Italy and the Naples section which he had detached from the International. In the other Italian towns he corresponded with small cliques composed not of workers but of lawyers, journalists and other bourgeois doctrinaires. At Barcelona some of his friends maintained his influence. In some towns in the South of France the Alliance made an effort to found separatist sections under the direction of Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc, of Lyons, about whom we shall have more to say later. In a word, the international society within the International continued to operate.

The big blow—the attempt to take over the leadership of Romance Switzerland—was to have been executed by the Alliance at the Chaux-de-Fonds Congress, opened on April 4, 1870.

The battle began over the right to admit the Alliance delegates, which was contested by the delegates of the Geneva Federation and the Chaux-de-Fonds sections.

Although, on their own calculation, the Alliance supporters represented no more than a fifth of the Federation members, they succeeded, thanks to repetition of the Basle manoeuvres, to procure a fictitious majority of one or two votes, a majority which, in the words of their own organ (see the Solidarité of May 7, 1870), represented no more than fifteen sections, while in Geneva alone there were thirty! On this vote, the Romance Congress split into two groups which continued their meetings independently. The Alliance supporters, considering themselves the legal representatives of the whole of the Federation, transferred the Romance Federal Committee's seat to La Chaux-de-Fonds and founded at Neuchâtel their official organ, the Solidarité, edited by Citizen Guillaume. This young writer had the special job of decrying the Geneva "factory workers", those odious "bourgeois", of waging war on the Égalité, the Romance Federation newspaper, and of preaching total abstention from politics. The authors of the most

a "Deux organes socialistes...", La Solidarité, No. 5, May 7, 1870.—Ed.
important articles on this theme were Bastelica in Marseilles, and Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc in Lyons, the two big pillars of the Alliance.

On their return, the Geneva delegates convened their sections in a general assembly which, despite opposition from Bakunin and his friends, approved their actions at the Chaux-de-Fonds Congress. A little later, Bakunin and the more active of his accomplices were expelled from the old Romance Federation.

Hardly had the Romance Congress closed when the new Chaux-de-Fonds Committee called for the intervention of the General Council in a letter signed by F. Robert, secretary, and by Henri Chevalley, president, who was denounced two months later as a thief by the Committee's organ the Solidarité of July 9. After having examined the case of both sides, the General Council decided on June 28, 1870 to keep the Geneva Federal Committee in its old functions and invite the new Chaux-de-Fonds Federal Committee to take a local name. In the face of this decision which foiled its plans, the Chaux-de-Fonds Committee denounced the General Council's authoritarianism, forgetting that it had been the first to ask for its intervention. The trouble that the persistent attempts of the Chaux-de-Fonds Committee to usurp the name of the Romance Federal Committee caused the Swiss Federation obliged the General Council to suspend all official relations with the former.

Louis Bonaparte had just surrendered his army at Sedan. From all sides arose protests from International members against the war's continuation. In its address of September 9, the General Council, denouncing Prussia's plans of conquest, indicated the danger of her triumph for the proletarian cause and warned the German workers that they would themselves be the first victims.

In England, the General Council organised meetings which condemned the pro-Prussian tendencies of the court. In Germany, the International workers organised demonstrations demanding recognition of the Republic and "an honourable peace for France"...

Meanwhile, his bellicose nature gave the hot-headed Guillaume (of Neuchâtel) the brilliant idea of publishing an anonymous
manifesto as a supplement and under cover of the official newspaper *Solidarité*, calling for the formation of a Swiss volunteer corps to fight the Prussians, something which he had always been prevented from doing doubtlessly by his abstentionist convictions.\(^{70}\)

Then came the Lyons uprising.\(^{71}\) Bakunin rushed there and, supported by Albert Richard, Gaspard Blanc and Bastelica, installed himself on September 28 in the Town Hall, where he *refrained* from posting a guard, however, lest it would be viewed as a political act. He was driven out in shame by several National Guards at the moment when, after a difficult accouchement, his decree on the *abolition of the State* had just seen the light of day.

In October 1870, the General Council, in the absence of its French members, co-opted Citizen Paul Robin, a refugee from Brest, one of the best-known supporters of the Alliance, and, what is more, the instigator of several attacks in the *Égalité* against the General Council where, since that moment, he acted constantly as official correspondent of the Chaux-de-Fonds Committee. On March 14, 1871, he suggested the calling of a private Conference of the International to sift out the Swiss trouble. Foreseeing that important events were in the making in Paris, the Council flatly refused. Robin returned to the question on several occasions and even suggested that the Council take a definite decision on the conflict. On July 25, the General Council decided that this affair would be one of the questions for the Conference due to be convened in September 1871.

On August 10, the Alliance, hardly eager to see its activities looked into by a Conference, declared itself dissolved as from the 6th of August.\(^{72}\) But on September 15, it reappeared and requested admission to the Council under the name of the *Atheist Socialist Section*, According to Administrative Resolution No. V of the Basle Congress,\(^a\) the Council could not admit it without consulting the Geneva Federal Committee, which was exhausted after its two years of struggle against the sectarian sections. Moreover, the Council had already told the English Christian workers’ societies (*Young Men’s Christian Association*) that the International did not recognise theological sections.

On August 6, the date of the dissolution of the Alliance, the Chaux-de-Fonds Federal Committee renewed its request to enter into official relations with the Council and said that it would continue to ignore the June 28 resolution and to regard itself, in

---

\(^a\) See *Compte-rendu du IVe Congrès international, tenu à Bâle, en septembre 1869*, Brussels, 1869, p. 172.— *Ed.*
relation to Geneva, as the Romance Federal Committee, and "that it was up to the General Congress to judge this affair". On September 4, the same Committee challenged the Conference's competence, even though it had been the first to call for its convocation. The Conference could have replied by questioning the competence of the Paris Federal Committee which the Chaux-de-Fonds Committee had requested before the siege of Paris to deliberate on the Swiss conflict. But it confined itself to the General Council decision of June 28, 1870 (see the motives expounded in the Égalité of Geneva, October 21, 1871).

III

The presence in Switzerland of some of the outlawed French who had found refuge there put some life back into the Alliance. The Geneva members of the International did all they could for the emigrants. They came to their aid right from the beginning, initiated a wide campaign and prevented the Swiss authorities from serving an extradition order on the refugees as demanded by the Versailles government. Several risked the grave danger by going to France to help the refugees to gain the frontier. Imagine the surprise of the Geneva workers when they saw several of the ringleaders such as B. Malon* immediately come to an understanding with the Alliance people and with the help of N. Zhukovsky, ex-Secretary of the Alliance, try to found at Geneva, outside of the Romance Federation, the new "Section of Propaganda and Revolutionary Socialist Action". In the first article of its rules it

* Do the friends of B. Malon, who have been advertising him in a stereotyped way for the last three months as the founder of the International, who have called his book [La troisième défaite du prolétariat français] the only independent work on the Commune, know the attitude taken by this assistant of the Mayor of Batignolles on the eve of the February elections? At that time, B. Malon, who did not yet foresee the Commune and saw nothing more than the success of his election to the Assembly, plotted to get himself put on the list of the four committees as a member of the International. To these ends he insolently denied the existence of the Paris Federal Council and submitted to the committees the list of a section founded by himself at Batignolles as coming from the entire Association. — Later, on March 19, he insulted in a public document the leaders of the great Revolution accomplished on the eve. — Today, this anarchist from top to toe prints or has printed what he was saying a year ago to the four committees: I am the International! B. Malon has hit on a way of parodying Louis XIV and Perron the chocolate manufacturer at one and the same time. It was Perron who declared that his chocolate was the only ... edible chocolate!
"pledges allegiance to the General Rules of the International Working Men's Association, while reserving for itself the complete freedom of action and initiative to which it is entitled as a logical consequence of the principle of autonomy and federation recognised by the Rules and Congresses of the Association".

In other words, it reserves for itself full freedom to continue the work of the Alliance.

In a letter from Malon, of October 20, 1871, this new section for the third time asked the General Council for admission into the International. Conforming to Resolution V of the Basle Congress, the Council consulted the Geneva Federal Committee which vigorously protested against the Council recognising this new "seedbed of intrigues and dissentions". The Council acted, in fact, in a rather "authoritarian" manner so as not to bind the whole Federation to the will of B. Malon and N. Zhukovsky, the Alliance's ex-Secretary.

The Solidarité having gone out of business, the new Alliance supporters founded the Révolution Sociale under the supreme management of Madame André Léo who had just said at the Lausanne Peace Congress that

"Raoul Rigault and Ferré were the two sinister figures of the Commune who, up till then" (up till the execution of the hostages), "had not stopped calling for bloody measures, albeit always in vain".¹

From its very first issue, the newspaper hastened to put itself on the same level as the Figaro, Gaulois, Paris-Journal and other disreputable sheets, reproducing the mud they were throwing at the General Council. It thought the moment opportune to fan the flames of national hatred, even within the International. It called the General Council a German committee led by a Bismarckian brain.*

After having definitely established that certain General Council members could not boast of being "Gauls first and foremost" the Révolution Sociale could find nothing better than to take up the second slogan put in circulation by the European police and to denounce the Council's authoritarianism.

What, then, were the facts on which this childish rubbish rested? The General Council had let the Alliance die a natural death and,

* Here is the national composition of the Council: 20 Englishmen, 15 French, 7 Germans (of whom five are foundation members of the International), 2 Swiss, 2 Hungarians, 1 Pole, 1 Belgian, 1 Irishman, 1 Dane and 1 Italian.

¹ A. Léo, La guerre sociale. Discours prononcé au Congrès de la Paix à Lausanne (1871), Neuchâtel, 1871, p. 7.— Ed.
in accord with the Geneva Federal Committee, had prevented it from being resurrected. Moreover, it had suggested to the Chaux-de-Fonds Committee to take a name which would permit it to live in peace with the great majority of International members in Romance Switzerland.76

Apart from these "authoritarian" acts, what use did the General Council make, between October 1869 and October 1871, of the fairly extensive powers that the Basle Congress had conferred upon it?

1) On February 8, 1870, the Paris "Society of Positivist Proletarians" applied to the General Council for admission. The Council replied that the principles of the positivists, the part of the society's special rules concerning capital, were in flagrant contradiction with the preamble of the General Rules; that the society had therefore to drop them and join the International not as "positivists" but as "proletarians", while remaining free to reconcile their theoretical ideas with the Association's general principles. Realising the justness of this decision, the section joined the International.

2) At Lyons, there was a split between the 1865 section and a recently-formed section in which, amidst honest workers, the Alliance was represented by Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc. As had been done in similar cases, the judgment of a court of arbitration, formed in Switzerland, was turned down. On February 15, 1870, the recently-formed section, besides requesting the General Council to resolve the conflict by virtue of Resolution VII of the Basle Congress, sent it a ready-made resolution excluding and branding the members of the 1865 section, which was to be signed and sent back by return mail. The Council condemned this unprecedented procedure and demanded that the evidence be produced. In reply to the same request, the 1865 section said that the accusatory documents against Albert Richard, which had been submitted to the court of arbitration, had been seized by Bakunin, who refused to give them up. Consequently, it could not completely satisfy the desires of the General Council. The Council's decision on the affair, dated March 8, met with no objection from either side.77

3) The French branch in London, which had admitted people of a more than dubious character, had been gradually transformed into a sleeping partners concern run by Mr. Félix Pyat. He used it to organise damaging demonstrations calling for the assassination of Louis Bonaparte, etc., and to spread his absurd manifestos in France under cover of the International. The
General Council confined itself to declaring in the Association's organs that Mr. Pyat was not a member of the International and it could not be responsible for his actions. The French branch then declared that it no longer recognised either the General Council or the Congresses; it plastered the walls of London with bills proclaiming that with the exception of itself the International was an anti-revolutionary society. The arrest of French members of the International on the eve of the plebiscite, on the pretext of a conspiracy, plotted in reality by the police and to which Pyat's manifestos gave an air of credibility, forced the General Council to publish in the Marseillaise and Réveil its resolution of May 10, 1870, declaring that the so-called French branch had not belonged to the International for over two years, and that its agitation was the work of police agents. The need for this démarche was proved by the declaration of the Paris Federal Committee, published in the same newspapers, and by that of the Paris members of the International during their trial, both declarations referring to the Council's resolution. The French branch disappeared at the outbreak of the war, but like the Alliance in Switzerland, it was to reappear in London with new allies and under other names.

During the last days of the Conference, a "French Section of 1871", about 35 members strong, was formed in London among the Commune refugees. The first "authoritarian" act of the General Council was to publicly denounce the secretary of this section, Gustave Durand, as a French police spy. The documents in our possession prove the intention of the police to assist Durand, firstly, to attend the Conference and then to secure for him membership in the General Council. Since the rules of the new section directed its members not to "accept any delegation to the General Council other than that of their section", Citizens Theisz and Bastelica withdrew from the Council.

On October 17, the section delegated to the Council two of its members, holding imperative mandates; one was none other than Mr. Chautard, ex-member of the artillery committee. The Council refused to admit them prior to an examination of the rules of the
“1871 section”. Suffice it to recall here the principal points of the debate to which these rules gave rise. Article 2 states:

“In order to be admitted as member of the section, a person must justify his means of existence, present guarantees of morality, etc.”

In its resolution of October 17, 1871,² the Council proposed deleting the words “justify his means of existence”.

“In dubious cases,” said the Council, “a section may well take information about means of existence as ‘guarantee of morality’, while in other cases, like those of the refugees, workers on strike, etc., absence of means of existence may well be a guarantee of morality. But to ask candidates to justify their means of existence as a general condition to be admitted to the International, would be a bourgeois innovation contrary to the spirit and letter of the General Rules.” The section replied:

“The General Rules make the sections responsible for the morality of their members and, as a consequence, recognise the right of sections to demand the guarantees they think necessary.”

To this the General Council replied, November 7ᵇ:

“On this argument, a section of the International founded by teetotallers (société de tempérance) could include in its own rules this type of article: To be admitted as member of the section, a person must swear to abstain from all alcoholic drinks. In a word, the most absurd and most incongruous conditions of admittance into the International could be imposed by sections’ rules, always on the pretext that they intend, in this way, to be assured of the morality of their members... ‘The means of existence of strikers,’ adds the French Section of 1871, ‘consist of the strike fund.’ This might be answered by saying, first, that this fund is often fictitious... Moreover, official English questionnaires have proved that the majority of English workers... is forced—by strikes or unemployment, by insufficient wages or terms of payment, as well as many other causes—to resort incessantly to pawnshops or to borrowing. These are means of existence about which one cannot demand information without interfering in an unqualified manner in a

* A little later, this Chautard whom they had wanted to put on the General Council was expelled from his section as an agent of Thiers’ police. He was accused by the same people who had judged him worthy among all others of representing them on the General Council.

---

¹ See this volume, pp. 24-27.— Ed.
² Cf. ibid., pp. 37-42.— Ed.
person's private life. There are thus two alternatives: either the section is only to seek guarantees of morality through means of existence, in which case the General Council's proposal serves the purpose... Or the section, in Article 2 of its rules, intentionally says that the members have to provide information as to their means of existence as a condition of admission, over and above the guarantees of morality, in which case the Council affirms that it is a bourgeois innovation, contrary to the letter and spirit of the General Rules."

Article 11 of their rules states:

"One or several delegates shall be sent to the General Council."

The Council asked for this article to be deleted "because the International's General Rules do not recognise any right of the sections to send delegates to the General Council". "The General Rules," it added, "recognise only two ways of election for General Council members: either their election by the Congress, or their co-option by the General Council..."

It is quite true that the different sections existing in London had been invited to send delegates to the General Council which, so as not to violate the General Rules, has always proceeded in the following manner: it has first determined the number of delegates to be sent by each section, reserving itself the right to accept or refuse them depending on whether it considered them able to fulfil the general functions assigned to them. These delegates became members of the General Council not by virtue of their nomination by their sections, but by virtue of the right that the Rules accord the Council to co-opt new members. Having operated up to the decision taken by the last Conference both as the International Association's General Council and as the Central Council for England, the London Council thought it expedient to admit, besides the members that it co-opted directly, also members nominated initially by their respective sections. It would be a serious mistake to identify the General Council's electoral procedure with that of the Paris Federal Council which was not even a national Council nominated by a national Congress like, for example, the Brussels Federal Council or that of Madrid. The Paris Federal Council was only a delegation of the Paris sections... The General Council's electoral procedure is defined in the General Rules ... and its members would not accept any other imperative mandate than that of the Rules and General Regulations... If we take into consideration the article that precedes it, Article 11 means nothing else but a complete change of the
General Council’s composition, turning it, contrary to Article 3 of the General Rules, into a delegation of the London sections, in which the influence of local groups would be substituted for that of the whole International Working Men’s Association. Lastly, the General Council, whose first duty is to carry out the Congress resolutions (see Article 1 of the Geneva Congress’s Administrative Regulations), said that it “considers that the ideas expressed by the ‘French Section of 1871’ about a radical change to be made in the articles of the General Rules concerning the constitution of the General Council have no bearing on the question...”

Moreover, the Council declared that it would admit two delegates from the section on the same conditions as those of the other London sections.

The “1871 section”, far from being satisfied with this reply, published on December 14 a “declaration”\(^a\) signed by all its members, including the new secretary who was shortly expelled as a scoundrel from the refugee society. According to this declaration, the General Council, by refusing to usurp the legislative functions, was accused of “a gross distortion of the social idea”.

Here are some samples of the good faith displayed in the drawing up of this document.

The London Conference approved the conduct of the German workers during the war.\(^79\) It was apparent that this resolution, proposed by a Swiss delegate,\(^b\) seconded by a Belgian delegate\(^c\) and approved unanimously, only referred to the German members of the International who paid and are still paying for their anti-chauvinist behaviour during the war by imprisonment. Furthermore, in order to avoid any possible misinterpretation, the Secretary of the General Council for France had just explained the true sense of the resolution in a letter published by the journals *Qui Vive!*\(^d\), *Constitution, Radical, Émancipation, Europe,*\(^e\) etc. Nonetheless, eight days later, on November 20, 1871, fifteen members of the French Section of 1871 inserted in *Qui Vive!* a “protest” full of abuse against the German workers and denounc-
ing the Conference resolution as irrefutable proof of the General Council's "pan-Germanic idea". On the other hand, the entire feudal, liberal and police press of Germany seized avidly upon this incident to demonstrate to the German workers how their international dreams had come to naught. In the end the November 20 protest was endorsed by the entire 1871 section in its December 14 declaration.

To show "the dangerous slope of authoritarianism down which the General Council was slipping" the declaration cited "the publication by the very same General Council of an official edition of the General Rules as revised by it".

One glance at the new edition of the Rules is enough to see that each new article has, in the appendix, reference to the original sources establishing its authenticity. As for the words "official edition", the first Congress of the International decided that "the official and obligatory text of the Rules and Regulations would be published by the General Council" (see Congrès ouvrier de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs, tenu à Genève du 3 au 8 septembre 1866, page 27, note).

Naturally enough, the 1871 section was in continuous contact with the dissidents of Geneva and Neuchâtel. One Chalain, a member who had shown more energy in attacking the General Council than he had ever shown in defending the Commune, was unexpectedly rehabilitated by B. Malon, who quite recently levelled very grave charges against him in a letter to a Council member. The French Section of 1871, however, had scarcely launched its declaration when civil war exploded in its ranks. First Theisz, Avrial and Camélinat withdrew. Thereafter the section broke up into several small groups, one of which was led by Mr. Pierre Vésinier, expelled from the General Council for his slander against Varlin and others, and then cast out of the International by the Belgian Commission appointed by the Brussels Congress of 1868. Another of these groups was founded by B. Landeck who had been relieved by the sudden flight of police prefect Piétri, on September 4, of his obligation,

"scrupulously fulfilled, not to engage any more in political affairs, nor in the International in France!" (see Troisième procès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs de Paris, 1870, p. 4).

On the other hand, the mass of French refugees in London have formed a section which is in complete harmony with the General Council.

---

\[\text{a See this volume, pp. 3-20. — Ed.}\]
The men of the Alliance, hidden behind the Neuchâtel Federal Committee and determined to make another effort on a vaster scale to disorganise the International, convened a Congress of their sections at Sonvillier on November 12, 1871.—Back in July two letters from maître Guillaume to his friend Robin had threatened the General Council with the same kind of campaign if it did not agree to recognise them to be in the right “vis-à-vis the Geneva bandits”.

The Sonvillier Congress was composed of sixteen delegates claiming to represent nine sections in all, including the new “Section of Propaganda and Revolutionary Socialist Action” of Geneva.

The Sixteen made their début by publishing the anarchist decree declaring the Romance Federation dissolved, and the latter hastened to restore to the Alliance members their “autonomy” by driving them out of all sections. However, the Council has to recognise that a stroke of good sense brought them to accept the name of the Jura Federation that the London Conference had given them.

The Congress of Sixteen then proceeded to “reorganise the International” by attacking the Conference and the General Council in a circular to all federations of the International Working Men’s Association.

The authors of the circular accuse the General Council first of all of having called in 1871 a Conference instead of a Congress. The preceding explanations show that these attacks were made directly against the International as a whole, which had unanimously agreed to convene a Conference at which, incidentally, the Alliance was properly represented by Citizens Robin and Bastelica.

The General Council has had its delegates at every Congress; at the Basle Congress, for example, it had six. The Sixteen claim that

“the majority of the Conference was fraudulently assured in advance by the admission of six General Council delegates with deciding vote”.

In actual fact, among the General Council delegates at the Conference, the French refugees were none other than the representatives of the Paris Commune, while its English and Swiss members could only take part in the sessions on rare occasions, as is attested to by the Minutes which will be submitted before the next Congress. One Council delegate had a mandate from a
national federation. According to a letter addressed to the Conference, the mandate of another was withheld because of the news of his death in the papers. That left one delegate. Thus, the Belgians alone outnumbered the Council by 6 to 1.

The international police, who in the person of Gustave Durand were kept out, complained bitterly about the violation of the General Rules by the convening of a “secret” conference. They were not conversant enough with our General Regulations to know that the administrative sittings of the Congresses have to be in private.

Their complaints, nonetheless, found a sympathetic echo with the Sonviller Sixteen who cried out:

“And on top of it all, a decision of this Conference declares that the General Council will itself fix the time and place of the next Congress or of the Conference to replace it; thus, we are threatened with the suppression of the General Congresses, these great public sessions of the International.”

The Sixteen refused to see that this decision had no other purpose but to show to the various governments that, despite all the repressive measures, the International was firmly resolved to hold its general meetings one way or another.

At the general assembly of the Geneva sections, held on December 2, 1871, which gave a bad reception to Citizens Malon and Lefrançais, the latter put forward a proposal confirming the decrees passed by the Sonviller Sixteen and censuring the General Council, as well as disavowing the Conference. The Conference had resolved that “the Conference resolutions not intended for publicity will be communicated to the Federal Councils of the various countries by the corresponding secretaries of the General Council”. This resolution, which was in complete conformity with the General Rules and Regulations, was fraudulently revised by B. Malon and his friends to read as follows:

“Some Conference resolutions shall be communicated only to the Federal Councils and to the corresponding secretaries.”

They further accused the General Council of having “violated the principle of sincerity” in refusing to hand over to the police, by means of “publicity”, the resolutions which were aimed exclusively at reorganising the International in the countries where it is proscribed.

Citizens Malon and Lefrançais complain further that

---

a A. Herman held a mandate of the Liège sections (Belgium).—Ed.
b This refers to Marx.—Ed.
"the Conference had aimed a blow at freedom of thought and its expression ... in conferring upon the General Council the right to denounce and disavow any publicity organ of the sections and federations that discussed either the principles on which the Association rests, or the respective interests of the sections and federations, or finally the general interests of the Association as a whole (see the Égalité of October 21)".

What, then, had the Égalité of October 21 published? It had published a resolution in which the Conference "gives warning that henceforth the General Council will be bound to publicly denounce and disavow all newspapers calling themselves organs of the International which, following the example of the Progrès and the Solidarité, should discuss in their columns, before the middle-class public, questions exclusively reserved for the local or Federal Committees and the General Council, or for the private and administrative sittings of the Federal or General Congresses".ᵃ

To appreciate properly the sour-sweet lamentation of B. Malon we must bear in mind that this resolution puts an end once and for all to the attempts of some journalists who wished to substitute themselves for the responsible committees of the International and to play therein the role that the journalists' Bohemia is playing in the bourgeois world. As a result of one such attempt the Geneva Federal Committee had seen some members of the Alliance edit the Égalité, the official organ of the Romance Federation, in a manner completely hostile to the latter.

Incidentally, the General Council had no need of the London Conference to "publicly denounce and disavow" the improper use of the press, for the Basle Congress had decided (Resolution II) that:

"All newspapers containing attacks on the Association must be immediately sent by the sections to the General Council."ᵇ

"It is evident," says the Romance Federal Committee in its December 20, 1871 declaration (Égalité, December 24) "that this article was adopted not in order that the General Council might keep in its files newspapers which attack the Association, but to enable it to reply, and to nullify in case of need, the pernicious effect of slander and malevolent denigrations. It is also evident that this article refers in general to all newspapers, and that if we do not want to leave the attacks of the bourgeois papers without retaliation, it is all the more necessary to disavow, through our main representative body, i.e., the General Council, those newspapers whose attacks against us are made under cover of the name of our Association."

Let us note, in passing, that The Times, that Leviathan of the capitalist press, the Progrès (of Lyons), a publication of the liberal

---
b Compte-rendu du IVᵉ Congrès international, tenu à Bâle, en septembre 1869, Brussels, 1869, p. 172.— Ed.
bourgeoisie, and the *Journal de Genève*, an ultra-reactionary paper, have brought the same charges against the Conference and used virtually the same terms as Citizens Malon and Lefrançais.

After having challenged the convocation of the Conference and, later, its composition and its allegedly secret character, the Sixteen’s circular challenged even the Conference resolutions.

Stating first that the Basle Congress had surrendered its rights

> “having authorised the General Council to grant or refuse admission to, or to suspend, the sections of the International”,

it accuses the Conference, farther on, of the following sin:

> “This Conference has ... taken resolutions ... which tend to turn the International, which is a free federation of autonomous sections, into a hierarchical and authoritarian organisation of disciplined sections placed entirely under the control of a General Council which may, at will, refuse their admission or suspend their activity!”

Still farther on, the circular once more takes up the question of the Basle Congress which had allegedly “distorted the nature of the General Council's functions”.

The contradictions contained in the circular of the Sixteen may be summed up as follows: the 1871 Conference is responsible for the resolutions of the 1869 Basle Congress, and the General Council is guilty of having observed the Rules which require it to carry out Congress resolutions.

Actually, however, the real reason for all these attacks against the Conference is of a more profound nature. In the first place, it thwarted, by its resolutions, the intrigues of the *Alliance* men in Switzerland. In the second place, the promoters of the Alliance had, in Italy, Spain and part of Switzerland and Belgium, created and upheld with amazing persistence a calculated confusion between Bakunin's *makeshift programme and the programme of the International Working Men's Association*.

The Conference drew attention to this deliberate misunderstanding in its two resolutions on proletarian policy and sectarian sections. The motivation of the first resolution, which makes short work of the political abstention preached by Bakunin's programme, is given fully in its recitals, which are based on the General Rules, the Lausanne Congress resolution and other precedents.*

* The Conference resolution on the *political action of the working class* reads as follows:

> “Considering the following passage of the original Rules: 'The economical emancipation of the workmen is the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means';
We now pass on to the sectarian sections:
The first phase of the proletariat’s struggle against the bourgeoisie is marked by a sectarian movement. That is logical at a time when the proletariat has not yet developed sufficiently to act as a class. Certain thinkers criticise social antagonisms and suggest fantastic solutions thereof, which the mass of workers is left to accept, preach and put into practice. The sects formed by these initiators are abstentionist by their very nature, i.e., alien to all real action, politics, strikes, coalitions, or, in a word, to any united movement. The mass of the proletariat always remains indifferent or even hostile to their propaganda. The Paris and Lyons workers did not want the Saint-Simonians, the Fourierists, the Icarians, any more than the Chartists and the English trades unionists

"That the Inaugural Address of the International Working Men’s Association (1864) states: ‘The lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies. So far from promoting, they will continue to lay every possible impediment in the way of the emancipation of labour... To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the working classes’;

"That the Congress of Lausanne (1867) has passed this resolution: ‘The social emancipation of the workmen is inseparable from their political emancipation’;

"That the declaration of the General Council relative to the pretended plot of the French Internationals on the eve of the plebiscite (1870) says: ‘Certainly by the tenor of our Rules, all our branches in England, on the Continent, and in America have the special mission not only to serve as centres for the militant organisation of the working class, but also to support, in their respective countries, every political movement tending towards the accomplishment of our ultimate end—the economical emancipation of the working class’;

"That inaccurate translations of the original Rules have given rise to false interpretations which have been harmful to the development and action of the International Working Men’s Association;

"In presence of an unbridled reaction which violently crushes every effort at emancipation on the part of the working men, and pretends to maintain by brute force the distinction of classes and the political domination of the propertied classes resulting from it;

"Considering, besides,

"That against this collective power of the propertied classes the working class cannot act, as a class, except by constituting itself into a political party, distinct from, and opposed to, all old parties formed by the propertied classes;

"That this constitution of the working class into a political party is indispensable in order to ensure the triumph of the Social Revolution and its ultimate end—the abolition of classes;

"That the combination of forces which the working class has already effected by its economical struggles ought at the same time to serve as a lever for its struggles against the political power of its exploiters.

"The Conference recalls to the members of the International:

"That in the militant state of the working class, its economical movement and its political action are indissolubly united."
wanted the Owenists. These sects act as levers of the movement in the beginning, but become an obstruction as soon as the movement outgrows them; after which they become reactionary. Witness the sects in France and England, and lately the Lassalleans in Germany who, after having hindered the proletariat's organisation for several years, ended by becoming simple instruments of the police. To sum up, we have here the infancy of the proletarian movement, just as astrology and alchemy are the infancy of science. If the International were to be founded it was necessary that the proletariat would go through this phase.

Contrary to the sectarian organisations with their vagaries and rivalries, the International is a genuine and militant organisation of the proletarian class of all countries united in their common struggle against the capitalists and the landowners, against their class power organised in the state. The International's Rules, therefore, speak of only simple "working men's societies", all following the same goal and accepting the same programme, which presents a general outline of the proletarian movement, while leaving its theoretical elaboration to be guided by the needs of the practical struggle and the exchange of ideas in the sections, unrestrictedly admitting all shades of socialist convictions in their organs and Congresses.

Just as in every new historical phase old mistakes reappear momentarily only to disappear forthwith, so within the International there followed a resurrection of sectarian sections, though in a less obvious form.

The Alliance, while considering the resurrection of the sects a great step forward, is in itself conclusive proof that their time is over: for, if initially they contained elements of progress, the programme of the Alliance, in tow of a "Mohammed without the Koran", is nothing but a heap of pompously worded ideas long since dead and capable only of frightening bourgeois idiots or serving as evidence to be used by the Bonapartist or other prosecutors against members of the International.*

The Conference, at which all shades of socialism were represented, unanimously acclaimed the resolution against sectarian sections, fully convinced that this resolution, bringing the Interna-

* Recent police publications on the International, including the Jules Favre circular to foreign powers and the report of Sacase, a deputy in the Rural Assembly, on the Du Faure project, are full of quotations from the Alliance's pompous manifestos. The phraseology of these sectarians, whose radicalism is wholly restricted to verbiage, is extremely useful for promoting the aims of the reactionaries.
tional back to its true ground, would mark a new stage of its development. The Alliance supporters, whom this resolution dealt a fatal blow, construed it only as the General Council’s victory over the International, through which, as their circular pointed out, the General Council assured “the domination of the special programme” of some of its members, “their personal doctrine”, “the orthodox doctrine”, “the official theory, and the sole permissible within the Association”. Incidentally, this was not the fault of those few members, but the necessary consequence, “the corrupting effect”, of the fact that they were members of the General Council, for

“It is absolutely impossible for a person who has power” (1) “over his fellows to remain a moral person. The General Council is becoming a hotbed of intrigue”.

According to the opinion of the Sixteen, the General Rules of the International should be censured for the grave mistake of authorising the General Council to co-opt new members. Thus authorised, they claim,

“the Council could, whenever it saw fit, co-opt a group numerous enough to completely change the nature of its majority and its tendencies”.

They seem to think that the mere fact of belonging to the General Council is sufficient to destroy not only a person’s morality, but also his common sense. How else can we suppose that a majority will transform itself into a minority by voluntary co-options?

At any rate, the Sixteen themselves do not appear to be very sure of all this, for they complain further on that the General Council has been

“composed for five years running of the same persons, continually re-elected”,

and immediately afterwards they repeat:

“most of them are not regular mandatories, not having been elected by a Congress”.

The fact is that the body of the General Council is constantly changing, though some of the founding members remain, as in the Belgian, Romance, etc., Federal Councils.

The General Council must fulfil three essential conditions, if it is to carry out its mandate. In the first place, it must have a numerically adequate membership to carry on its diverse functions; secondly, a membership of “working men belonging to the different nations represented in the International Association”; and, lastly, workers must be the predominant element therein. Since the exigencies of the worker’s job incessantly cause changes
in the membership of the General Council, how can it fulfil all these indispensable conditions without the right of co-option? The Council nonetheless considers a more precise definition of this right necessary, as it indicated at the recent Conference.

The re-election of the General Council's original membership, at successive Congresses, at which England was definitely under-represented, would seem to prove that it has done its duty within the limits of the means at its disposal. The Sixteen, on the contrary, view this only as a proof of the "blind confidence of the Congresses" carried at Basle to the point of

"a sort of voluntary abdication in favour of the General Council".

In their opinion, the Council's "normal role" should be "that of a simple correspondence and statistical bureau". They justify this definition by adducing several articles extracted from an incorrect translation of the Rules.

Contrary to the rules of all bourgeois societies, the International's General Rules touch only lightly on its administrative organisation. They leave its development to practice, and its regularisation to future Congresses. Nevertheless, inasmuch as only the unity and joint action of the sections of the various countries could give them a genuinely international character, the Rules pay more attention to the General Council than to the other bodies of the organisation.

Article 5 of the original Rules states:

"The General Council shall form an international agency between the different national and local groups,

and proceeds to give some examples of the manner in which it is to function. Among these examples is a request to the Council to see that

"when immediate practical steps should be needed, as, for instance, in case of international quarrels, the action of the associated societies be simultaneous and uniform".

The article continues:

"Whenever it seems opportune, the General Council shall take the initiative of proposals to be laid before the different national or local societies."

In addition, the Rules define the Council's role in convening and arranging Congresses, and charge it with the preparation of certain reports to be submitted thereto. In the original Rules so little distinction is made between the spontaneous action of various

---

a Here and further on the authors quote from the Rules of the International Working Men's Association (present edition, Vol. 20, p. 443).— Ed.
groups and unity of action of the Association as a whole, that Article 6 states:

"Since the success of the working men's movement in each country cannot be secured but by the power of union and combination, while, on the other hand, the activity of the General Council will be more effective ... the members of the International Association shall use their utmost efforts to combine the disconnected working men's societies of their respective countries into national bodies, represented by central organs."

The first administrative resolution of the Geneva Congress (Article I) says:

"The General Council is commissioned to carry the resolutions of the Congress into effect."a

This resolution legalised the position that the General Council has held ever since its origin: that of the Association's executive delegation. It would be difficult to carry out orders without enjoying moral "authority" in the absence of any other "freely recognised authority". The Geneva Congress at the same time charged the General Council with publishing "the official and obligatory text of the Rules".

The same Congress resolved (Administrative Resolution of Geneva, Article 14):

"Every section has the right to draw up its own rules and regulations adapted to local conditions and to the laws of its own country, but they must not contain anything contrary to the General Rules and Regulations" [p. 27].

Let us note, first of all, that there is not the least allusion either to any special declarations of principles, or to any special tasks which this or that section should set itself apart from the common goal pursued by all the groups of the International. The issue simply concerns the right of sections to adapt the General Rules and Regulations "to local conditions and to the laws of their country".

In the second place, who is to establish whether or not the local rules conform to the General Rules? Evidently, if there would be no "authority" charged with this function, the resolution would be null and void. Not only could police or hostile sections be formed, but also the intrusion of declassed sectarians and bourgeois philanthropists into the Association could warp its character and, by force of numbers at Congresses, crush the workers.

a Congrès ouvrier de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs, tenu à Genève du 3 au 8 septembre 1866, Geneva, 1866, p. 26.— Ed.
Since their origin, the national and local federations have exercised in their respective countries the right to admit or reject new sections, according to whether or not their rules conformed to the General Rules. The exercise of the same function by the General Council is provided for in Article 6 of the General Rules, which allows local independent societies, i.e., societies formed outside the federal body in the country concerned, the right to establish direct contacts with the General Council. The Alliance did not hesitate to exercise this right in order to fulfil the conditions set for the admission of delegates to the Basle Congress.

Article 6 of the Rules deals further with legal obstacles to the formation of national federations in certain countries where, consequently, the General Council is asked to function as a Federal Council (see Procès-verbaux du Congrès, etc., de Lausanne, 1867, p. 13a).

Since the fall of the Commune, these legal obstacles have been multiplying in the various countries, making action by the General Council therein, designed to keep doubtful elements out of the Association, more necessary than ever. Thus, for instance, the French committees recently demanded the General Council's intervention to rid themselves of informers, and why, in another great country, members of the International requested it not to recognise any section which has not been formed by its direct mandatory or by themselves. Their request was motivated by the necessity of ridding themselves of agents-provocateurs, whose burning zeal manifested itself in the rapid formation of sections of unparalleled radicalism. On the other hand, the so-called anti-authoritarian sections do not hesitate to appeal to the Council the moment a conflict arises in the midst, nor even to ask it to deal severely with their adversaries, as in the case of the Lyons conflict. More recently, since the Conference, the Turin Working Men's Federation decided to declare itself a section of the International. As the result of the split that followed, the minority formed a society called "Emancipation of the Proletarian". It joined the International and began by passing a resolution in favour of the Jura people. Its newspaper, *Il Proletario*, is filled with outbursts against all authoritarianism. When sending in the society's subscriptions,

---


b Austria.— Ed.
the secretary\textsuperscript{a} warned the General Council that the old federation would probably also send its subscriptions. Then he continues:

"As you will have read in the \textit{Proletario}, the \textit{Emancipation of the Proletarian society}... has declared... its rejection of all solidarity with the bourgeoisie, who, under the mask of workers, are organising the \textit{Working Men's Federation},"

and begs the Council to

"communicate this resolution to all sections and to refuse the 10 centimes in subscriptions in the event of their being sent".\textsuperscript{*}

Like all the International's groups, the General Council is required to carry on propaganda. This it has accomplished through its manifestos and its agents, who laid the basis for the first organisations of the International in North America, in Germany and in many French towns.

Another function of the General Council is to aid strikers and organise their support by the entire International (see General Council reports to the various Congresses). The following fact, \textit{inter alia}, indicates the importance of its intervention in the strike movement. The Resistance Society of the English Foundrymen is in itself an international Trades Union with branches in other countries, notably in the United States. Nonetheless, during a strike of American foundrymen, the latter found it necessary to invoke the intercession of the General Council to prevent English foundrymen being brought into America.\textsuperscript{84}

The growth of the International obliged the General Council and all Federal Councils to assume the role of arbiter.

The Brussels Congress resolved that:

"The Federal Councils shall transmit to the General Council every three months a report on the \textit{administration} and \textit{financial state} of their respective branches" (Administrative Resolution No. 3\textsuperscript{b}).

Lastly, the Basle Congress, which provokes the bilious wrath of the Sixteen, occupied itself solely with regulating the administra-

\textsuperscript{*} At this time these were the \textit{apparent} ideas of the Emancipation of the Proletarian society, represented by its corresponding secretary, a friend of Bakunin. Actually, however, this section's tendencies were quite different. After expelling this double-dealing traitor for embezzlement and for his friendly relations with the Turin police chief, the society set forth its explanations, which cleared up all misunderstanding between it and the General Council.

\textsuperscript{a} Carlo Terzaghi.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} \textit{Troisième Congrès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Compte-rendu officiel}, Brussels, September 1868. Supplement to the journal \textit{Le Peuple Belge}, p. 50.—\textit{Ed.}
tive relations engendered by the Association's continuing development. If it extended unduly the limits of the General Council's powers, whose fault was it if not that of Bakunin, Schweitzguébel, F. Robert, Guillaume and other delegates of the Alliance, who were so anxious to achieve just that? Or will they accuse themselves of "blind confidence" in the London General Council?

Here are two resolutions of the Basle Congress:

"No. IV. Each new section or society which is formed and wishes to be part of the International, must immediately announce its adhesion to the General Council",

and "No. V. The General Council has the right to admit or reject the affiliation of any new society or group, subject to appeal at the next Congress."

As for local independent societies formed outside the federal body, these articles only confirm the practice observed since the International's origin, the maintaining of which is a matter of life or death for the Association. But extending this practice and applying it indiscriminately to every section or society in the process of formation is going too far. These articles do authorise the General Council to intervene in the internal affairs of the federations; but they have never been applied in this sense by the General Council. It defies the Sixteen to cite a single case where it has intervened in the affairs of new sections desirous of affiliating themselves with existing groups or federations.

The resolutions cited above refer to sections in the process of formation, while the resolutions given below refer to sections already recognised:

"VI. The General Council has equally the right to suspend until the next Congress any section of the International."

"VII. When conflicts arise between the societies or branches of a national group, or between groups of different nationalities, the General Council shall have the right to decide the conflict, subject to appeal at the next Congress which will decide definitely."

These two articles are necessary for extreme cases, although up to the present the General Council has never had recourse to them. The review presented above shows that the Council has never suspended any section and, in cases of conflict, has only acted as arbiter at the request of the two parties.

We arrive, at last, at a function imposed on the General Council by the needs of the struggle. However shocking this may be for supporters of the Alliance, it is the very persistence of the attacks

---

a *Compte-rendu du IVe Congrès international, tenu à Bâle, en septembre 1869, Brussels, 1869, p. 172.— Ed.*
to which the General Council is subjected by all the enemies of the proletarian movement that has placed it in the vanguard of the defenders of the International Working Men’s Association.

V

Having dealt with the International such as it is, the Sixteen proceed to tell us what it should be.

Firstly, the General Council should be nominally a simple correspondence and statistical bureau. Once it has been relieved of its administrative functions, its correspondence would be concerned only with reproducing the information already published in the Association’s newspapers. The correspondence bureau would thus become needless. As for statistics, that function is possible only if a strong organisation, and especially, as the original Rules expressly say, a common direction are provided. Since all that smacks very much of “authoritarianism”, however, there might perhaps be a bureau, but certainly no statistics. In a word, the General Council would disappear. The Federal Councils, the local committees and other “authoritarian” centres would go by the same token. Only the autonomous sections would remain.

What, one may ask, will be the purpose of these “autonomous sections”, freely federated and happily rid of all superior bodies, “even of the superior body elected and constituted by the workers”?

Here it becomes necessary to supplement the circular by the report of the Jura Federal Committee submitted to the Congress of the Sixteen.

“In order to make the working class the real representative of humanity’s new interests”, its organisation must be “guided by the idea that will triumph. To evolve this idea from the needs of our epoch, from mankind’s vital aspirations, by a consistent study of the phenomena of social life, to then carry this idea to our workers’ organisations,—such should be our aim, etc.” Lastly, there must be created “amidst our working population a real revolutionary socialist school”.

Thus, the autonomous workers’ sections are in a trice converted into schools, of which these gentlemen of the Alliance will be the masters. They evolve the idea by “consistent studies” which leave no trace behind. They then “carry this idea to our workers’ organisations”. To them, the working class is so much raw material, a chaos into which they must breathe their Holy Spirit before it acquires a shape.
All of which is but a paraphrase of the old Alliance programme beginning with these words:

“The socialist minority of the League of Peace and Freedom, having broken away from this League”, proposes to found “a new Alliance of Socialist Democracy... adopting as its special mission the study of political and philosophical questions...”

This is the idea that is being “evolved” therefrom!

“Such an enterprise... would provide sincere socialist democrats of Europe and America with the means of being understood and of affirming their ideas.”*

That is how, on its own admission, the minority of a bourgeois society slipped into the International shortly before the Basle Congress with the exclusive aim of utilising it as a means for posing before the working masses as a hierarchy of a secret science that may be expounded in four phrases and whose culminating point is “the economic and social equality of the classes”.

Apart from this “theoretical mission”, the new organisation proposed for the International also has its practical aspect.

“The future society,” says the circular of the Sixteen, “should be nothing but a universalisation of the organisation which the International will establish for itself. We must therefore try to bring this organisation as close as possible to our ideal.”

“How could one expect an egalitarian and free society to grow out of an authoritarian organisation? That is impossible. The International, embryo of the future human society, must henceforth be the faithful image of our principles of liberty and federation.”

In other words, just as the medieval convents presented an image of celestial life, so the International must be the image of the New Jerusalem, whose “embryo” the Alliance bears in its womb. The Paris Communards would not have failed if they had understood that the Commune was “the embryo of the future human society” and had cast away all discipline and all arms, that is, the things which must disappear when there are no more wars!

Bakunin, however, the better to establish that despite their “consistent studies” the Sixteen did not hatch this pretty project of

* The gentlemen of the Alliance, who continue to reproach the General Council for calling a private Conference at a time when the convocation of an open Congress would be the height of treachery or folly, these absolute proponents of clamour and publicity organised within the International, in contempt of our Rules, a real secret society directed against the International itself with the aim of bringing its sections, unbeknown to them, under the sacerdotal direction of Bakunin.

The General Council intends to demand at the next Congress an investigation of this secret organisation and its promoters in certain countries, such as Spain, for example.
disorganisation and disarmament in the International when it was fighting for its existence, has just published the original text of that project in his report on the International’s organisation (see *Almanach du Peuple pour 1872*, Geneva).”

VI

Now turn to the report presented by the Jura Committee at the Congress of the Sixteen.

“A perusal of the report,” says their official organ, *Révolution Sociale* (November 16), “will give the exact measure of the devotion and practical intelligence that we can expect from the Jura Federation members.”

It begins by attributing to “these terrible events”—the Franco-Prussian war and the Civil War in France—a “somewhat demoralising” influence ... “on the situation within the International’s sections”.

If, in fact, the Franco-Prussian war could not but lead to the disorganisation of the sections because it drew great numbers of workers into the two armies, it is no less true that the fall of the empire and Bismarck’s open proclamation of a war of conquest provoked in Germany and England a violent struggle between the bourgeoisie, which sided with the Prussians, and the proletariat, which more than ever demonstrated its international sentiments. This alone should have been sufficient for the International to have gained ground in both countries. In America, the same fact produced a split in the vast German proletarian émigré group; the internationalist party definitely dissociating itself from the chauvinist party.

On the other hand, the advent of the Paris Commune gave an unprecedented boost to the expansion of the International and to a vigorous support of its principles by sections of all nationalities, except the Jura sections, whose report continues thus: “The beginning of the gigantic struggle ... has caused people to think... Some go away to hide their weakness... For many this situation” (within their ranks) “is a sign of decrepitude”, but “on the contrary ... this situation is capable of transforming the International completely” according to their own pattern. This modest wish will be

---


*b* “Le Congrès de Sonvillier”, *La Révolution Sociale*, No. 4, November 16, 1871.—*Ed.*
understood after a deeper examination of so propitious a situation.

Leaving aside the dissolved Alliance, replaced since by the Malon section, the Committee had to report on the situation in twenty sections. Among them, seven simply turned their backs on the Alliance; this is what the report has to say about it:

"The section of box-makers and that of engravers and guillocheurs of Bienne have never replied to any of the communications that we sent them.
"The sections of Neuchâtel craftsmen, i.e., joiners, box-makers, engravers and guillocheurs, have made no reply to letters from the Federal Committee.
"We have not been able to obtain any news of the Val-de-Ruz section.
"The section of engravers and guillocheurs of Locle has given no reply to letters from the Federal Committee."

That is what is described as free intercourse between the autonomous sections and their Federal Committee.

Another section, that

"of engravers and guillocheurs of the Courtelary district after three years of stubborn perseverance ... at the present time ... is forming a resistance society"

independent of the International, which does not in the least deter them from sending two delegates to the Congress of the Sixteen.

Next come four completely defunct sections:

"The central section of Bienne has currently been dissolved; one of its devoted members wrote to us recently, however, saying that all hope of seeing the rebirth of the International at Bienne is not lost.
"The Saint-Blaise section has been dissolved.
"The Catébat section, after a brilliant existence, has had to yield to the intrigues woven by the masters" (!) "of this district in order to dissolve this valiant" (!) "section.
"Lastly, the Corgémont section also has fallen victim of intrigues on the part of the employers."

The central section of Courtelary district follows, which

"took the wise step of suspending its activity",

which did not deter it from sending two delegates to the Congress of the Sixteen.

Now we come to four sections whose existence is more than problematical.

"The Grange section has been reduced to a small nucleus of socialist workers... Their local action is paralysed by their numerically modest membership.
"The central section of Neuchâtel has suffered considerably from the events, and would have inevitably disbanded if it were not for the dedication and activity of some of its members.
"The central section of Locle, hovering between life and death for some months, ended up by being dissolved. It has been reconstituted quite recently, however",
evidently for the sole purpose of sending two delegates to the Congress of the Sixteen.

"The Chaux-de-Fonds section of socialist propaganda is in a critical situation... Its position, far from getting better, tends rather to deteriorate."

Next come two sections, the study-circles of Saint-Imier and of Sonvillier, which are only mentioned in passing, without so much as a word about their circumstances.

There remains the model section, which, to judge by its name of central section, is nothing but the residue of other defunct sections.

"The central section of Moutier is certainly the one that has suffered least... Its Committee has been in constant contact with the Federal Committee... No sections have yet been founded..."

That is easily explained:

"The activity of the Moutier section was especially facilitated by the excellent attitude of a working population... with a traditional life style; we would like to see the working class of this district make itself still more independent of political elements."

One can see, in fact, that this report

"gives the exact measure of the devotion and practical intelligence that we can expect from the Jura Federation members".

They might have rounded it off by adding that the workers of La Chaux-de-Fonds, the original seat of their committee, have always refused to have anything to do with them. Just recently, at the general assembly of January 18, 1872, they replied to the circular of the Sixteen by a unanimous vote confirming the London Conference resolutions, as also the Romance Congress resolution of May 1871:

"To exclude forever from the International Bakunin, Guillaume and their supporters."

Is it necessary to say anything more about the gallantry of this sham Sonvillier Congress which, in its own words, "caused war, open war within the International"?

Certainly these men, who make more noise than their stature warrants, have had an incontestable success. The whole of the liberal and police press has openly taken their side; they have been backed in their personal slander of the General Council and the insipid attacks aimed against the International by ostensible reformers in many lands:—by the bourgeois republicans in England, whose intrigues were exposed by the General Council; by
the dogmatic free-thinkers in Italy, who, under the banner of Stefanoni, have just formed a “Universal Society of Rationalists”, with obligatory seat [headquarters] in Rome, an “authoritarian” and “hierarchical” organisation, monasteries for atheist monks and nuns, whose rules provide for a marble bust in the Congress hall for every bourgeois who donates ten thousand francs; and, lastly, by the Bismarck socialists in Germany, who, apart from their police mouthpiece, the *Neuer Social-Demokrat*, played the role of “white shirts” for the Prusso-German empire.

The Sonvillier conclave requests all sections of the International, in a pathetic appeal, to insist on the urgency of an immediate Congress “to curb the consistent encroachments of the London Council”, according to Citizens Malon and Lefrançais, but actually to replace the International with the Alliance. This appeal received such an encouraging response that they immediately set about falsifying a resolution voted at the last Belgian Congress. Their official organ (*Révolution Sociale*, January 4, 1872) writes as follows:

“Lastly, which is even more important, the Belgian sections met at the Congress of Brussels on December 24 and 25 and voted unanimously for a resolution identical with that of the Sonvillier Congress, on the urgency of convening a General Congress.”

It is important to note that the Belgian Congress voted the very opposite. It charged the Belgian Congress, which was not due to meet until the following June, to draft new General Rules for submission to the *next Congress* of the International.

In accordance with the will of the vast majority of members of the International, the General Council is to convene the annual Congress only in September 1872.

VII

Some weeks after the Conference, Messrs. Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc, the most influential and most ardent members of the *Alliance*, arrived in London. They came to recruit, among the French refugees, aides willing to work for the restoration of the Empire, which, according to them, was the only way to rid themselves of Thiers and to avoid being left destitute. The General Council warned all concerned, including the Brussels Federal Council, of their Bonapartist plots.

In January 1872, they dropped their mask by publishing a pamphlet entitled *L'Empire et la France nouvelle. Appel du*

With the modesty characteristic of the charlatans of the Alliance, they declare the following humbug:

“We who have built up the great army of the French proletariat ... we, the most influential leaders of the International in France,* ... happily, we have not been shot, and we are here to flaunt in their face (to wit: ambitious parliamentarians, smug republicans, sham democrats of all sorts) the banner under which we are fighting, and despite the slander, threats, and all manner of attacks that await us, to hurl at an amazed Europe the cry that comes from the very heart of our conscience and that will soon resound in the hearts of all Frenchmen: *Long live the Emperor!*

“Napoleon III, disgraced and scorned, must be splendidly reinstated”;

and Messrs. Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc, paid out of the secret funds of Invasion III, are specially charged with this restoration.

Incidentally, they confess:

“It is the normal evolution of our ideas that has made us imperialists.”

Here is a confession that should give pleasure to their co-religionists of the Alliance. As in the heyday of the Solidarité, A. Richard and G. Blanc mouth again the old clichés regarding “abstention from politics” which, on the principle of their “normal evolution”, can become a reality only under the most absolute despotism, with the workers abstaining from any meddling in politics, much like the prisoner abstaining from a walk in the sun.

* Under the heading “Au Pilori!”, L'Égalité (of Geneva), February 15, 1872, had this to say:

“The day has not yet come to describe the story of the defeat of the movement for the Commune in the South of France; but what we can announce today, we, most of whom witnessed the deplorable defeat of the Lyons insurrection on April 30,* is that one of the reasons for the insurrection's failure was the cowardice, the treachery and the thievery of G. Blanc, who intruded everywhere carrying out the orders of A. Richard, who kept in the shade.

“By their carefully prepared manoeuvres these rascals intentionally compromised many of those who took part in the preparatory work of the insurrectionary Committees.

“Further, these traitors managed to discredit the International at Lyons to such an extent that by the time of the Paris Revolution the International was regarded by the Lyons workers with the greatest distrust. Hence the total absence of organisation, hence the failure of the insurrection, a failure which was bound to result in the fall of the Commune which was left to rely on its own isolated forces! It is only since this bloody lesson that our propaganda has been able to rally the Lyons workers around the flag of the International.

“Albert Richard was the pet and prophet of Bakunin and company.”
“The time of the revolutionaries,” they say, “is over ... communism is restricted to Germany and England, especially Germany. That, moreover, is where it had been developed in earnest for a long time, to be subsequently spread throughout the International, and this disturbing expansion of German influence in the Association has in no small degree contributed to retarding its development, or rather, to giving it a new course in the sections of central and southern France, whom no German has ever supplied with a slogan.”

Perhaps this is the voice of the great hierophant, who has taken upon himself, ever since the Alliance’s foundation, in his capacity as a Russian, the special task of representing the Latin races? Or do we have here the “true missionaries” of the Révolution Sociale (November 2, 1871) denouncing “the backward march which the German and Bismarckian minds endeavour to foist upon the International”?

Fortunately, however, the true tradition has survived, and Messrs. Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc have not been shot! Thus, their own “contribution” consists in “setting a new course” for the International in central and southern France to follow, by an effort to found Bonapartist sections, ipso facto basically “autonomous”.

As for the constitution of the proletariat as a political party, as recommended by the London Conference,

“after the restoration of the Empire, we”—Richard and Blanc—“shall quickly deal not only with the socialist theories but also with any attempts to implement them through revolutionary organisation of the masses”.

Briefly, exploiting the great “autonomy principle of the sections” which “constitutes the real strength of the International ... especially in the Latin countries (Révolution Sociale, January 4),”

these gentlemen base their hopes on anarchy within the International.

Anarchy, then, is the great war-horse of their master Bakunin, who has taken nothing from the socialist systems except a set of labels. All socialists see anarchy as the following programme: once the aim of the proletarian movement, i.e., abolition of classes, is attained, the power of the State, which serves to keep the great majority of producers in bondage to a very small exploiter minority, disappears, and the functions of government become simple administrative functions. The Alliance reverses the whole process. It proclaims anarchy in proletarian ranks as the most infallible means of breaking the powerful concentration of social

---

a Mikhail Bakunin.—Ed.
and political forces in the hands of the exploiters. Under this pretext, it asks the International, at a time when the old world is seeking a way of crushing it, to replace its organisation with anarchy. The international police want nothing better for perpetuating the Thiers republic, while cloaking it in a royal mantle.*

General Council:


Corresponding Secretaries:

Karl Marx, Germany and Russia; Leó Frankel, Austria and Hungary; A. Herman, Belgium; Th. Mottershead, Denmark; J. G. Eccarius, United States; Le Moussu, French sections in the United States; Aug. Serraillier, France; Charles Rochat, Holland; J. P. MacDonnell, Ireland; Fred. Engels, Italy and Spain; Walery Wróblewski, Poland; H. Jung, Switzerland.

* In the report on the Dufaure law, Sacase, the Rural Assembly deputy, attacks above all the International's "organisation". He positively hates that organisation. After having verified "the mounting popularity of this formidable Association", he goes on to say: "This Association rejects ... the shady practices of the sects that preceded it. Its organisation was created and modified quite openly. Because of the power of this organisation ... it has steadily extended its sphere of activity and influence. It is expanding throughout the world." Then he gives a "short description of the organisation" and concludes: "Such is, in its wise unity ... the plan of this vast organisation. Its strength lies in its very conception. It also rests in its numerous adherents, who are linked by their common activities, and, lastly, in the invincible impulse which drives them to action."
Charles Longuet, Chairman of the meeting
Hermann Jung, Treasurer
John Hales, General Secretary

33, Rathbone Place, W.
London, March 5, 1872

Written between mid-January and March 5, 1872
First published as a pamphlet in Geneva in 1872

Printed according to the pamphlet
Translated from the French
I. THE TWO FEDERAL COUNCILS

Art. 1. Considering, that Central Councils are but instituted in order to secure, in every country, to "the Working Men's movement the power of union and combination" (Art. 7 of the General Rules)²; that, consequently, the existence of two rival Central Councils for the same federation is an open infraction of the General Rules;

The General Council calls upon the two provisional Federal Councils at New York to re-unite and to act as one and the same provisional Federal Council for the United States until the meeting of an American General Congress.

Art. 2. Considering, that the efficiency of the Provisional Federal Council would be impaired if it contained too many members who have only quite recently joined the International Working Men's Association;

The General Council recommends that such new-formed sections as are numerically weak, should combine amongst each other for the appointment of a few common delegates.

II. GENERAL CONGRESS
OF THE UNITED STATES' FEDERATION

Art. 1. The General Council recommends the convocation, for the 1st of July 1872, of a General Congress of the delegates of sections and affiliated societies of the United States.

Art. 2. To this Congress will belong the appointment of the

² See this volume, p. 7.— Ed.
members of the Federal Council for the United States. It may, if convenient, empower the Federal Council thus appointed to add to itself a certain limited number of members.

Art. 3. This Congress will have the sole power of determining the bye-laws and regulations for the organisation of the I.W.A. in the United States, "but such bye-laws and regulations must not contain anything contrary to the General Rules and Regulations of the Association" (Adm. Reg., V. Art. 1).a

III. SECTIONSb

Art. 1. Considering, that Section No. 12 at New York has not only passed a formal resolution by virtue of which "each section" possesses "the independent right" to construe, according to its fancy, "the proceedings of the several congresses" and the "General Rules and Regulations",c but moreover has fully acted up to this doctrine which, if generally adopted, would leave nothing of the I.W.A. but its name;

that the same section has never ceased to make the I.W.A. the vehicle of issues some of which are foreign to, while others are directly opposed to, the aims and purposes of the I.W.A.;

For these reasons the General Council considers it its duty to put in force Administrative Resolution VI of the Bâle Congressd and to declare Section No. 12 suspended till the meeting of the next General Congress of the I.W.A. which is to take place in September 1872.

Art. 2. Considering, that the I.W.A., according to the General Rules, is to consist exclusively of "working men's societies" (see Art. 1, Art. 7 and Art. 11 of the General Rules);

that, consequently, Art. 9 of the General Rules to this effect: "Everybody who acknowledges and defends the principles of the I.W.A. is eligible to become a member", although it confers upon the active adherents of the International, who are no working men,e the right either of individual membership or of admission to working men's sections, does in no way legitimate the foundation

a Cf. ibid., p. 12.— Ed.
b In the Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly this part is headed "Section XII".— Ed.
c "Appeal of Section No. 12", Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly, No. 19 (71), September 23, 1871.— Ed.
d Compte-rendu du IVe Congrès international, tenu à Bâle, en septembre 1869, Brussels, 1869, p. 172.— Ed.
e The words "who are no working men" are omitted in the Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly.— Ed.
of sections, exclusively or principally composed of members not belonging to the working class;
that for this very reason the General Council was some months ago precluded from recognising a Slavonian section, exclusively composed of students;
that, according to the General Regulations V, 1, the General Rules and Regulations are to be adapted "to local circumstances of each country";
that the social conditions of the United States, though in many other respects most favourable to the success of the working-class movement, peculiarly facilitate the intrusion into the International of bogus reformers, middle-class quacks and trading politicians;
For these reasons the General Council recommends that in future there be admitted no new American section of which two-thirds at least do not consist of wage-labourers.

Art. 3. The General Council calls the attention of the American Federation to Resolution II, 3, of the London Conference relating to "sectarian sections" or "separatist bodies pretending to accomplish special missions" distinct from the common aim of the Association, viz., to emancipate the man of labour from his "economical subjection to the monopoliser of the means of labour", which "lies at the bottom of servitude in all its forms, of all social misery, mental degradation, and political dependence" (see Preamble of the General Rules).  

Written on about March 5, 1872
First published in La Emancipacion, No. 43, April 6, 1872; Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly, No. 103, May 4, 1872; Der Volksstaat, No. 37, May 8, 1872

Reproduced from the manuscript checked with the Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly

---

\*a\* The word "new" is omitted in the Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly.—\*Ed.\*

\*b\* The word "sectarian" is omitted in the Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly.—\*Ed.\*


\*d\* See this volume, p. 3.—\*Ed.\*
Karl Marx

TO THE EDITOR OF LA LIBERTÉ

London, March 12, 1872

Dear Sir,

In the book by Citizen G. Lefrançais, *Sur le mouvement communaliste*, which only came to my attention a few days ago, I find on page 92 the following passage:

"The letter subsequently written to Citizen Serraillier by Karl Marx, the principal inspirer of the German section of the International, on the subject of the elections of February 8, in which he criticises with some bitterness the intervention of the French section in these elections, is sufficient evidence that rightly or wrongly the International was then reluctant to become involved in active politics."

Immediately after the publication of my alleged letter to Serraillier I declared in *The Times*, *the Courrier de l'Europe*, *the Zukunft* of Berlin, etc., that this letter was a fabrication of the *Paris-Journal*. From his part, Serraillier publicly denounced the police journalist who was the true author of this letter. Since almost all the organs of the International and even some Parisian newspapers have taken note of our statements, I am really astonished to see Citizen Lefrançais publicly endorse the falsehood circulated by Henri de Pène.

Yours faithfully,

Karl Marx

First published in *La Liberté*, No. 11, March 17, 1872

Printed according to the newspaper

Translated from the French

Published in English for the first time
Karl Marx

RESOLUTIONS OF THE MEETING
HELD TO CELEBRATE THE ANNIVERSARY
OF THE PARIS COMMUNE.93

[I]

"That this meeting assembled to celebrate the anniversary of the
18th March last, declares, that it looks upon the glorious
movement inaugurated upon the 18th March, 1871, as the dawn
of the great social revolution which will for ever free the human
race from class rule."

[II]

"That the incapacity and the crimes of the middle classes,
extended all over Europe by their hatred against the working
classes, have doomed old society no matter under what form of
government—Monarchical or Republican."

[III]

"That the crusade of all governments against the International,
and the terror of the murderers of Versailles as well as of their
Prussian conquerors, attest the hollowness of their successes,
and the presence of the threatening army of the proletariat
of the whole world gathering in the rear of its heroic vanguard
crushed by the combined forces of Thiers and William of
Prussia."

Written between March 13 and 18, 1872
First published in La Liberté No. 12,
March 24, 1872 and in The International
Herald, No. 3, March 30, 1872

Reproduced from The International Herald
Frederick Engels

TO THE SPANISH FEDERAL COUNCIL

We have received your letter of March 15, and we thank you for the detailed report about the present state of our Association in Spain, a very satisfying state in the circumstances at the moment.\textsuperscript{94} We will publish the most important elements of this report, we will send you a letter for the Saragossa Congress, and we will send you a telegram\textsuperscript{a} later. The telegram will be in the name of the General and British Federal Councils. As for France, with the Dufaure law\textsuperscript{95} against the International, there is no way to maintain a Federal Council, but we will write to Paris so that the “Ferré Section”\textsuperscript{96} sends you a letter for the Congress—there will be no signatures but you will receive it signed “Ferré Section”, which will be in order. In Germany the recent trials have disorganised the Association for the moment, and as you will know Liebknecht and Bebel have been condemned to two years in prison, mainly because of involvement with the International\textsuperscript{97}; sending a telegram from there would be impracticable at the moment; however we have sent your letter to Germany.

There is no problem about stamps. Ask for as many stamps as you think you will need, and send us the quotas or parts of the quotas \textit{received} before the 1st July; then two or three weeks before the General Congress you can send us the rest with the stamps which you have not used. We have a large quantity and it will not matter if your delegates at the Congress return us a thousand or two.

Yesterday afternoon Jung the treasurer did not come to the Council. I have sent him the receipt to sign and when I have it

\textsuperscript{a} See this volume, pp. 137-39.—\textit{Ed.}
back from him I shall send it with the letter for the Saragossa Congress.

We hope that you will submit the resolutions of the London Conference to the Regional Congress for their approval. These resolutions have so far been recognised by the German, Romance, German-Swiss (Zurich), English, Dutch and American federations and by the French and Irish sections.

Written on March 27, 1872


Printed according to the rough manuscript

Translated from the Spanish

Published in English for the first time
The property in the soil is the original source of all wealth, and has become the great problem upon the solution of which depends the future of the working class.\(^a\)

I do not intend discussing here all the arguments put forward by the advocates of private property in land, by jurists, philosophers and political economists, but shall confine myself firstly to state that they have tried hard to disguise the primitive fact of conquest under the cloak of "Natural Right". If conquest constituted a natural right on the part of the few, the many have only to gather sufficient strength in order to acquire the natural right of reconquering what has been taken from them.

In the progress of history the conquerors found it convenient to give to their original titles, derived from brute force, a sort of social standing\(^b\) through the instrumentality of laws imposed by themselves.

At last comes the philosopher and demonstrates that those laws imply and express the universal consent of mankind.\(^c\) If private property in land be indeed founded upon such an universal consent, it will evidently become extinct from the moment the majority of a society dissent from warranting it.

However, leaving aside the so-called "rights" of property, I assert that the economical development of society, the increase and concentration of people, the very circumstances that compel the capitalist farmer to apply to agriculture collective and organised

---

\(^a\) In the rough manuscript the sentence is preceded by the note "Ad p. 1".—Ed.

\(^b\) The rough manuscript has "sanction" instead of "standing".—Ed.

\(^c\) The rough manuscript has "society" instead of "mankind".—Ed.
labour, and to have recourse to machinery and similar contrivances, will more and more render the nationalisation of land a "Social Necessity", against which no amount of talk about the rights of property can be of any avail. The imperative wants of society will and must be satisfied, changes dictated by social necessity will work their own way, and sooner or later adapt legislation to their interests.

What we require is a daily increasing production and its exigencies cannot be met by allowing a few individuals to regulate it according to their whims and private interests, or to ignorantly exhaust the powers of the soil. All modern methods, such as irrigation, drainage, steam ploughing, chemical treatment and so forth, ought to be applied to agriculture at large. But the scientific knowledge we possess, and the technical means of agriculture we command, such as machinery, etc., can never be successfully applied but by cultivating the land on a large scale.

If cultivation on a large scale proves (even under its present capitalist form, that degrades the cultivator himself to a mere beast of burden) so superior, from an economical point of view, to small and piecemeal husbandry, would it not give an increased impulse to production if applied on national dimensions?

The ever-growing wants of the people on the one side, the ever-increasing price of agricultural produce on the other, afford the irrefutable evidence that the nationalisation of land has become a social necessity.

Such a diminution of agricultural produce as springs from individual abuse, will, of course, become impossible whenever cultivation is carried on under the control and for the benefit of the nation.

All the citizens I have heard here today during the progress of the debate, on this question, defended the nationalisation of land, but they took very different views of it.

France was frequently alluded to, but with its peasant proprietorship it is farther off the nationalisation of land than England with its landlordism. In France, it is true, the soil is accessible to all who can buy it, but this very facility has brought about a division

---

a The words "from an economical point of view" are not to be found in the rough manuscript.— Ed.
b In the rough manuscript the end of the sentence reads: "at the cost and for the benefit of the nation".— Ed.
c The phrase, presumably, belongs to Dupont since it is absent in the rough manuscript.— Ed.
d In the rough manuscript the sentence is preceded by the note "+p. 5".— Ed.
Page of Marx's manuscript *The Nationalisation of the Land*
into small plots cultivated by men with small means and mainly relying upon the land by exertions of themselves and their families. This form of landed property and the piecemeal cultivation it necessitates, while excluding all appliances of modern agricultural improvements, converts the tiller himself into the most decided enemy to social progress and, above all, the nationalisation of land. Enchained to the soil upon which he has to spend all his vital energies in order to get a relatively small return, having to give away the greater part of his produce to the state, in the form of taxes, to the law tribe in the form of judiciary costs, and to the usurer in the form of interest, utterly ignorant of the social movements outside his petty field of employment; still he clings with fanatic fondness to his bit of land and his merely nominal proprietorship in the same. In this way the French peasant has been thrown into a most fatal antagonism to the industrial working class.

Peasant proprietorship being then the greatest obstacle to the nationalisation of land, France, in its present state, is certainly not the place where we must look to for a solution of this great problem.

To nationalise the land, in order to let it out in small plots to individuals or working men's societies, would, under a middle-class government, only engender a reckless competition among themselves and thus result in a progressive increase of "Rent" which, in its turn, would afford new facilities to the appropriators of feeding upon the producers.

At the International Congress of Brussels, in 1868, one of our friends said:

"Small private property in land is doomed by the verdict of science, large land property by that of justice. There remains then but one alternative. The soil must become the property of rural associations or the property of the whole nation. The future will decide that question."a

I say on the contraryb; the social movement will lead to this decision that the land can but be owned by the nation itself. To give up the soil to the hands of associated rural labourers, would be to surrender society to one exclusive class of producers.

The nationalisation of land will work a complete change in the

---

a Marx quotes César De Paepe's report on land property at the meeting of the Brussels Congress of the International Working Men's Association on September 11, 1868 (see Troisième Congrès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Compte-rendu officiel, Brussels, 1868, p. 35 et seq.).—Ed.

b In the rough manuscript the end of the sentence reads: "the future will decide that the land cannot be owned but nationally".—Ed.
relations between labour and capital, and finally, do away with the capitalist form of production, whether industrial or rural. Then class distinctions and privileges will disappear together with the economical basis upon which they rest. To live on other people's labour will become a thing of the past. There will be no longer any government or state power, distinct from society itself! Agriculture, mining, manufacture, in one word, all branches of production, will gradually be organised in the most adequate manner. National centralisation of the means of production will become the national basis of a society composed of associations of free and equal producers, carrying on the social business on a common and rational plan. Such is the humanitarian goal to which the great economic movement of the 19th century is tending.

Written in March-April 1872
First published in *The International Herald*, No. 11, June 15, 1872

Reproduced from the newspaper checked with the rough manuscript

---

a In the rough manuscript the end of the sentence reads: "from which they originate and society will be transformed into an association of free producers".—*Ed.*

b The rough manuscript has "natural" instead of "national".—*Ed.*

c This word is crossed out in the rough manuscript.—*Ed.*
Frederick Engels

TO CITIZEN DELEGATES
OF THE REGIONAL SPANISH CONGRESS
ASSEMBLED AT SARAGOSSA

London, April 3, 1872

Citizens,

The General Council of the International Working Men's Association has asked me to congratulate you on its behalf on the occasion of the second congress of the Spanish sections. You are indeed to be congratulated for the results you have obtained in so short a time. The International, founded in Spain less than three years ago, now covers the whole country with its sections and federations, is established in all the towns and is penetrating into the countryside. Thanks to your efforts, and also to the senseless and ridiculous persecution by successive governments of your country, it has been possible to obtain these fine results and make the International a real force in Spain. We ought not to forget, at the same time, that these results are also due to the special constitution of our Association which leaves every national or local federation complete freedom of action, granting the central organs only such powers as are absolutely essential to enable them to safeguard the unity of the programme and common interests, and to prevent the Association from becoming a plaything of bourgeois intrigues and police machinations.\(^a\)

You have probably still to come in for further persecutions. Remember then that there are other countries, like France, Germany, and Austria and Hungary, where the members of the

\(^a\) The rough copy of the letter continues: "No bourgeois association would ever be able to subsist in such conditions; the merit of the modern proletariat is that it organised for the common struggle an association embracing all civilised countries and yet in no way restricting the autonomy of each federation." — Ed.
International suffer even harsher government repression and yet
do not bow their heads, knowing, as you know, that persecution is
the best means of propaganda for our Association, and that there
is no force in the world strong enough to suppress the
ever-growing revolutionary movement of the modern proletariat.
In order to destroy the International it would be necessary to
destroy the soil of which it is the natural product: modern society
itself.

Greetings and fraternity,
On behalf of the General Council
Secretary for Spain,

Frederick Engels

First published in La Emancipacion,
No. 44, April 13, 1872 and in other
newspapers of the International

Printed according to the newspaper checked with the rough
copy of the letter in French

Translated from the Spanish
London, April 6 [1872]

The General Council and the British Federal Council greet the Congress of Saragossa. Long live the emancipation of the proletariat!

Engels

First published in *La Emancipacion*, No. 44, April 13, 1872
Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the Spanish
Karl Marx

[DECLARATION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S
ASSOCIATION
CONCERNING COCHRANE'S SPEECH
IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS]101

The performances of the Versailles Rural Assembly, and of the
Spanish Cortes, with intent to extinguish the International, very
properly aroused a noble spirit of emulation in the breasts of the
representatives of the Upper Ten Thousand in the British House
of Commons. Accordingly, on the 12th April, 1872, Mr. B. Cochrane,
one of the most representative men, as far as Upper Class
intellect is concerned, called the attention of the House to the
sayings and doings of that formidable society. Being a man not
much given to reading, he had qualified himself for his task by a
journey of inspection to a few of the Continental headquarters of
the International, undertaken last autumn, and had, on his return,
hastened to secure, by a letter to *The Times*, a kind of provisional
protection for his right of priority to this subject.a His speech in
Parliament betrays, what in any other man would be considered a
wilful and premeditated ignorance of what he is talking about.
With one exception the many official publications of the Interna-
tional are unknown to him; in their stead, he quotes a jumble of
passages from petty publications by private individuals in Switzer-
land, for which the International, as a body, is as much
responsible as the British Cabinet is for the speech of Mr.
Cochrane. According to that speech,

"the great majority of those who joined the society in England, and their number
was 180,000, was totally ignorant of the principles it was intended to carry out, which
were carefully concealed from them while they were giving their subscriptions".b

---
a A. B. Cochrane, "To the Editor of *The Times*, *The Times*, No. 27208,
October 31, 1871, p. 6.—Ed.
b Here and below Cochrane’s speech in the House of Commons on April 12,
1872 is cited from *The Times*, No. 27350, April 13, 1872.—Ed.
Now, the principles intended to be carried out by the International, are laid down in the preamble to the General Rules, and Mr. Cochrane is in happy ignorance of the fact that no one can enter the Association without giving his express adhesion to them. Again,

"the society, as originally constituted, was founded upon the principles of the Trades' Unions, and no political element was then introduced into it".

Not only does the preamble to the original General Rules contain a strong political element, but the political tendencies of the Association are very fully developed in the Inaugural Address, published in 1864, contemporaneously with these Rules. Another wonderful discovery is this, that Bakounine was "charged" to reply, in the name of the International, to the attacks of Mazzini, which is simply an untruth. After giving a quotation from Bakounine's pamphlet, he continues:

"We might smile at such bombastic nonsense, but when these papers emanated from London" (from which they did not emanate) "was it surprising that Foreign Governments should take alarm?"

And is it surprising that Mr. Cochrane should become their spokesman in England? Another charge is that the International had just started "a newspaper" in London, which is another untruth. However, let Mr. Cochrane console himself, the International has plenty of organs of its own in Europe and America, and in almost all civilised languages.

But the gist of the whole speech is contained in the following:

"He should be able to show that the Commune and the International Association were, in reality, one, and that the International Society located" (?) "in London, had given orders to the Commune to burn Paris, and to murder the Archbishop of that City."

And now for the proofs. Eugène Dupont, as chairman of the Brussels Congress of September, 1868, truly stated that the International aimed at a social revolution. And what is the secret link between this statement of Eugène Dupont in 1868 and the deeds of the Commune in 1871? That

"only last week Eugène Dupont was arrested in Paris, to which he had gone secretly from this country. Now, this M. Eugène Dupont was a member of the Commune and also a member of the International Society".

---

* This refers to Bakunin's *Risposta d'un Internazionale a Giuseppe Mazzini*, published in Milan in 1871.— *Ed.*
Unfortunately for this very conclusive mode of reasoning, A. Dupont, the member of the Commune, who has been arrested in Paris, was not a member of the International, and E. Dupont, the member of the International, was not a member of the Commune. The second proof is:

"Bakounine said, at Geneva, July, 1869, when the Congress met under his presidency:—"The International proclaims itself Atheist.'"

Now there never took place an International Congress at Geneva, in July, 1869; Bakounine never presided at any International Congress, and was never charged to make declarations in its name. Third proof:—The Volksstimme, the International organ at Vienna, wrote:

"For us the red flag is the symbol of universal love, let our enemies beware, lest they turn it into the symbol of universal terror."

The same paper, moreover, stated in so many words that the General Council in London was, in fact, the General Council of the International, that is to say, its central administrative delegation. Fourth proof:—In one of the French trials of the International, Tolain ridiculed the assertion of the public prosecutor, that

"it was sufficient for the president of the International" (who does not exist) "to raise his finger to command obedience over the whole surface of the globe".

The muddling brain of Mr. Cochrane turns Tolain's denial into a confirmation. Fifth proof:—The manifesto of the General Council on the Civil War in France, from which Mr. Cochrane quotes the defence of the reprisals against the hostages, and of the use of fire, as measures of warfare, necessary under the circumstances. Now, as Mr. Cochrane approves of the massacres committed by the Versaillese, are we to infer that he had ordered them, although he is surely innocent of the murder of anything but game? Sixth proof:

"There was a meeting held between the leaders of the International and the Commune before the burning of Paris."

This is exactly as true as the report which a short time ago went the round of the Italian press to the effect that the General Council of the International had sent, on a tour of inspection to the Continent, its truly and well-beloved Alexander Baillie-Cochrane, who reported most satisfactorily on the flourishing state

---

a K. Marx, The Civil War in France.—Ed.
of the organisation, and stated that it counted seventeen millions of members. Final proof:

"In the decree of the Commune which commanded the destruction of the Column of the Place Vendôme, the approval of the International is signified."

Nothing of the kind is stated in that decree, although the Commune was, no doubt, fully aware that the whole International all over the world would applaud this resolution.

Such then is the, according to *The Times* newspaper, irrefutable evidence for Cochrane's statement that the Archbishop of Paris\(^a\) was killed and Paris burnt by the direct order of the General Council of the International in London. Compare his incoherent rant to the report of M. Sacase, on the law against the International in Versailles,\(^b\) and you will be able to realise the distance still existing between a French Rural and a British Dogberry.\(^c\)

Of Mr. Cochrane's *fidus Achates*, Mr. Eastwick, we should say with Dante: "Look at him and pass on";\(^c\) were it not for his absurd assertion that the International is responsible for the *Père Duchêne* of Vermersch, whom the learned Mr. Cochrane calls Vermuth.

If it is an unmixed pleasure to have an opponent like Mr. Cochrane, it is a grievous calamity to have to undergo the patronage, as far as it goes, of Mr. Fawcett. If he is bold enough to defend the International against forcible measures, which the British Government neither dare not care to take, he has at the same time that sense of duty and high moral courage which compel him to pass upon it his supreme professoral condemnation. Unfortunately the pretended doctrines of the International which he attacks, are but concoctions of his own poor brain.

"The State," he says, "was to do this and that, and find money to carry out all their projects. The first article of the programme was that the State should buy up all the land, and all the instruments of production, and let them out at a fair and reasonable price to the people."\(^d\)

As to the buying up of the land by the State under certain circumstances and the letting of it out to the people at a fair and reasonable price, let Mr. Fawcett settle that with his theoretical

---

\(^a\) Georges Darboy.— *Ed.*

\(^b\) Dogberry—a character in Shakespeare's comedy *Much Ado about Nothing.*— *Ed.*

\(^c\) Dante, *The Divine Comedy*, Hell, Canto III.— *Ed.*

\(^d\) Here and below Fawcett's speech in the House of Commons on April 12, 1872 is cited from *The Times*, No. 27350, April 13, 1872.— *Ed.*
teacher Mr. John Stuart Mill, and with his political Chief Mr. John Bright. The second article

"proposes that the State should regulate the hours of labour ''. The historical learning of our Professor shines out brilliantly when he makes the International the author of the British Factory and Workshops' Acts, and his economical proficiency comes out to equal advantage in his appreciation of those acts. Third article—

"That the State should provide gratuitous education." Such broad facts as the existence of gratuitous education in the United States and Switzerland, and their beneficial results, what are they compared to the gloomy vaticinations of Professor Fawcett? Fourth article—

"That the State should lend capital to co-operative societies." There is here a slight mistake; Mr. Fawcett mixes up the demands put forth by Lassalle, who died before the foundation of the International, with the principles of the International. By the by, Lassalle invoked the precedent of the State loans, which, under the pretext of agricultural improvements, and by the instrumentality of Parliament, the British landed proprietors had so generously granted to themselves. Fifth article—

"as the coping-stone, it was proposed that the whole revenue of the country should be raised by a graduated tax upon property". This is really too bad; to make the demands of Mr. Robert Gladstone and his Liverpool middle-class Financial Reformers the "coping-stone" of the International!

This great political economist, Mr. Fawcett, whose claim to scientific fame rests entirely upon a vulgarisation, for the use of schoolboys, of Mr. John Stuart Mill's compendium of political economy, a confesses that "the confident predictions" (for the free-traders) "of five and twenty years ago had been falsified by facts". At the same time he is confident of his ability to allay the giant proletarian movement of our days by repeating over and over again, in a still more diluted form, the very same stale phrases by which those false predictions of twenty-five years ago were propped up. His sham defence of the International, which is, in reality, an humble apology for his former pretended sympathies with the working classes, will, it is to be hoped, open the eyes of

such English working men as are still taken in by the sentimentalism, under which Mr. Fawcett hitherto tried to hide his scientific nullity.

Now if Mr. B. Cochrane represents the political intellect, and Mr. Fawcett the economical science of the British House of Commons, how does this "pleasantest of all London Clubs" compare with the American House of Representatives, which, on the 13th December, 1871, passed an act for the establishment of a Labour Statistics Office, and declared that this act was passed at the express desire of the International Working Men's Association, which the House recognised as one of the most important facts of the present age?

The General Council:


Corresponding Secretaries:

Léon Frankel, for Austria and Hungary; A. Herman, Belgium; T. Mottershead, Denmark; A. Serraillier, France; Karl Marx, Germany and Russia; C. Rochat, Holland; J. P. McDonnell, Ireland; F. Engels, Italy and Spain; Walery Wróblewski, Poland; Hermann Jung, Switzerland; J. G. Eccarius, United States; Le Moussu, for French Branches of United States; J. Hales, General Secretary

Written between April 13 and 16, 1872

First published as a leaflet on April 17, 1872, and later on in some organs of the International
Frederick Engels

TO THE SOCIETY OF FERRARESE WORKERS¹⁰⁵

Citizens,

In reply to your kind letter of March 3 I thank you, on behalf of the General Council, for your adherence to the International Working Men’s Association. I must at the same time inform you that before accepting it, the Council requires clarification of the significance of the reservation you make about your “autonomy”.

When an association is formed, the first requirement is to draw up rules and administrative regulations such as you yourselves possess, and as the International possesses too. You are perhaps not familiar with the latter and I am therefore enclosing a copy in French. Kindly submit them to your society and, if you agree to abide by them, let me know. These General Rules and Administrative Regulations are the only laws which our association possesses and which could limit your autonomy. But as you yourselves must realise, there cannot be two sorts of section in the International, one which accepts the collective laws and one which rejects them.¹ I hope, though, that you will have no difficulty in agreeing to these laws, made by the workers of the whole of Europe after seven years of annual meetings and recognised by all.

Administrative Regulation V, Article 1, says that “every branch is at liberty to make rules and bye-laws for its local administration, adapted to local circumstances and the laws of its country”.² But these rules and bye-laws must not contain anything contrary to the

¹ Further on it is crossed out in the rough copy: “preserving its autonomy”.— Ed.
² See this volume, p. 12.— Ed.
General Rules and Regulations. Administrative Regulation II, Article 5, which leaves to the General Council the responsibility for accepting or rejecting each new section, entrusts it with the task of checking whether the rules and regulations of these new sections are in accordance with this article. I should be grateful, therefore, if you would send the Council a copy of your rules so that this formality can be carried out.

Written on April 16, 1872


Printed according to the rough copy of the letter

Translated from the Italian

Published in English for the first time

---

*Further on it is crossed out in the rough copy: "As Italy does not yet have a regular Federal Council, the General Council reserves the right to check the rules and bye-laws of the Italian sections." — *Ed.*
Frederick Engels
LETTERS FROM LONDON

I
[THE ENGLISH AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS' STRIKE]

London, April 20, 1872

The labour movement in England has made enormous progress in the last few days. It has established itself—solidly—among the agricultural labourers. In Great Britain, as is well known, all the land belongs to an extremely small number of large landowners who receive, in the form of rent, annual incomes ranging from 100,000 lire in the case of the poorest to several million for the richest. The Marquis of Westminster enjoys an annual income of over 10 million lire.

The land is divided up into large lots, worked by a small number of agricultural labourers, with the aid of machines, on behalf of the tenant farmer. There are no small peasant proprietors. The number of agricultural workers, already small in proportion to the area of land they cultivate is decreasing every year as a result of the introduction of new machinery. Hence the English agricultural labourers—ignorant, slaves of the soil as were never seen before and at the same time victims of competition—form the lowest paid class of the population. On several occasions they have rebelled against their hard fate. In 1831, in the south of England, they burned the farmers' corn and hay ricks. A few years ago they did the same thing in Yorkshire. From time to time there have been attempts at setting up resistance societies among them, but with no real results. The present movement, however, has in a few weeks assumed dimensions which guarantee it an enormous success. This movement began among the labourers of Warwickshire. They demanded a rise in their wages from 11 or 12 shillings (13 or 14 francs) a week to 16 shillings (19 francs). In order to obtain it they formed a resistance society and went on strike. There was general horror among the landowners,
farmers and Tories of the county; the labourers, slaves in body and mind, after over a thousand years were daring to rebel against the authority of the masters! And they really did rebel. They struck with such effect that in two or three weeks the rebellion spread to all the labourers not just of Warwickshire but of the eight neighbouring counties. The union of agricultural labourers was for the frightened landlords and farmers what the *International* is for the reactionary governments of Europe: the scarecrow at the mere mention of whose name they quake. And they mounted an opposition, but in vain; the union, helped by the counsel and by the experience of the resistance societies of the industrial workers, grew and became more solid every day. It was supported, moreover, by the public opinion of the bourgeoisie itself. The bourgeoisie, despite its contract of political alliance with the aristocracy, permanently wages a sort of little economic war with it. Since at present it is enjoying a state of great industrial prosperity in which it needs many workers, nearly all the agricultural labourers on strike found themselves transported to the towns, where they were employed and paid much better than they could have been on the land. Hence the strike was completely successful, with the landlords and farmers of all England spontaneously raising labourers’ wages by 25 and 30 per cent. From this first great victory will date a new era in the intellectual and social life of the rural proletariat, which has entered as a mass into the movement of the urban proletarians against the tyranny of capital.

Last week, the English Parliament discussed the *International*. Mr. Cochrane, a rabid reactionary, accused the terrible workers’ association of having ordered the Paris Commune to murder the archbishop\(^a\) and set fire to the city! He then demanded repressive measures against the General Council which is based, for the moment, in London. Naturally the government replied that the members of the International, like all the inhabitants of England, are responsible before the law alone, and as they have not yet broken it there was no reason to persecute them.\(^b\) It is believed

\(^{a}\) Georges Darboy.— *Ed.*

\(^{b}\) This refers to the reply of Bruce, Home Secretary, at the sitting of the House of Lords on April 12, 1872 in connection with A. B. Cochrane’s speech against the International Working Men’s Association (*The Times*, No. 27350, April 13, 1872).— *Ed.*
that the General Council of the Association will be replying to Mr. Cochrane's falsehoods.  

Written on April 20, 1872
First published in *La Plebe*, No. 48, April 24, 1872
Signed: *F. E.*
"Our correspondence"

Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the Italian

—a See this volume, pp. 140-45.— Ed.
Frederick Engels

[ON THE POLICE PERSECUTION OF THE MEMBER OF THE INTERNATIONAL THEODORE CUNO]¹⁰⁹

It has been known for some time that a conspiracy had been entered into by the Governments of Germany, Austria, and Italy, for the purpose of hunting down the Internationals. How this conspiracy works may be seen from the following facts:—A prominent member of the International at Milan, Citizen Theodore Cuno, a native of Prussia and an engineer, having lost his place in a large machine shop, was, on the 25th February, arrested, and all his papers, and all photographs in his possession (including that of his father, &c.) were seized. He was transported, in chains, to Verona, where he was kept in prison for nearly a month amongst thieves and murderers, and treated exactly as they were, while his papers were sent to Rome to be examined. On the 29th March, chained to a common criminal, he was transported to the frontier, and handed over to the Austrian authorities. Here, for the first time, he was allowed to learn the reason which had caused all this. What was his astonishment when he read that he had been arrested because

"he was in Milan idle, a vagabond, and without means of existence, and, moreover, a dangerous agent of the International Socialist party, and for all these reasons expelled from the kingdom of Italy"!

Now, so far from being idle, he was, on the 1st of March, to have entered upon a very lucrative place at Como as manager of a factory, and so far from being without means of existence, the Italian authorities on parting with him, had to hand him over 111 francs of his own money! The Austrians could not make out this contradiction, but, instead of letting him free gave him in charge of a policeman who had to see him, at Cuno's expense, to the
Bavarian frontier; and thus, Cuno had not only to pass another seven nights in prison, but to spend the greater part of his money too. At the Bavarian frontier, thanks, no doubt, to the want of proper instructions, as also to the homely stupidity of the Bavarian police, he obtained intelligence that a telegram was sent to his relatives and on receipt of a satisfactory reply, he was at last set at liberty. Thus, it appears, that the European police league against the International is a reality. Cuno could have been sent to the Swiss frontier, and there set at liberty; but instead, he must be handed over to the Austrians, and by them to the Bavarians, to be sent from prison to prison as a common criminal. There is the liberalism of "free" Constitutional monarchies.

Written on April 22-23, 1872

Reproduced from The Eastern Post

First published in The Eastern Post, No. 187, April 27, 1872 and in Gazzettino Rosa, No. 127, May 7, 1872
Frederick Engels

TO THE SOCIETY OF FERRARESE WORKERS\textsuperscript{110}

[Draft letter] [London,] May 10 [1872]

Confirmation given that the reservation concerning autonomy is sufficiently outlined in this letter. Promise to send all our publications.

Request for report on their strength, position, etc.

I inform that the General Council will soon devote itself to preparations for the Congress and that the Congress will take place in September.


Printed according to the original
Published in English for the first time
Frederick Engels

[RELATIONS BETWEEN THE IRISH SECTIONS AND THE BRITISH FEDERAL COUNCIL

ENGELS' RECORD OF HIS REPORT
AT THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING
OF MAY 14, 1872]

Citizen Engels said the real purport of this motion was to bring the Irish sections under the jurisdiction of the British Federal Council, a thing to which the Irish sections would never consent, and which the Council had neither the right nor the power to impose upon them. According to the Rules and Regulations, this Council had no power to compel any section or branch to acknowledge the supremacy of any Federal Council whatsoever. It was certainly bound, before admitting or rejecting any new branch, within the jurisdiction of any Federal Council, to consult that Council. But he maintained that the Irish sections in England were no more under the jurisdiction of the British Federal Council than the French, German or Italian sections in this country. The Irish formed, to all intents and purposes, a distinct nationality of their own, and the fact that they used the English language could not deprive them of the right, common to all, to have an independent national organisation within the International.

Citizen Hales had spoken of the relations between England and Ireland as if they were of the most idyllic nature, something like those between England and France at the time of the Crimean war, when the ruling classes of the two countries never tired of praising each other, and everything breathed the most complete harmony. But the case was quite different. There was the fact of seven centuries of English conquest and oppression of Ireland, and so long as that oppression existed, it was an insult to Irish working men to ask them to submit to a British Federal Council.

a The Minute Book of the General Council has: "French, German, Italian or Polish sections".— Ed.
The position of Ireland with regard to England was not that of an equal, it was that of Poland with regard to Russia. What would be said if this Council called upon Polish sections to acknowledge the supremacy of a Russian Federal Council in Petersburg, or upon Prussian Polish, North Schleswig, and Alsatian sections to submit to a Federal Council in Berlin? Yet what it was asked to do with regard to Irish sections was substantially the same thing. If members of a conquering nation called upon the nation they had conquered and continued to hold down to forget their specific nationality and position, to "sink national differences" and so forth, that was not Internationalism, it was nothing else but preaching to them submission to the yoke, and attempting to justify and to perpetuate the dominion of the conqueror under the cloak of Internationalism. It was sanctioning the belief, only too common among the English working men, that they were superior beings compared to the Irish, and as much an aristocracy as the mean Whites of the Slave States considered themselves to be with regard to the Negroes.

In a case like that of the Irish, true Internationalism must necessarily be based upon a distinctly national organisation; the Irish, as well as other oppressed nationalities, could enter the Association only as equals with the members of the conquering nation, and under protest against the conquest. The Irish sections, therefore, not only were justified, but even under the necessity to state in the preamble to their rules that their first and most pressing duty, as Irishmen, was to establish their own national independence. The antagonism between Irish and English working men in England had always been one of the most powerful means by which class rule was upheld in England. He recollected the time when he saw Feargus O'Conor and the English Chartists turned out of the Hall of Science in Manchester by the Irish. Now, for the first time, there was a chance of making English and Irish working men act together in harmony for their common emancipation, a result attained by no previous movement in their country. And no sooner had this been effected, than they were called upon to dictate to the Irish, and to tell them they must not carry on the movement in their own way, but submit to be ruled by an English Council! Why, that was introducing into the International the subjugation of the Irish by the English.

If the promoters of this motion were so brimful of the truly International spirits, let them prove it by removing the seat of the British Federal Council to Dublin, and submit to a Council of Irishmen.
As to the pretended collisions between Irish and English branches, they had been provoked by attempts of members of the British Federal Council to meddle with the Irish sections, to get them to give up their specific national character and to come under the rule of the British Council.

Then the Irish sections in England could not be separated from the Irish sections in Ireland; it would not do to have some Irishmen dependent upon a London Federal Council and others upon a Dublin Federal Council. The Irish sections in England were our base of operations with regard to the Irish working men in Ireland; they were more advanced, being placed in more favourable circumstances, and the movement in Ireland could be propagated and organised only through their instrumentality. And were they to wilfully destroy their own base of operations and cut off the only means of which Ireland could be effectually won for the International? For it must not be forgotten that the Irish sections, and rightly so, would never consent to give up their distinct national organisation and submit to the British Council. The question, then, amounted to this: were they to leave the Irish alone, or were they to turn them out of the Association? If the motion was adopted by the Council, the Council would inform the Irish working men, in so many words, that, after the dominion of the English aristocracy over Ireland, after the dominion of the English middle class over Ireland, they must now look forth to the advent of the dominion of the English working class over Ireland.

Written on about May 14, 1872


Reproduced from the manuscript checked with the Minute Book of the General Council
Some weeks ago a pamphlet was published under the title "Universal Federalist Council of the International Working Men's Association and of the Republican Socialist Societies adhering". This pamphlet pretends nothing less than to inaugurate a coup d'état within the International. It announces the formation of a second General Council, and it denounces both the organisation of the International, and the administration of its General Council. Now, who are the members of this new self-constituted Council, and the authors of these denunciations? Among the names affixed to the document we find, firstly, that of Citizen John Weston, a member of the General Council, and its former treasurer, who, in a letter to the Council, declares his name to have been made use of without his authority. Secondly, six delegates from the Universal Republican League, a society entirely foreign to the International. Thirdly, two delegates from an "International Republican Federalist Section", which section is totally unknown to the International. Fourthly, two delegates from the Land and Labour League, which society does not form any part of the International. Fifthly, two self-styled delegates of the German Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein, but, in fact, delegates of a few Germans who were excluded from that society on account of their openly avowed hostility to the International. Lastly, four delegates of two French societies counting together less than a score of members, and which the General Council had declined to admit as branches; amongst these we find M. Vésinier, excluded from the International by a committee appointed by the Brussels Congress in 1868, and M. Landeck, whom the hasty flight of Louis
Bonaparte's prefect of police, a on the 4th of September, 1870, liberated from the engagement he had voluntarily taken towards that officer, and "scrupulously kept, not to occupy himself any more, in France, either with politics or with the International" (see the published report of the third trial of the International at Paris b) and who only lately was expelled from the Society of the Communard Refugees in London.

It must be evident, even to the signatories of this document, that a conclave of such entire strangers to the International has exactly as much right to meddle with its organisation and to constitute itself its General Council, as the General Council of the International has to interfere with the organisation, and to declare itself the Board of Directors of the Great Northern Railway.

No wonder that these men are utterly ignorant of the history and organisation of the International. How should they be expected to know that according to our rules the General Council has to render its accounts to the General Congresses, and not to them? or that, when in 1870 the breaking out of the war prevented the Congress meeting an unanimous vote of all federations empowered the General Council to continue in office until political circumstances should permit the convocation of a public Congress? As to the fund collected by the General Council in favour of the refugees, the sum total received has, from time to time, been acknowledged in the published reports of the Council meetings, and our treasurer, Citizen Jung, 4, Charles-street, Northampton-square, Clerkenwell, holds the receipts for every farthing expended, which receipts, as well as the accounts, can be inspected any day by any of the donors. Such an inspection will show not only that the Council has devoted a great portion of its time to this object, quite foreign to its regular functions, but also that itself, as a body, and its individual members, have contributed to the refugee fund within the limits of their means.

Since the growth and power of the International have become what they are, the only way in which rival and hostile societies can attempt to attack it with any chance of success is to usurp its name in order to undermine its strength. This has been so well understood by the whole press-gang of the Governments, and of the ruling classes, that the same papers, from police press to so-called democratic and republican, which carefully suppress

---

a J. M. Piétri.— Ed.
b Troisième procès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs à Paris, Paris, 1870, p. 4.— Ed.
every official declaration of the General Council, always hasten to keep all Europe well-informed of insignificant and ridiculous manifestations like that of this "Universal Federalist Council".

The General Council:


Corresponding Secretaries:

Leó Frankel, for Austria and Hungary; A. Herman, Belgium; F. Cournet, Denmark; A. Serraillier, France; Karl Marx, Germany and Russia; C. Rochat, Holland; J. P. McDonnell, Ireland; F. Engels, Italy and Spain; Walery Wróblewski, Poland; Hermann Jung, Switzerland; Le Moussu, for French Branches of United States.

C. Murray, Chairman,
H. Jung, Treasurer,
John Hales, Gen. Sec.

33, Rathbone-place, London, W.
May 20th, 1872

First published in The Eastern Post, No. 191, May 26, 1872 (second edition) and in other newspapers of the International
Dear Editor,

In the *Libero Pensiero* of March 28, Mr. Stefanoni rightly foresaw that, despite his misfortune with Liebknecht, I would continue to reply with silence to his incessant slanders. If I now break this silence, it is because Mr. Karl Vogt, a man whom I politically and morally assassinated in Germany with my book *Herr Vogt*, is revealed to be the inspiration behind the assertions of his coreligionist Stefanoni.

Mr. Stefanoni cites, taking it from Vogt’s book against me and the German communist party in general, the fairy story about my relations with the spy Cherval. Yet he takes care to suppress the letter from J. Ph. Becker of Geneva which exposes Vogt’s crass inventions in the most humorous fashion (see *Herr Vogt*, p. 21).

This slander and others of like nature, with which Vogt fills his smutty book, were reproduced a few days after it was published in the *National Zeitung* of Berlin. I immediately commenced legal proceedings for libel in London. In accordance with Prussian law, I had to go first through a preliminary procedure, in other words, obtain permission from the courts to prosecute the editor of the *National Zeitung*. I therefore had to go up the entire ladder of the tribunals, from the investigating magistrate to the supreme court, with absolutely no result. In a word, they prohibited me from embarking on a trial that would have been so compromising for

---


*b* See present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 60-64.— *Ed.*

*c* F. Zabel.— *Ed.*
Mr. Vogt (who in his *Politische Studien* had precisely invited Prussia to take possession of the rest of Germany by force of arms), and also so compromising for a newspaper which did the government's work under the mask of a fictitious opposition, and which later revealed itself to be the most servile tool of Bismarck—a trial, finally, that would give full satisfaction to a man who was torn to shreds, on command from above, by the entire prostituted press of Germany.

All the episodes of my struggle with the Prussian tribunals, together with the documents I submitted to them in support of my case, are to be found printed in my book *Herr Vogt*, and must therefore be familiar to the worthy Mr. Stefanoni too.

Mr. Stefanoni also cites my *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* (1853) in order to prove what? That I had relations with the German communists. Of that I am proud.

Besides, the true purpose of that publication was to show that the Communist League was not a secret society according to the definition of the penal code, and that for this reason the Prussian government was forced to get the notorious Stieber and his go-betweens to fabricate a series of false documents attributed to me and the accused. Today, in Germany, there is nobody, not even among the Bismarckians, who dares to deny this fact. That Mr. Stefanoni should make common cause not only with Vogt but also with Stieber is too rich, even for an *esprit fort* of Stefanoni's calibre.

In your newspaper of April 18, Mr. Stefanoni renews the attack. I had given abundant proof in my book that in 1859 Mr. Vogt sold himself to Bonaparte, taking up the role of his principal agent in Germany and Switzerland. Ten years later, the indiscretion of his friends Jules Favre and Co. merely served to verify the fact.

It is utterly false that I, through some supposed Germanic interest, took up the defence of Austria against Mr. Vogt, the valiant champion of Italy. In the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in 1848-49 I backed the cause of Italy against the majority in the German parliament and press. Later, in 1853 and at other times, I assumed in the *New-York Tribune* the defence of a man with

---


*b* See present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 395-457.—Ed.

*c* Ibid., Vols. 7-9.—Ed.
whose principles I was in permanent opposition—Mazzini. In a word, I always took the side of revolutionary Italy against Austria.

But the war of 1859 was a different matter altogether. I denounced it because it would prolong the Bonapartist empire for another decade, subject Germany to the regime of the Prussian horde and make Italy what it is today. Mazzini, for once, was of my opinion (see Pensiero e Azione of 2 to 15 May 1859). He, like me, was assailed at that time by the inevitable Mr. Vogt.

Although I was ready to denounce Mr. Vogt as a Bonapartist agent, I nevertheless had to deny the authorship of an anonymous circular launched against him by Mr. Karl Blind. Mr. Stefanoni quotes, following Vogt, the declarations which the latter obtained from the publisher and printers with the aim of proving that Blind was not the author of the circular and that it had not been printed by the aforementioned publisher.

Yet if Mr. Stefanoni had read my book, as he claims, he would have found reproduced on pages 186-187 the declarations made under oath to the English court by the aforementioned printer and one of his colleagues, asserting that it was precisely Karl Blind who was the author of the anonymous circular!

From Vogt, Mr. Stefanoni passes to Herzen. First of all he asserts that Herzen attended the foundation meeting of the International, and he gives the date of the Association’s foundation as 1867. Everybody knows that the International was founded in September 1864 at a meeting in Longacre, at which Herzen was not present. The evangelist of rationalism, Mr. Stefanoni, handles details of time and place exactly like his predecessors in the New Testament eighteen centuries ago. Nearly ten years before the founding of the International I refused to speak on the same platform as Mr. Herzen, the Russian Panslavist, at a public demonstration.

Herzen, in a posthumous book brought to light by his son, a book brimming with lies about me, does not dare to say that I

---

a This refers to Marx's correspondence published in the New-York Daily Tribune on December 12, 1853 and also to his article “Mazzini and Napoleon” (present edition, Vol. 12, pp. 511-12; Vol. 15, pp. 485-89).—Ed.


c Fidelio Hollinger.—Ed.


e Wiehe and Vögele.—Ed.


g A. A. Herzen. A reference to Сборник посмертных статей Александра Ивановича Герцена, Geneva, 1870.—Ed.
designated him as a *Russian spy*, as the veracious Mr. Stefanoni maintains. Besides, those who thirst for enlightenment about the esteem in which the amateur socialist Herzen is to be held have only to read Serno-Solovyovich's pamphlet *Our Internal Affairs*.¹

I have the honour, Sir, of being your devoted

*Karl Marx*

Written on May 23, 1872

First published in *Gazzettino Rosa*, No. 148, May 28, 1872 and in *Il Libero Pensiero*, August 1, 1872

Printed according to the newspaper

Translated from the Italian

Published in English for the first time

---

¹ A. Серно-Соловьевичъ, «Наші домашнія дѣла. Отвѣтъ г. Герцену на статью „Порядокъ торжествуетъ“» (III. Колоколь, No. 233), Vevey, 1867.—*Ed.*
TO THE EDITORS OF DER VOLKSSTAAT

A friend has sent me, from Germany, Concordia. Zeitschrift für die Arbeiterfrage, No. 10, dated March 7, in which this “organ of the German Manufacturers’ Association” publishes an editorial entitled “How Karl Marx Quotes”.

In the Inaugural Address of the International Working Men’s Association I quote, amongst other material, a portion of Gladstone’s budget speech of April 16, 1863, which is not contained in Hansard’s semi-official report of parliamentary debates. On this basis, with comfortable manufacturers’ logic the Concordia concludes: “This sentence is nowhere to be found in Gladstone’s speech”, and jubilates in the fullness of its heart with this mocking sentence in manufacturers’ German, printed in mocking bold face:

“Marx has added the sentence lyingly, both in form and in content.”

It would, in fact, be extremely strange if the Inaugural Address, originally printed in English in London under Gladstone’s very eyes, had placed in his mouth a sentence interpolated by me, a sentence that, for seven and a half years, circulated unchallenged in the London press, to be finally detected by the “learned men” of the German Manufacturers’ Association in Berlin.

The sentence in question of the Inaugural Address reads as follows:

“This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to classes of property” (p. 6, Inaugural Address etc.).

---

a W. Liebknecht.— Ed.
b See present edition, Vol. 20, p. 7.— Ed.
German translation literally: "Diese berauschende Vermehrung von Reichtum und Macht ist ganz und gar beschränkt auf Eigentumsklassen.")

In an article in The Fortnightly Review (November 1870), which attracted great attention and was discussed by all the London press, Mr. Beesly, Professor of History at the university here, quoted as follows, p. 518:

"AN INTOXICATING AUGMENTATION OF WEALTH AND POWER, AS MR. GLADSTONE OBSERVED, ENTIRELY CONFINED TO CLASSES OF PROPERTY." (In the German translation: "Eine berauschende Vermehrung von Reichtum und Macht, wie Herr Gladstone bemerke, ganz und gar beschränkt auf Eigentumsklassen.")\(^a\)

Yet Professor Beesly's article appeared six years later than the Inaugural Address! Good! Let us now take a specialised publication, intended solely for the City and published not only before the appearance of the Inaugural Address, but even before the International Working Men's Association was founded. It is entitled: THE THEORY OF EXCHANGES. THE BANK CHARTER ACT OF 1844. London 1864, published by T. Cautley Newby, 30, Welbeck Street.\(^b\) It examines Gladstone's budget speech at length and p. 134 gives the following quotation from this speech:

"THIS INTOXICATING AUGMENTATION OF WEALTH AND POWER IS ENTIRELY CONFINED TO CLASSES OF PROPERTY." (In the German translation: "Diese berauschende Vermehrung von Reichtum und Macht ist ganz und gar beschränkt auf Eigentumsklassen"),

that is, word for word, exactly what I quoted.

This proves irrefutably that the German Manufacturers' Association "lied both in form and in content" in decrying this "sentence" as a fabrication "by me"!

Incidentally: honest old Concordia printed in bold face another passage, in which Gladstone prattled about an elevation of the English working class, over the last 20 years, that was supposedly "extraordinary and unparalleled in all countries and in all periods". The bold-face type is supposed to indicate that I had suppressed this passage. On the contrary! In the Inaugural Address I emphasised most strongly the screaming contrast between this shameless phrase and the "APPALLING STATISTICS", as

---

\(^a\) E. S. Beesly, "The International Working Men's Association", The Fortnightly Review, Vol. XLVII, November 1, 1870.— Ed.

\(^b\) Its author is Henry Roy.— Ed.
Professor Beesly rightly calls them, contained in the official English reports on the same period.*

The author of the Theory of Exchanges quoted, like myself, not from Hansard, but from a London newspaper which, on April 17, published the April 16 budget speech. In my collectanea of cuttings for 1863, I have searched in vain for the relevant extract and thus, also, for the name of the newspaper that published it. This is, however, not important. Although the parliamentary reports of the London newspapers always differ from one another, I was certain that none of them could completely suppress such a striking quotation from Gladstone. So I consulted The Times of April 17, 1863—it was then, as now, Gladstone’s organ—and there I found, on p. 7, column 5, in the report on the budget speech:

“That is the state of the case as regards the wealth of this country. I must say for one, I should look almost with apprehension and with pain upon this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power, if it were my belief that it was confined to classes who are in easy circumstances. This takes no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population. The augmentation I have described, and which is founded, I think, upon accurate returns, is an augmentation entirely confined to classes of property.”

In the German translation: “So steht’s mit dem Reichtum dieses Landes. Ich für meinen Teil würde beinahe mit Besorgnis und mit Pein auf diese berauschende Vermehrung von Reichtum und Macht blicken, wenn ich sie auf die wohlhabenden Klassen beschränkt glaubte.** Es ist hier gar keine Notiz genommen von der arbeitenden Bevölkerung. Die Vermehrung, die ich beschrieben habe” (which he now characterised as “diese berauschende Vermehrung von Reichtum und Macht”) “ist ganz und gar beschränkt auf Eigentumsklassen”.

So, on April 16, 1863, Mr. Gladstone declared “both in form and in content” in the House of Commons, as reported in his own organ, The Times, on April 17, 1863 that “this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to the classes possessed of property”, and his apprehension gives him a sort of shiver, but only because of his scruples that this was confined to one part of this class, the part in really easy circumstances.

Italiam, Italiam! a Finally we arrive at Hansard. In its edition, here botchily corrected, Mr. Gladstone was bright enough clumsily

* Other whimsical apologetics from the same speech are dealt with in my work Capital (p. 638, 639).126

** The words “EASY CLASSES”, “CLASSES IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES” were apparently first introduced by Wakefield for the really rich portion of the propertied class [E. G. Wakefield, England and America. A Comparison of the Social and Political State of Both Nations, Vols. I-II, London, 1833].

a Virgil, Aeneid, III.—Ed.
to excise the passage that would be, after all, compromising on the
lips of an English Chancellor of the Exchequer. This is,
incidentally, traditional English parliamentary practice, and by no
means the invention of little Lasker versus Bebel.\textsuperscript{127} A careful
comparison of Gladstone's speech itself, as it appeared in \textit{The Times},
and its subsequent form, as distorted by the same
Gladstone, would provide an amusing description of thisunctuous,
phrase-mongering, quibbling and strictly-religious bourgeois hero,
who timidly displays his pioussness and his liberal \textit{attitudes of mind}.

One of the most infuriating things in my work \textit{Capital} consists in
the masses of official proof describing how manufacturers work,
something in which no scholar could previously find a thing
wrong. In the form of a rumour this even reached the ears of the
gentlemen of the German Manufacturers' Association, but they thought:

\begin{quote}
"Was kein Verstand der Verständigen sieht,
Das übet in Einfalt ein kindlich' Gemüt."\textsuperscript{a}
\end{quote}

No sooner said than done. They find a suspicious-looking
quotation in the Inaugural Address and turn for information to a
business friend in London, the first best Mundella, and he, being a
manufacturer himself, rushes to despatch overseas, in black and
white, the extract from Hansard's Parliamentary Debates. Now
they have my fabrication secret. I manufacture not only the text,
but the quotations too. Drunk with victory, they trumpet out to
the world "\textit{How Karl Marx Quotes!}" So my \textit{wares} were discredited,
once and for all, and, as is fitting for manufacturers, in the way of
normal business, without the expense of learned men.

The irksome subsequent events will perhaps teach the Manufac-
turing Associates that, however well they may know how to fake
goods, they are as well fitted to judge literary goods as a donkey is
to play the lute.

\textit{Karl Marx}

London, May 23, 1872

First published in \textit{Der Volksstaat}, No. 44,
June 1, 1872

Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time

\textsuperscript{a} "What the knowledge of the knowing cannot find,
May be seen by an innocent childish mind."

Fr. Schiller, \textit{Die Worte des Glaubens}.—\textit{Ed.}
Frederick Engels

TO THE EMANCIPATION
OF THE PROLETARIAN
SOCIETY IN TURIN

[Outline of a letter]

In Milan, Ferrara, Naples, everywhere there are friends of Bakunin. As for the Fascio Operaio of Bologna, we have never had a word from it. The Jura party, abandoned everywhere, seems to want to make Italy its great fortress. This party has formed within the International a secret society for the purpose of dominating it; we have in our possession proofs as regards Spain, it must be the same thing in Italy. These men, who always have on their lips the words autonomy and free federation, treat the workers like a flock of sheep which is good only for being directed by the heads of this secret society and used to attain ends unknown to the masses. You have had a good example of this in Terzaghi (investigations are being made concerning the handing over of the letter). The Jura Committee, having revolted against the whole organisation of the International, and knowing that it would have had great difficulty in justifying itself at the Congress in the coming September, is now searching everywhere for letters and mandates originating from the General Council in order to fabricate a false accusation against us. We fully agree to all our letters being read at the Congress but it does not suit us to learn that the same letters which we wrote to this or that section have been placed at the disposal of these gentlemen. Meanwhile we ask you to postpone any decision and then act as the interests of the International dictate to you; I hope that you

---

a Workers' Union.—Ed.
b This refers to the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy.—Ed.
c The record published in the Russian edition further has: "The circular [Fictitious Splits in the International] informs".—Ed.
will discover that it was not the General Council, but certainly these Jura men, acting exclusively in the interest of the ambition of Bakunin, the head of the secret society, who sowed the discord.

(Request an immediate reply concerning the letter.)

Written on June 14, 1872

Printed according to La Corrispondenza di Marx e Engels con italiani 1848-1895, Milan, 1964, pp. 226-27

Translated from the Italian
Frederick Engels


1. Considering the resolution of the Basel Congress fixing the seat of the next Congress at Paris, also the resolution of the General Council dated July 12th, 1870, by which, it being then impossible to hold a Congress at Paris, and conformably with Art. 4 of the General Rules, the Congress was convoked to meet at Mayence.

    Considering further that up to this day the government persecutions directed against the International in France, as well as in Germany, render impossible the meeting of a Congress either in Paris or in Mayence.

    Conformably with Art. 4 of the General Rules which confers upon the General Council the rights of changing, in case of need, the place of meeting of the Congress, the General Council convokes the next Congress of the I.W.M.A. for Monday, September 2nd, at The Hague, Holland.

2. Considering that the questions contained in the programme of the Congress which was to be held at Mayence on the 5th September 1870 do not correspond with the present wants of the International, these wants having been profoundly affected by the great historic events which have taken place since then.

    That numerous sections and federations belonging to various countries have proposed that the next Congress should occupy itself with the revision of the General Rules and Regulations.

---

a The manuscript has “prosecutions”.—Ed.

b See this volume, p. 4.—Ed.

c Cf. K. Marx, “Programme for the Mainz Congress of the International”.—Ed.
Page of Engels' manuscript with the announcement of the General Council on the convocation of the I.W.M.A.'s Congress at The Hague.
That the persecutions to which the International finds itself exposed at this moment in almost all European countries, impose upon it the duty of strengthening its organization:

The General Council, while reserving to itself the faculty of drawing up hereafter a more extensive programme, to be completed by the propositions of the sections and federations, places on the order of the day, as the most important questions to be discussed by the Congress of The Hague, the revision of the General Rules and Regulations.

Written between June 18 and 28, 1872

First published in *The International Herald*, No. 13, June 29, 1872

Reproduced from the newspaper checked with Engels' rough manuscript
Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

PREFACE TO THE 1872 GERMAN EDITION
OF THE MANIFESTO
OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The Communist League, an international association of workers, which could of course be only a secret one under the conditions obtaining at the time, commissioned the undersigned, at the Congress held in London in November 1847, to draw up for publication a detailed theoretical and practical programme of the Party. Such was the origin of the following Manifesto, the manuscript of which travelled to London, to be printed, a few weeks before the February Revolution. First published in German, it has been republished in that language in at least twelve different editions in Germany, England and America. It was published in English for the first time in 1850 in The Red Republican, London, translated by Miss Helen Macfarlane, and in 1871 in at least three different translations in America. A French version first appeared in Paris shortly before the June insurrection of 1848 and recently in Le Socialiste of New York. A new translation is in the course of preparation. A Polish version appeared in London shortly after it was first published in German. A Russian translation was published in Geneva in the sixties. Into Danish, too, it was translated shortly after its first appearance.

However much the state of things may have altered during the last twenty-five years, the general principles laid down in this Manifesto are, on the whole, as correct today as ever. Here and there some detail might be improved. The practical application of the principles will depend, as the Manifesto itself states, everywhere and at all times, on the obtaining historical conditions, and, for that reason, no special stress is laid on the revolutionary

---

a The 1848 revolution in France.—Ed.
measures proposed at the end of Section II. That passage would, in many respects, be very differently worded today. In view of the gigantic strides of Modern Industry in the last twenty-five years, and of the accompanying improved and extended party organisation of the working class, in view of the practical experience gained, first in the February Revolution, and then, still more, in the Paris Commune, where the proletariat for the first time held political power for two whole months, this programme has in some details become antiquated. One thing especially was proved by the Commune, viz., that “the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery, and wield it for its own purposes”. (See The Civil War in France. Address of the General Council of the International Working Men’s Association, German edition, p. 19, where this point is further developed.) Further, it is self-evident that the criticism of socialist literature is deficient in relation to the present time, because it comes down only to 1847; also, that the remarks on the relation of the Communists to the various opposition parties (Section IV), although in principle still correct, yet in practice are antiquated, because the political situation has been entirely changed, and the progress of history has swept from off the earth the greater portion of the parties there enumerated.

But, then, the Manifesto has become an historical document which we have no longer any right to alter. A subsequent edition may perhaps appear with an introduction bridging the gap from 1847 to the present day; this reprint was too unexpected to leave us time for that.

Karl Marx  
Frederick Engels

London, June 24, 1872

First published in Das kommunistische Manifest. Neue Ausgabe mit einem Vorwort der Verfasser, Leipzig, 1872

Printed according to the pamphlet

---

Frederick Engels

[RESOLUTIONS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON MIKHAIL BAKUNIN AND THE ALLIANCE] 137

1. That it would not reply to Bakunin’s letter. a

2. Citizen Engels was to write to Valencia, to the Federal Council, to ask it to account for its relations with the Alliance, since the Council had at least three of its members belonging to this society. b

3. The Sub-Committee was to request the General Council to propose the expulsion of Bakunin and the members of the Alliance at the next Congress.

Adopted at the sitting of the Sub-Committee on July 5, 1872

Printed according to the original
Translated from the French

First published, in Russian, in Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1871-1872, Moscow, 1965

---


b See this volume, pp. 211-13.— Éd.
Our readers will already be aware from our American correspondence that a split has occurred amongst the members of the International in the United States. What has happened in New York in the last few months is, in fact, so unique in the history of the International that it is worth presenting it in context. For that purpose, we shall base what we have to say on an article from the Emancipacion, published in Madrid (June 22),\(^a\) and will supplement it with the original documents at our disposal.

It is a well-established fact that, in Europe, the bourgeoisie and the governments made the International into a fearful bogey that has subsequently properly fulfilled its task and so alarmed all good citizens that no one need fear that the International will ever be diverted from its original aims by a mass influx of bourgeois elements. Things take a different course in America. That which sends European bourgeois and governments into convulsions appears, by contrast, interesting there. A society that has grown up on a purely bourgeois foundation, without a landowning nobility or a monarchy, laughs at the childish mortal terror of the European bourgeoisie which—even in France, intellectually at least—has still not outgrown the scourge of the monarchy and the nobility. The more fearful, therefore, the International appeared in Europe and the more monstrously it was presented by the correspondents of the American press—and no one is more adept at painting a lurid picture than these gentlemen—the more

\(^a\) [P. Lafargue,] “La burguesía y la Internacional en los Estados-Unidos”, La Emancipación, No. 54, June 22, 1872.—Ed.
widespread the view became in America that the time was now right for making both financial and political capital out of it.

The extent to which American society is ahead of European is strikingly exemplified by the fact that it was two American ladies who first discovered this and attempted to set up a business on the basis of it. Whilst the men of the European bourgeoisie trembled in fear of the International, two female members of the American bourgeoisie, Mrs. Victoria Woodhull and her sister Miss Tenni Claflin (who publish Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly) conceived the plan of exploiting this society of horrors—and they almost got away with it.

Both these sisters, millionairesses, advocates of women's emancipation and especially "free love", resolutely joined the International. Section No. 9 was set up under the leadership of Miss Claflin, Section No. 12 under that of Mrs. Woodhull; new sections soon followed in the most diverse parts of America, all set up by adherents of the two sisters. According to the currently valid arrangements, every section had the right to send a delegate to the Central Committee, which met in New York. The consequence was that, very soon, this federal council, which had originally been made up of German, Irish and French workers, was swamped by a whole host of bourgeois American adventurers of all sorts and of both sexes. The workers were pushed into the background; victory for the two speculating sisters seemed assured. Then Section No. 12 took centre stage and explained to the founders of the American International what it was really all about.

On August 30, 1871, Section 12 issued its own manifesto over the signature of W. West, secretary. It reads:

"The object of the International is simply to emancipate the labourer, male and female, by the conquest of political power. It involves, first, the Political Equality and Social Freedom of men and women alike. Political Equality means the personal participation of each in the preparation, administration and execution of the laws by which all are governed. Social Freedom means absolute immunity from impertinent intrusion in all affairs of exclusively personal concernment, such as religious belief, the sexual relation, habits of dress, etc. The proposition involves, secondly, the establishment of an Universal Government" for the whole world. "Of course, the abolition of [...] even differences of language are embraced in the programme."  

So there might be no misunderstanding as to the aim involved, a form of organisation is called for, according to which

"if practicable, for the convenience of political action, there should be a section

---

a ""Appeal of Section No. 12", Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly, No. 19 (71), September 23, 1871.— Ed.
formed in every ... election district. There must ... be instituted in every town a municipal Committee or Council, corresponding with the Common Councils; in every State a State Committee or Council, corresponding with the State legislature, and in the Nation a National Committee or Council, corresponding with the United States National Congress... The work of the International, includes nothing less than the institution, within existing forms, of another form of Government, which shall supersede them all."

It is not, then, for the overthrow, but for the exploitation of the principles of the existing state, that, according to this, the International has come into existence. Mr. West was, in fact, right in proclaiming (Woodhull & Cl. Weekly, March 2, 1872):

"The issue of the 'Appeal' of Section 12 was a new departure in the history of the International!"

In order to accomplish this "new departure" it was, above all, necessary to shake off the fetters of the previous General Rules and Congress decisions, the validity of which had remained uncontested. Accordingly, Section No. 12 proclaimed (W. & C. Weekly, October 21, 1871)

"the independent right of each section" freely to interpret the congress decisions and the Rules and Regulations of the General Council (it should read the General Rules and Administrative Regulations of the Association) "each section being alone responsible for its own action".\(^a\)

The nonsense now went too far. Instead of sections of workers, sections consisting of all kinds of bourgeois swindlers, free-lovers, spirit-rappers, spirit-rapping shakers,\(^{140}\) etc., were set up, and so Section No. 1, the first section of the International to be formed in America (Germans), finally issued an appeal in which, in contrast to this swindle, emphasis was laid on the essentially proletarian character of the Association. The American parent section, No. 12, replied immediately. In W. & C. W. of November 18, 1871, it declares, through its secretary West:

"The extension of equal citizenship to women, the world over, must precede any general change in the [...] relations of capital and labour... Section 12 would also remonstrate against the vain assumption, running all through the Protest" (of Section 1) "under review, that the International Working Men's Association is an organisation of the working classes."

On November 25, there followed another protest from Section 12, which says:

"The statement" (contained in the General Rules) that the working classes can

\(^a\) "The Internationals", Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly, No. 23 (75), October 21, 1871.— *Ed.*
only be emancipated by their own efforts, "cannot be denied, yet it is true so far as it describes the fact that the working classes cannot be emancipated against their will." \(^a\)

War finally broke out between the exploiters of the state, place-seekers, free-lovers, spirit-rappers and other bourgeois swindlers, on the one hand, and, on the other, the workers who, in their naiveté, actually imagined that the International Working Men's Association was an organisation not of the bourgeois, but of the working class in America too. The German Section No. 1 demanded that the Central Committee exclude Section 12 and the delegates of all sections that did not consist, at least two-thirds, of wage labourers. This demand caused a split in the Central Committee; some of the Germans and the Irish together with some Frenchmen supported Section 1, whilst the Americans, together with the majority of the French and two German (Schweitzer) sections formed a new central committee.

On December 4, the old committee (which we shall call No. I) issued a circular describing the circumstances as follows:

"In the Central Committee, which is supposed to be a defence against all reformist swindles, the majority finally consisted of reformists and benefactors of the nation who had already almost sunk into oblivion, and thus it came about that the people who preached the gospel of free love sat most fraternally beside those who want to bless the whole world with a common language; supporters of land co-operatives, spiritualists, atheists, and deists, each trying to ride his own particular hobby-horse. Particularly Section 12 (Woodhull)... The first step that has to be taken here, in order to advance the movement, is to organise and, at the same time, to stimulate the revolutionary element, which lies in the conflict of interests of worker and capitalist... The delegates of sections 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 16, 21, 23, 24, 25 and other sections, having seen that all efforts to direct this nonsense were in vain, therefore decided, after the old Central Committee had been indefinitely adjourned (December 3, 1871) to found a new one, which consists of actual workers." \(^b\)

In the meantime, central committee No. II (Woodhull) continued to meet and filled its places with a host of delegates from allegedly new sections that had been established mainly by virtue of the efforts of sections 9 and 12, but were, in the main, so weak that they scarcely had enough members to fill the barest minimum of officers' positions (secretary, treasurer, etc.).

Both committees appealed to the General Council in London. In the meantime, various sections (e.g., French No. 10 and all the Irish sections) withdrew from both committees pending the decision of the General Council.

\(^a\) "Protest of Section 12", Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly, No. 2 (80), November 25, 1871.—*Ed*.

\(^b\) New-Yorker Demokrat, December 9, 1871.—*Ed*.
On March 5 and 12, the General Council passed the resolutions that have already been published in the *Volksstaat* (No. 37). They suspended Section 12, advised that both committees combine until an American Congress was held to decide the matter, and recommended for the future that all sections not consisting at least two-thirds, of wage labourers should not be admitted. Although, for good reasons, these resolutions almost exclusively took the form of recommendations, they determined the future of the International in America. By supporting as they did committee No. I, they made it impossible for the bourgeois of committee No. II to continue exploiting the name of the International for their own particular purposes.

Since the beginning of the split and in direct contravention of Resolution No. 17 of the London Conference, which laid down that all internal affairs of the Association should be dealt with only within the sections and federations and not in public, committee No. II had been inviting reporters from the New York press to all its proceedings, and had seen to it that the whole matter was discussed in the most disreputable bourgeois papers. The same thing happened at this point, when this committee set about the General Council, which it had imagined it had duped. The activities of committee No. II made it possible for the worst of the New York newspapers, such as the *Herald*, etc., to declare the whole thing a squabble between Germans and Frenchmen, between communism and socialism, etc., and the opponents of the workers in New York were jubilant at the alleged destruction of the International in America.

However, in all that, committee No. II was constantly at pains to inform the world that the International was not a workers' organisation, but a bourgeois one. As early as December 16, 1871, its organ *Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly* declared:

"Where our committee is concerned, there is no need to prove that two-thirds or any part of a section shall be wages-slaves, as if it were a crime to be free";

and on May 4, 1872, it declared again:

"In this decree of the General Council its authors presume to recommend that in future no American section be admitted, of which two-thirds at least are not wages-slaves. Must they be politically slaves also? As well one thing or the other. [...]"
The intrusion of 'bogus reformers, benefactors of the nation, middle-class quacks and trading politicians' is mostly to be feared from that class of citizens who have nothing better to depend upon than the *proceeds of wages-slavery*.

This was committee No. II's last word on one count. Not only was it absurd to believe that the International Working Men's Association was an association of workers—in addition to that, it could only fulfil its purpose really properly if it excluded all workers and wages-slaves, or at least declared them suspect.

What, precisely, is the purpose of the International Working Men's Association (without working men) in America? This, too, is now explained to us. The elections for a new President of the United States were approaching.

On March 2, 1872, those two ladies' paper *W. & C. W.*, forever with us, carried an article entitled "The Coming Combination Convention" in which it may be read that:

"There is a proposition under consideration by the representatives of the various reformatory elements of the country looking to a grand consolidated convention to be held in this city in May... Indeed, if this convention acts wisely, who can say that the fragments of the defunct Democratic" (i.e., sympathetic towards slavery) "Party may not make themselves known and take part in it... Everybody of *Radicals* should be represented at it", etc.

Week after week the same paper carries appeals to all kinds of world reformers:

"Labour, Land, Peace and Temperance reformers, and Internationals and Women Suffragists, [...] as well as all others, who believe that the time has come" to carry out the principles of true morality and religion (sic!),

signed first of all by Victoria Woodhull, then by Th. H. Banks, R. W. Hume, G. R. Allen, W. West, G. W. Maddox, T. Millot, in short by the main people of committee No. II. All these appeals expressly state that the delegate convention would nominate candidates for the presidency and vice-presidency of the United States.

On May 9, 10, and 11, at the Apollo Hall in New York, this monstrous delegate convention finally got underway. All the male and female cranks of America assembled there. Committee No. II was present in a body. It was decided that *Mrs. Victoria Woodhull* should be nominated as candidate for the presidency of the United States, and, in fact, in the name of the International!

The whole of America responded with resounding laughter. Of

---

course, those Americans who had a vested interest and were indulging in speculation, did not allow this to divert them. It was a different story with the Germans and Frenchmen who had allowed themselves to be talked into it. Section 2 (French) withdrew its delegate from committee No. II and declared its support for the resolutions of the General Council. Section 6 (German) likewise withdrew its delegate, Dr. Grosse, former private secretary to the Berliner Schweitzer, from committee No. II, and refused to have anything to do with committee No. II until it declared its support for the resolutions of the General Council. On May 20, a further eight sections—French and German—withdraw from committee No. II, which now represents only the well-known, ambiguous American elements, which, in fact, had belonged together even before they had joined the International—Madame Victoria Woodhull, together with assorted accomplices. They now declare that they intend to establish a separate, exclusively American International, which, of course, they are free to do.

In the meantime, in response to an inquiry from the German section in St. Louis and the French section in New Orleans, the General Council has declared that it only recognises committee No. I (now the provisional Federal Council of the United States). Thus, Madame Victoria Woodhull's campaign to conquer the International has achieved its ultimate goal.

The Emancipacion adds:

"Having heard these facts, all impartial observers must wonder: when and how might this scandal have ended, if there had been no General Council with authority to uphold the basic principles of the International and to suspend sections and federations who sought to change the character of the Association for their own political or personal ends."

Written not later than July 9, 1872
First published in Der Volksstaat, No. 57, July 17, 1872

Printed according to the newspaper
Frederick Engels

TO CITIZEN VINCENZO SPOTTI,
SECRETARY OF THE COMMITTEE
FOR THE EMANCIPATION
OF THE WORKING CLASSES IN PARMA

INTERNATIONAL WORKING MENS ASSOCIATION
33, Rathbone Place, London

July 18, 1872

Dear Citizen,

From your kind letter dated June 7 (postmarked Parma, July 9 and delivered here on July 13), I conclude that your Society wishes to become affiliated to the great International Working Men’s Association.

As your rules\(^a\) do not contain anything contrary to the General Rules and Regulations of the Association, there is no obstacle to your affiliation. It will only be necessary for you to adhere to the General Rules and Regulations of the Association, of which I enclose a copy in French (there being no complete and authentic edition in Italian).

I should be grateful if you would discuss this proposal and let me know the outcome if affirmative so that I may complete the necessary formalities for your affiliation.

Fraternal greetings.
In the name of the General Council
Secretary for Italy,
Frederick Engels

Write to the address I sent you last time, i.e. that of my place, so that your letter reaches me sooner.

---


Printed according to the manuscript checked with the text in La corrispondenza de Marx e Engels...

Translated from the Italian

Published in English for the first time

\(^a\) Comitato per l’Emancipazione delle Classi Lavoratrici. Statuta, Parma [1872].—Ed.
Karl Marx

TO THE STRIKING MINERS
OF THE RUHR VALLEY

The German capitalist press is calling on you to drop your demands for an eight-hour shift and a 25 per cent wage increase, and is saying that you should resume work so that German industry might avoid having to get its coal from England, thus letting German money go abroad instead of using it to pay for German labour.

This is the eternal miserable whine of the bourgeois, heard whenever the workers get up on their own feet and try to make any demands. In England, where they have been telling the same old story for forty years or so now, nobody takes any notice any more. In this particular instance, however, it is worth pointing out that the capitalist press is deliberately trying to mislead you, by telling you that all the mine-owners and manufacturers need to do is just to write to England to get all the coal they want.

In England, coal consumption has increased since 1869 at an unprecedented rate, owing to the general upturn that has occurred in English industry since then, to the increase in the number of factories, the enlarged consumption by the railways, the immense growth of marine steam-ship traffic—but mainly owing to the colossal extension of the iron industry, which, in the last three years, has far outstripped all previous periods of prosperity. The Daily News, a liberal capitalist paper (edition of July 15\(^a\) of this year) has this to say on the subject:

"One of the principal reasons for the recent advance in the price of coal is undoubtedly the sudden and unexampled improvement in the iron trade.[...] The

North of England raises about one-fourth of the total quantity of coal produced in Great Britain. A large portion of this "goes to "London and the South and East of England with fuel. It has also been extensively used for steam-ship purposes; but more recently the development of the iron trade in Cleveland" (quite close to the mines) "caused a sudden demand for coal for local purposes. The growth of a trade requiring now at the rate of, perhaps, not less than from five to six millions of tons* of coal per annum, naturally gave a great stimulus to the coal trade [...]. In addition to this, however, we have to consider the rapid rise of the west-coast hematite iron district. The blast-furnaces in Cumberland and Lancashire derive their fuel almost exclusively from the Durham coal-field," and, according to moderate estimates, need "one million and a half tons of coal" annually [...]. "In the North of England alone the new blast-furnaces now in course of erection [...] would require [...] three-quarters of a million tons of coal per annum. Then there are new rolling mills and several blast-furnaces in the west-coast district. It is no matter of surprise, therefore, that the fuel question became a subject of vital importance in the whole North of England, and the natural result was that prices speedily went up. In South Staffordshire, Scotland, South Wales, Derbyshire, the West Riding, and other parts of the country, the same causes operated to bring about higher prices of fuel."

Under these circumstances, the English miners did the same as you: they demanded higher wages and shorter working hours. The English mine-owners, as always superior to their German competitors in insight and worldly wisdom, put up no serious resistance, but rather accepted all the demands. Hear what The Daily News says further on this point:

"Wages were advanced from time to time... The miners also went in for systematic shortening of [...] a day's work. Altogether it is asserted by practical men that the quantity of coal now raised is not more per man than about 60 per cent of what was produced when trade was dull and wages were [...] much lower than they are now. This difficulty might be met by the employment of more men, but the men are not to be had all at once. It is true they are being drafted in to some extent from the agricultural districts; but pitmen want a good deal of training, so that the amount of relief thus to be obtained will be comparatively small and slow in its operation. At this moment the men have succeeded in some parts of the country in getting a reduction of the hours of labour to eight per day, whilst in all parts advances in wages are succeeding each other so rapidly that there seems no alternative but higher selling prices."

Then there is another circumstance to be borne in mind. Almost throughout England the topmost coal seams are exhausted and the mines have to be sunk deeper and deeper. Hear, again, the article in The Daily News:

"the best portions of these valuable deposits" in South Staffordshire "have been worked out. In many parts of that once rich mineral tract, the mines are exhausted, and the pit mounds are fast being converted into arable and grazing land, though thousands of acres" (pit mounds) "yet remain an almost desolate

* The English ton is almost the exact equivalent of 2,000 Zollpfunds or 1,000 kilos.
waste. The resources of the district are not, however, yet used up. Mines are being sunk to greater depths round the confines of the coal field... But under existing circumstances, even with improved modern appliances for mining purposes, it is increasingly expensive to raise material, besides which it has now to be carried further before it reaches the iron manufacturer... What we have said about South Staffordshire applies also to many other parts of the country. The coal has now to be won from greater depths, and has to be conveyed longer distances to the works where it is principally consumed."

The consequence is that, as The Daily News points out, coal prices at the pit-head “have doubled”, and that there is now a real shortage of coal, which is claiming the attention of the whole country. Another paper, the English capitalists’ main economic journal The Economist, says in its July 13\(^a\) edition:

“Since the beginning of the present year coal has been rising rapidly in price, till it is now between 60 and 100 per cent dearer than it was twelve months ago... Before a week or two is over, the whole rise may be a good deal more than 100 per cent, with little sign of any immediate check to the movement. Coal exports in June of this year were 1,108,000 tons, or 4 per cent more than in June last year, but its value was £758,000, or 53 per cent more. This year the value of the coal exports in June was on average 13s 9d\(^b\) per ton; last year it was 9s 4d\(^b\) (or 3 thalers 3½ groschen).

The Spectator, a third capitalist paper (July 20), also reports that, in London, good house coal has increased in price from 23s, or 7 thalers 20 groschen, to 35s, or 11 thalers 20 groschen.

From these facts you can see what to make of the mine-owners’ and manufacturers’ threat to get their coal from England. Mr. Alfred Krupp can issue as many ukases as he wishes; he will have to pay dearer for English coal than for Ruhr coal, and it is very questionable too whether he will get it at all.

In my capacity as Secretary for Germany of the General Council of the International Working Men’s Association I considered it my duty to bring these facts to your notice.

Karl Marx

London, July 21, 1872\(^b\)

First published in Der Volksstaat, No. 60, July 27, 1872

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

\(^a\) Der Volksstaat mistakenly has: “July 20”. What follows is Marx’s summary of a passage from “The Great Rise in the Price of Coal”, The Economist, No. 1507, July 13, 1872.— Ed.

\(^b\) In Der Volksstaat mistakenly: “1871”.— Ed.
To Citizen Schwitzguébel, Corresponding Secretary of the Jura Federal Committee

I have placed your letter of July 15 inst. before the General Council and it has instructed me to inform you that its decision to hold the next Congress at The Hague was reached after due consideration of all the arguments contained in your letter, and that this choice was dictated by the following considerations:

The Congress could not be held in Switzerland, since that is the place of origin and focal point of the disputes; the Congress is always influenced to some extent by the place in which it is held; in order to add more weight to its decisions and enhance the wisdoms of its debates, the local character must be avoided, for which it was necessary to choose a place remote from the main centre of disputes.

You can scarcely be ignorant of the fact that three of the last four Congresses were held in Switzerland, and that at Basle the Belgian delegates were most insistent that the next Congress should be held either at Verviers or in Holland.

In spite of the relative freedom which she enjoys, Switzerland can hardly claim the right to monopolise Congresses.

---

a In Geneva (1866), Lausanne (1867) and Basle (1869).—Ed.
The Romance Federal Council has also expressed its dissatisfaction with the General Council’s choice and does not approve it.

Greetings and equality,

H. Jung,
Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland

July 28, 1872

First published in Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne..., No. 14, August 1, 1872
Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French
TO THE EDITORS OF DER VOLKSTAAT

In the Concordia of July 4, the German Manufacturers’ Association attempted to prove to me that its “learned men” were as well fitted to judge literary goods as the Association was to fake commercial ones.

With reference to the passage from Gladstone’s budget speech of April 16, 1863, as quoted in the Inaugural Address of the International, the manufacturers’ organ (No. 10) stated:

“Marx has added the sentence lyingly, both in form and in content.”

It thus declares that I fabricated the sentence in both form and content, with hair and bones. Even more: it knows exactly how I did so. The paper writes: “The fact that Gladstone mentioned this, etc., was utilised by Marx in order to have Gladstone say, etc.” By quoting the sentence from a work published before the Inaugural Address, the Theory of Exchanges, I exposed the crude lie of the manufacturers’ organ. As the paper itself tells, it then ordered from London this work, which it did not know, and convinced itself of the facts of the matter. How could it lie itself out of the situation? See here:

“When we stated that Marx had lyingly added the sentence in question to Gladstone’s speech, we did not claim, either in form or in content, that he himself had also fabricated it.”

Here we obviously have a case of equivocation peculiar to the mind of manufacturers. For example, when a manufacturing swindler, in agreement with business colleagues, sends out into the

---

a See this volume, pp. 164-67.—Ed.
world rolls of ribbon that contain, instead of the alleged three dozen ells only two dozen, then he has in fact *lyingly added* one dozen ells, precisely because he "*has not fabricated*" them. Why, moreover, should lyingly added sentences not behave just like lyingly added ells? "The understandings of the greater part of men," says Adam Smith, "are necessarily formed by their ordinary employments", the understandings of the manufacturer included.

Through the *Volksstaat*, I extended the erudite materials of the manufacturers' organ, not only with the quotation from the *Theory of Exchanges*, but also with the pages from my work *Capital* concerning Gladstone's budget speeches. Now, from the material with which I provided it, the paper attempts to prove that I did not quote the disputed passage from a "London newspaper", but from the *Theory of Exchanges*. The chain of arguments is another sample of manufacturers' logic.

I told the manufacturers' sheet that the *Theory of Exchanges* quotes on page 134 exactly as I quoted, and it discovers—that I quoted exactly as the *Theory of Exchanges* quotes on page 134.

And further!

"And the glosses too, which Marx bases on the contradiction contained in this version, are already contained in that book."

This is simply a lie. On page 639 of *Capital*, I give my glosses to the words in Gladstone's speech:

"While the rich have been growing richer, the poor have been growing less poor. Whether the extremes of poverty are less, I do not presume to say."

My remark on this is: "How lame an anti-climax! If the working-class has remained 'poor', only 'less poor' in proportion as it produces for the wealthy class 'an intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power', then it has remained relatively just as poor. If the extremes of poverty have not lessened, they have increased, because the extremes of wealth have." 146 And these "glosses" are nowhere to be found in the *Theory of Exchanges*.

"And the glosses too ... are already contained in that book, in particular also the quotation from Molière given in Note 105 on p. 640 of *Capital*." 147

So "in particular also" I quote Molière, and leave it up to the "learned men" of the *Concordia* to detect and communicate to the public the fact that the quotation comes from the *Theory of

---

EXCHANGES In fact, however, I state expressly in Note 105, p. 640 of Capital that the author of the Theory of Exchanges "characterises with the following quotation from Molière" the "continual crying contradictions in Gladstone's Budget speeches".

Finally:

"...in the same way the statement of the London Orphan Asylum about the rising prices of foodstuffs quoted by Marx appears on p. 135 of that book, though Marx bases his claim for its correctness not on that book, but on that book's sources (see Capital, p. 640, Note 104)".

The Concordia advisedly forgets to inform its readers that "that book" gives no sources. What was it trying to prove? That I took from that "book" a passage from Gladstone's speech without knowing its source. And how does the Concordia prove it? By the fact that I really did take a quotation from that book, and checked it with the original sources, independent of the book!

Referring to my quotation from Professor Beesly's article in The Fortnightly Review (November 1870), the Concordia remarks:

"This article by Professor Beesly deals, in fact, with the history of the International, and as the author himself informs every enquirer, was written on the basis of material provided him by Marx himself."

Professor Beesly states:

"To no one is the success of the association so much due as to Dr. Karl Marx, who, in his acquaintance with the history and statistics of the industrial movement in all parts of Europe, is, I should imagine, without a rival. I am largely indebted to him for the information contained in this article."a

All the material with which I supplied Professor Beesly referred exclusively to the history of the International, and not a word concerned the Inaugural Address, which he had known since its publication. The context in which his above remark stood left so little doubt on this point that The Saturday Review, in a review of his article,b more than hinted that he himself was the author of the Inaugural Address.*

The Concordia asserts that Professor Beesly did not quote the passage in question from Gladstone's speech, but only stated "that the Inaugural Address contained that quotation". Let us look into this.

* Professor Beesly drew my attention, in writing, to this quid pro quo.

---


b "Mr. Beesly and the International Association", The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art, No. 785, November 12, 1870, pp. 610-11.— Ed.
Professor Beesly states:

“The address [...] is probably the most striking and powerful statement of the workman’s case as against the middle class that has ever been compressed into a dozen small pages. I wish I had space for copious extracts from it.”

After mentioning the “frightful statistics of the Blue Books”, to which the Address refers, he goes on:

“From these appalling statistics the address passes on to the income-tax returns, from which it appeared that the taxable income of the country had increased in eight years twenty per cent, ‘an intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power’, *as Mr. Gladstone observed*, ‘entirely confined to classes of property’.”

Professor Beesly sets the words: “*as Mr. Gladstone observed*” outside quotation marks, saying these words on his own behalf, and thus proves to the *Concordia* with the greatest clarity that he knows Gladstone’s budget speech—solely from the quotation in the Inaugural Address! As the London business friend of the German Manufacturers’ Association, he is the only man who knows Gladstone’s budget speeches, just as he, and he alone, knows: “Persons with an income under 150 pounds sterling, in fact, pay no income tax in England.” (See the *Concordia*, Nos. 10 and 27.) Yet English tax officials suffer from the *idée fixe* that this tax only stops at incomes *under 100* pounds sterling.

Referring to the disputed passage in the Inaugural Address, the manufacturers’ paper stated:

“Yet this sentence is nowhere to be found in Gladstone’s speech.” I proved the contrary with a quotation from the *Times* report of April 17, 1863. I gave the quotation in the *Volksstaat* in both English and German, since a commentary was necessary on account of Gladstone’s assertion that he would “look almost with apprehension and with pain upon *this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power*, if it were my belief that it was confined to the *CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES*”. Basing myself on Wakefield, I declared that the “*CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES*”—an expression for which there is no German equivalent—means the “really rich”, “the really prosperous portion” of the propertied classes. Wakefield actually calls the real middle class “*THE UNEASY CLASS*”, which is in German roughly “die ungemächliche Klasse”.*

The manufacturers’ worthy organ not only suppresses my


---

*a E. S. Beesly, op. cit., p. 518; italics by Marx.—Ed.*
exposition, it ends the passage I quoted with the words: “Marx quotes The Times to this point”, thus leaving the reader to suppose that it had quoted from my translation; in fact, however, the paper, leaving my version aside, does not translate “CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES” as “wohlhabenden Klassen” but as “Klassen, die sich in angenehmen Verhältnissen befinden”. The paper believes its readers capable of understanding that not all sections of the propertied class are “prosperous”, though it will always be a “pleasant circumstance” for them to possess property. Even in the translation of my quotation, as given by the Concordia, however, Gladstone describes the progress of capitalist wealth as “this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power”, and remarks that here he has “taken no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population”, closing with words to the effect that this “augmentation is entirely confined to the classes possessed of property”. Once the “learned man” of the German Manufacturers’ Association has, in the report of The Times of April 17, 1863, thus had Gladstone say “both in form and in content”, the same as I had him say in the Inaugural Address, he strikes his swollen breast, brimming with conviction, and blusters:

“Yet despite this ... Marx has the impudence to write in the Volksstaat of June 1: ‘Both in form and in content Mr. Gladstone declared on April 16, 1863 in the House of Commons, as reported in his own organ, The Times, on April 17, 1863 that ‘this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power is entirely confined to the classes possessed of property’.”

The “learned man” of the German Manufacturers’ Association obviously knows exactly what to offer his readership!

In the Volksstaat of June 1, I remarked that the Concordia was trying to make its readers believe I had suppressed in the Inaugural Address Gladstone’s phrases about the improvement in the condition of the British working class, though in fact the exact opposite was the case, and I stressed there with great emphasis the glaring contradiction between this declamation and the officially established facts. In its reply of July 4, the manufacturers’ paper repeated the same manoeuvre. “Marx quotes The Times to this point,” the paper says, “we quote further.” In confrontation with the paper, I needed only to quote the disputed passage, but let us look for a moment at the “further”.

After pouring forth his panegyric on the increase of capitalist wealth, Gladstone turns to the working class. He takes good care

---

a Prosperous classes.—Ed.
b Classes finding themselves in pleasant circumstances.—Ed.
not to say that it had shared in the "intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power". On the contrary, he goes on, according to *The Times*: "Now, the augmentation of capital is of indirect benefit to the labourer, etc." He consoles himself further on with the fact "that while the rich have been growing richer the poor have been growing less poor". Finally, he asserts that he and his enriched parliamentary friends "have the happiness to know" the opposite of what parliamentary enquiries and statistical data prove to be the fact, viz.,

"that the average condition of the British labourer has improved during the last 20 years in a degree which we know to be extraordinary, and which we may almost pronounce to be unparalleled in the history of any country and of any age".

Before Mr. Gladstone, all his predecessors "had the happiness" to supplement the picture of the augmentation of capitalist wealth in their budget speeches with self-satisfied phrases about the improvement in the condition of the working class. Yet he gives the lie to them all; for the millennium dates only from the passing of the Free Trade legislation. The correctness or incorrectness of Gladstone's reasons for consolation and congratulation is, however, a matter of indifference here. We are concerned solely with this: that, from his standpoint, the pretended "extraordinary" improvement in the condition of the working class in no way contradicts the "intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power that is entirely confined to the classes possessed of property". On the contrary. It is the orthodox doctrine of the mouthpieces of capital—Mr. Gladstone being one of the best paid—that the most infallible means for working men to benefit themselves is—to enrich their exploiters.

The shameless stupidity or stupid shamelessness of the manufacturers' organ culminates in its assurance: "The report in *The Times* just gives, formally more contracted, what the shorthand report by Hansard gives verbatim." * Now let us see both reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>From Gladstone's speech of April 16, 1863, printed in &quot;The Times&quot; of April 17, 1863</em></td>
<td><em>From Gladstone's speech of April 16, 1863, printed by Hansard, Vol. 170, parliamentary debates of March 27 to May 28, 1863</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The manufacturers' paper appears actually to believe that the big London newspapers employ no shorthand writers for their parliamentary reports.
"That is the state of the case as regards the wealth of this country. I must say for one, I should look almost with apprehension and with pain upon this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power if it were my belief that it was confined to the CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES. This takes no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population. The augmentation I have described ... is an augmentation entirely confined to the classes possessed of property.\(^a\) Now the augmentation of capital is of indirect benefit to the labourer etc."

"Such [...] is the state of the case as regards the general progress of accumulation; but, for one, I must say that I should look with some degree of pain, and with much apprehension, upon this extraordinary and almost intoxicating growth, if it were my belief that it is confined to THE CLASS OF PERSONS WHO MAY BE DESCRIBED AS IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES. The figures which I have quoted take little or no cognizance of the condition of those who do not pay income tax; or, in other words, sufficiently accurate for general truth (!), they do not take cognizance of the property (!) of the labouring population, or (!) of the increase of its income. Indirectly, indeed, the mere augmentation of capital is of the utmost advantage to the labouring class, etc."

I leave it to the reader himself to compare the stilted, involved, complicated CIRCUMLOQUATION OFFICE\(^b\) style of the Hansard publication with the report in The Times.

Here it is enough to establish that the words of the Times report: "This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power ... the augmentation I have described ... is an augmentation entirely confined to the classes possessed of property", are in part garbled by Hansard and in part completely suppressed. Their emphatic "exact wording" escaped no earwitness. For example:

"The Morning Star", April 17, 1863 (Gladstone's budget speech of April 16, 1863).

"I must say, for one, I should look with apprehension and with pain upon this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power if it were my belief that it was confined to the CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES. THIS GREAT INCREASE OF WEALTH takes no cognizance at all of the condition of the labouring population. THE AUGMENTATION IS AN AUGMENTATION ENTIRELY CONFINED TO THE CLASSES POSSESSED OF PROPERTY. BUT THAT AUGMENTATION must be of indirect benefit to the labouring population, etc."

"The Morning Advertiser", April 17, 1863 (Gladstone's budget speech of April 16, 1863).

"I must say, for one, I should look almost with apprehension and ALARM upon this intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power, if it were my belief that it was

\(^a\) Marx's italics.—Ed.

\(^b\) The name is taken from Ch. Dickens’ Little Dorrit.—Ed.
confined to the CLASSES WHO ARE IN EASY CIRCUMSTANCES. *This great increase of wealth* takes no cognisance at all of the condition of the labouring population. *The augmentation stated is an augmentation entirely confined to the classes possessed of property. This augmentation must be of indirect benefit to the labouring population, etc.*

Thus, Gladstone subsequently filched away from the semi-official Hansard report of his speech the words that he had uttered in the House of Commons on April 16, 1863: “*This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power ... is an augmentation entirely confined to the classes possessed of property.*” The Concordia did not, therefore, find this in the excerpt provided by their business friend in London, and trumpeted:

“Yet this sentence is nowhere to be found in Gladstone’s speech. *Marx has added the sentence lyingly, both in form and in content.*”

It is no surprise that they now weepingly tell me that it is the critical “custom” to quote parliamentary speeches as officially falsified, and not as they were actually delivered. Such a “custom” in fact accords with the “general” Berlin “education”, and the limited thinking of the German Manufacturers’ Association, which is typical of Prussian subjects. Lack of time forces me to end, once and for all, my pleasurable exchange of opinions with the Association, but as a farewell, another nut for its “learned men” to crack. In what article did a man—and what was his name—utter to an opponent of a rank at least equal with that of the Concordia, the weighty words: “*Asinus manebis in secula seculorum*”? *?

**Karl Marx**

London, July 28, 1872

First published in *Der Volksstaat*, No. 63, August 7, 1872

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

* “Thou wilt remain an ass for evermore.”
Karl Marx

[AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERAL RULES AND ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL IN THE SUMMER OF 1872]

GENERAL RULES OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

Art 1. This Association is founded to organise common action by the workers of different countries aiming at the same end; viz., the protection, advancement, and complete emancipation of the working classes.

Art. 4. Each Congress appoints the time and place of meeting for the next Congress. The delegates assemble at the appointed time and place without any special invitation. The General Council may, in case of need, change the place and the date of the Congress and, with the sanction of the majority of the federations, may replace it with a private Conference which shall have the same powers. However, the Congress or the Conference which may replace it must meet within three months after the date fixed by the previous Congress.

The Congress appoints the seat and elects the members of the General Council annually, three from each nationality. The Council thus elected has the power to replace members who have resigned or who are unable, for one reason or another, to carry out their duties, and to co-opt members when the Congress elects fewer members than stipulated by the Rules.

On its annual meetings, the General Congress shall receive a public account of the annual transactions of the General Council. The latter may, in cases of emergency, convoke the General Congress before the regular yearly term.

Art. 7. Since the success of the working men's movement in each country cannot be secured but by the power of union and combination, while, on the other hand, the usefulness of the International General Council must greatly depend on the
Que tous les efforts tendant à ce but ont jusqu'ici échoué, faute de solidarité entre les travailleurs des différentes professions dans le même pays et d'une union fraternelle entre les classes ouvrières des divers pays ;
Que l'émanzipation du travail, n'étant un problème ni local ni national, mais social, embrasse tous les pays dans lesquels existe la société moderne, et nécessaire, pour sa solution, le concours théorique et pratique des pays les plus avancés ;
Que le mouvement qui vient de naître parmi les ouvriers des pays les plus industriels de l'Europe, tout en réveillant de nouvelles espérances, donne un solennel avertissement de ne pas retomber dans les vieilles erreurs et de combiner le plus tôt possible les efforts encore isolés ;

Pour ces raisons,
L'Association Internationale des Travailleurs a été fondée.

Elle déclare,
Que toutes les sociétés et individus y adhérant reconnaîtront comme base de leur conduite envers tous les hommes, sans distinction de couleur, de croyance et de nationalité, la Vérité, la Justice et la Morale,
Pas de devoirs sans droits, pas de droits sans devoirs.
C'est dans cet esprit que les statuts suivants ont été composés :

Art. 1er. — L'Association est déclarée pour être un point central de consultation et de coopération entre les mouvements ouvriers de différents pays aspirant au même but, savoir : le concours mutuel, le progrès et le complet affranchissement de la classe ouvrière.

Art. 2. — Le nom de cette association est l'Associaton Internationale des Travailleurs.


Art. 4. — Chaque Congrès fera le débat et le siège de la réunion du Congrès suivant. Les délégués se réuniront pour plein droit aux liens, et pour désigner, sans qu'une convocation spéciale soit nécessaire. En cas d'urgence, le Conseil général peut convoquer le Congrès suivant.

Tous les ans, le Congrès réuni indiquera le siège du

A chaque Congrès annuel, le Conseil général fera un rapport public de ses travaux. Il pourra, au cas de besoin, convoquer le Congrès avant le terme fixé.

Art. 4. — Le Conseil général se composera de travailleurs appartenant aux différentes races représentées dans l'Association Internationale. Il sera dans son sein les membres du bureau nécessaire pour la gestion des affaires, tels que travailleurs associés généraux, associés spéciaux pour les mouvements de pays, etc.

Pages of the French edition of the General Rules and Administrative Regulations of the First International with corrections by Marx
circumstance whether it has to deal with a few national centres of working men's associations, or with a great number of small and disconnected local societies; the members of the International Association shall use their utmost efforts to combine the disconnected working men's societies of their respective countries into national bodies, represented by central national organs which, as far as possible, should be international in their composition. It is self-understood, however, that the appliance of this rule will depend upon the peculiar laws of each country, and that, apart from legal obstacles, no independent local society shall be precluded from directly corresponding with the General Council.

Art. 8. In its struggle against the collective power of the propertied classes, the working class cannot act as a class except by constituting itself into a political party, distinct from, and opposed to, all old parties formed by the propertied classes.

This constitution of the working class into a political party is indispensable in order to insure the triumph of the social revolution, and of its ultimate end, the abolition of classes.

The combination of forces which the working class has already effected by its economical struggles ought, at the same time, to serve as a lever for its struggles against the political power of its exploiters.

The lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies, and for the enslavement of labour. The conquest of political power has therefore become the great duty of the working class.

Art. 9. Everybody who acknowledges and defends the principles of the International Working Men's Association is eligible to become a member.

However, in order to guarantee the proletarian character of the Association, no less than two-thirds of the members of each branch must consist of wage-workers.

Every branch is responsible for the integrity of the members it admits.

Art. 11. The working men's resistance societies joining the International Association may preserve their existent organisations intact.
ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS,
REVISED IN ACCORDANCE
WITH THE RESOLUTIONS PASSED
BY THE CONGRESSES (1866 TO 1869),
AND BY THE LONDON CONFERENCE (1871)

I

The General Congress

1. Every member of a branch of the International Working Men's Association has the right to vote at elections for the General Congress, and every member of the Association is eligible as a delegate.

2. Every branch or group of branches consisting of not less than 50 members may send a delegate to the Congress.

3. Every branch or group of branches numbering more than 50 members may send an additional delegate for every additional 10 members.

7. The sittings of the Congress will be twofold—administrative sittings, which will be private, and public sittings, reserved for the discussion of, and the vote upon, the questions of principle of the Congress programme.

8. The Congress official programme, consisting of questions placed on the order of the day by the preceding Congress, questions added by the General Council, and questions submitted to the acceptance of that Council by the different sections, groups, or their committees, and which it will accept, shall be drawn up by the General Council.

Every section, group, or committee which intends to propose, for the discussion of the impending Congress, a question not proposed by the previous Congress, shall give notice thereof to the General Council before the 31st of March.

II

The General Council

2. The General Council is bound to execute the Congress resolutions and to take care that in every country the basic principles of the International are strictly observed.

a With the introduction of this new article the subsequent articles of this section have been renumbered.—Ed.
3. The General Council shall publish a report of its proceedings every week.

4. Every group which is outside federal associations intending to join the International is bound immediately to announce its adhesion to the General Council.

6. The General Council has also the right to suspend branches, sections, Federal Councils or committees, and federations of the International, till the meeting of the next Congress. Nevertheless, in the case of sections belonging to a federation, the General Council will exercise this right only after having consulted the respective Federal Council.

In the case of the dissolution of a Federal Council, the General Council shall, at the same time, call upon the sections of the respective Federation to elect a new Federal Council within 30 days at most.

In the case of the suspension of an entire federation, the General Council shall immediately inform thereof the whole of the federations. If the majority of them demand it, the General Council shall convocate an extraordinary conference, composed of one delegate for each nationality, which shall meet within one month and finally decide upon the question. Nevertheless, it is well understood that the countries where the International is prohibited shall exercise the same rights as the regular federations.

8. All delegates appointed by the General Council to distinct missions shall have the right to attend, and be heard at, all federal or local meetings of the organisations of the International, without, however, being entitled to vote thereat.

V

Local Societies, Branches, and Groups

2. Conformity of the local rules and regulations with the General Rules and Regulations shall be established by the Federal Councils and, for branches outside the federal associations, by the General Council.

9. The addresses of the Federal Committees and of the General Council are to be published every three months in all the organs of the Association.

---

a With the introduction of this new article the subsequent articles of this section have been renumbered.—Ed.
VI

General Statistics of Labour

General scheme of inquiry, which may of course be modified by each locality

1. Industry, \textit{which}?

5. (a) Hours of work in factories. (b) The hours of work with small employers and in home work. (c) Nightwork and daywork. (d) \textit{Hours of rest}.

6. \textit{Regulations in workshops}.

12. \textit{Habitation and nourishment}.

Drawn up in June-August 1872

First published, in Russian, in \textit{Problemy mira i sotsializma}, No. 4, 1964

Reproduced from the 1871 English edition of the General Rules and Administrative Regulations. The amendments made in Marx's hand in the French copy of the Rules and Regulations are translated from the French
Citizens,

The General Council finds itself under the necessity of publicly denouncing to you the existence, within the International, of intrigues which, although in full work for several years past, have never been even suspected by the majority among you.

In our private circular dated 5th March 1872, on "the pretended divisions within the International", a we were compelled to call your attention to the manoeuvres of the so-called "Alliance of Socialist Democracy", manoeuvres aiming at the creation of discord in our ranks, and at the handing over, in an underhand manner, of the supreme direction of our Association to a small clique directed by Michael Bakounine.

The Alliance of Socialist Democracy, you will recollect, published, at its very origin, a set of rules which, if we had sanctioned them, would have given it a double existence, within and without the International at the same time. It would have had its own sections, federations and congresses at the side of the sections, federations and congresses of the International, and yet it pretended to take part in the latter. Its aim was to supersed our General Rules by the special programme of M. Bakounine and to force upon our Association his personal dictatorship.

The General Council, by its circular of the 22 December 1868, repelled these pretentions. b It admitted the Alliance of Socialist

---

a See this volume, pp. 79-123. — Ed.
b K. Marx, "The International Working Men's Association and the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy". Below, Engels sets forth the Council's second letter, also written by Marx, dated March 9, 1869, "The General Council of the International Working Men's Association to the Central Bureau of the Internation-
Democracy into the International on the express condition only, that it should cease to be an international body; that it should dissolve its organisation; that its sections should enter simply as local sections. These conditions were formally accepted by the Alliance. But of all its pretended sections, only the Central Section of Geneva entered into our Association. The others remained a mystery to the General Council, thus leaving it under the impression that they did not exist.

And now, three years later, we are put in possession of documents which prove irrefragably that this same Alliance of Socialist Democracy, in spite of its formal promise, has continued and does continue to exist as an international body within the International, and that in the shape of a secret society; that it is still directed by M. Bakounine; that its ends are still the same, and that all the attacks which for the last twelve months have been directed apparently against the London Conference and the General Council, but in reality against the whole of our organisation, have had their source in this Alliance. The same men who accuse the General Council of authoritativeness without ever having been able to specify one single authoritative act on its part, who talk at every opportunity of the autonomy of sections, of the free federation of groups; who charge the General Council with the intention of forcing upon the International its own official and orthodox doctrine and to transform our Association into a hierarchically constituted organisation—these very same men, in practice, constitute themselves as a secret society with a hierarchical organisation, and under a, not merely authoritative, but absolutely dictatorial leadership; they trample under their feet every vestige of autonomy of sections and federations; they aim at forcing upon the International, by means of this secret organisation, the personal and orthodox doctrine of M. Bakounine. While they demand that the International should be organised from below upwards, they themselves, as members of the Alliance, humbly submit to the word of command which is handed down to them from above.

Need we say that the very existence of such a secret society within the International is a flagrant breach of our General Rules? These Rules know only one kind of members of the International, with rights and duties equal for all; the Alliance separates them into two classes, the initiated and the profane, the latter destined

al Alliance of Socialist Democracy". Both documents are included into Fictitious Splits in the International (see this volume, pp. 86-87 and 88-89).—Ed.
to be led by the first, by means of an organisation whose very existence is unknown to them. The International demands of its adherents to acknowledge Truth, Justice and Morality as the basis of their conduct; the Alliance imposes upon its adepts, as their first duty, mendacity, dissimulation and imposture, by ordering them to deceive the profane Internationals as to the existence of the secret organisation and to the motives and ends of their own words and actions. The programme of the International is laid down in our Rules and known to all; that of the Alliance has never been avowed and is unknown up to this day.

The nucleus of the Alliance is in the federation of the Jura. From it the watchword is issued which is taken up and repeated immediately by the other sections and by the newspapers belonging to the secret organisation. In Italy, a certain number of societies are controlled by it. These societies call themselves International sections, but have never either demanded their admission, or paid any contributions, or fulfilled any of the other conditions prescribed by our Regulations. In Belgium, the Alliance has a few influential agents. In the South of France, it has several correspondents, among them pluralists, who couple their functions of correspondents to the Alliance with the office of clerk to the inspector of police. But the country where the Alliance is organised most effectively, and where it has the most extended ramifications is Spain. Having managed to slip itself quietly and from the commencement into the ranks of the Spanish Internationals, it has managed to control, most of the time, the successive Federal Councils and Congresses. The most devoted Internationals in Spain were induced into the belief that this secret organisation existed everywhere within our Association and that it was almost a duty to belong to it. This delusion was destroyed by the London Conference where the Spanish delegate, a himself a member of the Alliance, could convince himself that the contrary was the fact, and by the lies and violent attacks which, immediately afterwards, Bakounine ordered his faithful flock to launch against the Conference and the General Council. After a prolonged struggle within the Alliance, those of its Spanish members who had more at heart the International than the Alliance, retired from the latter. Immediately they were assaulted by the most atrocious insults and calumnies on the part of those who remained faithful to the secret society. Twice they were expelled from the local federation of Madrid, in open violation of the existing regulations. When they

---

a Anselmo Lorenzo.—Ed.
proposed constituting themselves as the "New Federation of Madrid", the Federal Council refused its authorisation and returned the contributions they had proffered. And here we must state that out of eight members of that Federal Council there are five (Vicente Rossell, Peregrin Montoro, Severino Albarracin, Francisco Tomás, and Franco Martínez) whom we know to be members of the Alliance; it is moreover likely that there are others besides these. Thus the sections and local federations of Spain, so proud of their autonomy, are led like a flock of sheep, without even suspecting it, by secret orders sent from Switzerland, which the Federal Council has to carry out without a murmur, under penalty of being outlawed by the Alliance.

The Spanish Federal Council, in order to ensure the election, as delegates for the Congress at The Hague, of members of the Alliance, has sent to the sections and local federations a private circular dated 7th July, in which it calls upon them for an extraordinary contribution with which to defray the expenses of the delegates, and moreover orders them, authoritatively, to vote for a certain number of delegates, to be elected by the whole of the Spanish Internationals; all voting papers to be sent to the Federal Council which would ascertain the result of the election.a In this manner, the success of the candidates of the Alliance was placed beyond all doubt. Moreover, the Federal Council announced that it will draw up instructionsb by which the delegates elected shall be bound. As soon as we had cognisance of this plot to have the delegates of the Alliance sent to the Congress with the money of the International, and had received, besides, the proofs of the complicity of the Spanish Federal Council in the manoeuvres of the secret society, we have summoned it, on the 24th July:

1) To hand us in a list of all members of the Alliance in Spain, with the designation of such offices as they may hold in the International;

2) To institute an inquiry into the character and action of the Alliance in Spain, as well as into its organisation and its ramifications beyond the frontier;

3) To send us a copy of their private circular of July 7thc;

---

a In the French manuscript the end of the sentence reads: "orders them, authoritatively, to elect these delegates by voting for a list for the whole of Spain, so that the Federal Council itself will be charged with polling the votes".— Ed.
b The French manuscript has "a mandate imperative for all" instead of "instructions".— Ed.
c Federación Regional Española. Circular reservada, Valencia, July 7, 1872.— Ed.
4) To explain to us how they reconciled with their duties towards the International, the presence, in the Federal Council, of at least three notorious members of the Alliance;

5) To send a categorical reply by return.\\(^a\)

This reply could have been in our hands on the 1st August at latest. But only on the 5th August we received a letter dated Valencia, Aug. 1st (postmark illegible), in which a reply was deferred under the pretence that the members of the Council did not understand our letter which was written in French, and that time was required to translate it. That same Council, in its letter of June 15th, had requested us to send them our publications, etc., as much as possible in French, they (the members of the Council) being somewhat familiarised with that language! Thus the pretence is false; all that is wanted is to make us lose time while it is precious.

We are therefore under the necessity of denouncing to all the members of the Association, and above all to the Spanish Internationals, the Spanish Federal Council as traitors towards the International Working Men's Association. Instead of faithfully fulfilling the mandate entrusted to them by the Spanish Internationals, they have made themselves the organ of a society not only foreign, but hostile to the International. Instead of obeying the General Rules and Regulations, and the resolutions of the General and Spanish Congresses, they obey to secret orders emanating from M. Bakounine. The very existence of a Federal Council composed, in its majority, of members of a secret society foreign to the International, is a flagrant violation of our General Rules.

These are, Citizens, the facts which we have to lay before you before the elections for the Congress take place. For the first time in the history of the working-class struggles, we stumble over a secret conspiracy plotted in the midst of that class, and intended to undermine, not the existing capitalist\(^b\) régime, but the very Association in which that régime finds its most energetic opponent. It is a conspiracy got up to hamper the proletarian movement. Thus, wherever we meet it, we find it preaching the emasculating doctrine of absolute abstention from political action; and while the plain profane Internationals are persecuted and imprisoned over nearly all Europe, the valiant members of the Alliance enjoy a quite exceptional immunity.

Citizens, it is for you to choose. What is at stake at this moment,

\(^a\) See this volume, pp. 211-13.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^b\) The French manuscript has "exploiter".—\textit{Ed.}
is neither the autonomy of sections, nor the free federation of
groups, nor the organisation from below upwards, nor any other
formula equally pretentious and sonorous; the question today is
this: Do you want your central organs composed of men who
recognise no other mandate but yours, or do you want them
composed of men elected by surprise, and who accept your
mandate with the resolution to lead you, like a flock of sheep, as
they may be directed by secret instructions emanating from a
mysterious personage in Switzerland?

To unveil the existence of this secret society of dupers, is to
 crush its power. The men of the Alliance themselves are not
foolish enough to expect that the great mass of the Internationals
would knowingly submit to an organisation like theirs, its existence
once made known. Yet there is complete incompatibility between
the dupers and those who are intended for the dupes, between the
Alliance and the International.

Moreover, it is time once and for all to put a stop to those
internal quarrels provoked every day afresh within our Asso-
ciation, by the presence of this parasite body. These quarrels only
serve to squander forces which ought to be employed in fighting
the present middle-class régime. The Alliance, in so far as it
paralyses the action of the International against the enemies of the
working class, serves admirably the middle class and the govern-
ments.

For these reasons, the General Council will call upon the
Congress of The Hague to expel from the International all and
every member of the Alliance and to give the Council such powers
as shall enable it effectually to prevent the recurrence of similar
conspiracies.a

Written on August 4-6, 1872
First published in: Marx and Engels,
Works, First Russian Edition, Vol. XIII,
Part II, Moscow, 1940

Reproduced from the English
manuscript checked with the
French manuscripts

---

a The French manuscript further has: “The General Council”.—Ed.
Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

TO THE SPANISH SECTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

London, August 8, 1872

In view of the intrigues launched against the *International Working Men's Association* by some members of the Alliance secret society, the Executive Committee of the General Council had, at its meeting of July 24, 1872, instructed Citizen F. Engels, Secretary for Spain, to write the Spanish Federal Council in Valencia the following letter:

TO THE SPANISH FEDERAL COUNCIL

Citizens,

We hold proof that within the International, and particularly in Spain, there exists a secret society called the *Alliance of Socialist Democracy*. This society, whose centre is in Switzerland, considers it its special mission to guide our great Association in keeping with its own particular tendencies and lead it towards goals unknown to the vast majority of International members. Moreover, we know from the Seville *Razon* that at least three members of your Council belong to the Alliance.

When this society was formed in 1868 as a public society, the General Council was obliged to refuse it admission to the International, so long as it preserved its international character, for it pretended to form a second international body functioning within and without the *International Working Men's Association*. The Alliance was admitted to the International only after promising to limit itself to being purely a local section in Geneva (see the private circular of the General Council on *Fictitious Splits etc.*, p. 7 onwards*).

---

* See this volume, pp. 86-87.—*Ed.*
If the organisation and character of this society were already contrary to the spirit and the letter of our Rules, when it was still public, its secret existence within the International, in spite of its promise, represents no less than treason against our Association. The International knows but one type of members, all with equal rights and duties; the Alliance divides them into two classes, the initiated and the uninitiated, the latter doomed to be led by the former by means of an organisation of whose very existence they are unaware. The International demands that its adherents should acknowledge Truth, Justice and Morality as the basis of their conduct; the Alliance obliges its supporters to hide from the uninitiated members of the International the existence of the secret organisation, the motives and the aim of their words and deeds. The General Council had already announced in its private circular that at the coming Congress it would demand an inquiry into this Alliance, which is a veritable conspiracy against the International. The General Council is also aware of the measures taken by the Spanish Federal Council on the insistence of the men of the Alliance in the interests of their society, and is determined to put an end to this underhand dealing. With this end in view, it requests from you for the report it will be presenting at the Hague Congress:

1) a list of all the members of the Alliance in Spain, with indication of the functions they fulfil in the International;
2) information about the nature and activities of the Alliance, and also about its organisation and ramifications outside Spain;
3) a copy of your private circular of July 7;
4) an explanation of how you reconcile your duties towards the International with the presence in your Council of at least three notorious members of the Alliance.

Unless it receives a categoric and exhaustive answer by return, the General Council will be obliged to denounce you publicly in Spain and abroad for having violated the spirit and the letter of the General Rules, and having betrayed the International in the interests of a secret society that is not only alien but hostile to it.

Greetings and fraternity.
On behalf of the General Council
Secretary for Spain,

Frederick Engels

33, Rathbone Place, W.
London, July 24, 1872

a Federación Regional Española. Circular reservada, Valencia, July 7. 1872.—Ed.
The Spanish Federal Council replied to the inquiries of the General Council in a letter dated “Valencia, August 1”, and received in London on August 5. It ran as follows:

“Comrades, we have received your last letter, but as it is in French we are unable to acquaint ourselves with its contents since our usual translator is not in Valencia. We have asked another comrade to translate it as soon as possible so that we can answer it.”

At its meeting of August 8, 1872, the Executive Committee of the General Council decided that pending the receipt of the requested information from the Spanish Federal Council, it was necessary to publish the above letter in order to move all the Spanish federations and sections to undertake their general inquiries into the existence, acts and aims of the Alliance secret society.

The Executive Committee of the General Council:

Leó Frankel, Corresponding Secretary for Austria and Hungary
J. P. McDonnell Ireland
F. Engels Spain and Italy
A. Serraillier France
Le Moussu America
Hermann Jung Switzerland
Karl Marx Germany and Russia

Chairman of the meeting
Walery Wróblewski, Secretary for Poland
Secretary of the meeting
F. Cournet, Secretary for Holland

Written on August 8, 1872
First published in La Emancipacion, No. 62, August 17, 1872

Printed according to the newspaper checked with the rough manuscript in French
Translated from the Spanish
Karl Marx

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

Sir,—In your issue of to-day I find a paragraph headed “The International”, containing, after “the Paris papers”, a pretended circular of the “Grand Council” of that Association, and bearing my signature as “General Secretary”.

I beg to state, in reply, that this document is from beginning to end a forgery. No such circular was ever issued by the General Council of the International Working Men’s Association, nor could I have signed anything of the sort as General Secretary, inasmuch as I have never occupied that position.

I request you to publish the above in your next number, and remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

Karl Marx

[London] 1, Maitland-park-road, N. W., Aug. 15 [1872].

First published in The Times, No. 27457, August 16, 1872
The Executive Committee, entrusted by the General Council
with temporarily carrying out all the administrative business of the Association,
in view of the New Madrid Federation’s letter of August 5, requesting its recognition by the General Council;
in view of the Spanish regional Federal Council’s resolution of July 16, refusing to admit the said federation;
considering that, formally, it would be absurd to share in this matter the attitude of a regional Federal Council, the majority of which are members of a secret society hostile to the International, and which the General Council intends opposing at the Congress;
considering that, essentially, the founders of the New Madrid Federation are the very people who were the first in Spain to dare disassociate themselves from this secret society called the Alliance of Socialist Democracy and disclose and thwart its schemes.
For these reasons,
the Executive Committee, on behalf of the General Council, has resolved to recognise the New Madrid Federation and enter into regular and direct relations with it.

London, August 15, 1872
In the name of the Executive Committee
Secretary for Spain,

Frederick Engels
The Bakuninists have now finally placed themselves outside the International. A conference (ostensibly of the International, in reality of the Italian Bakuninists) has been held in Rimini. Of the 21 sections represented, only one, that from Naples, really belonged to the International. The other 20, in order not to endanger their “autonomy”, had deliberately neglected to take all the measures on which the Administrative Regulations of the International make admission conditional; they had neither written to the General Council requesting admission, nor sent their subscriptions. And these 21 “International” sections decided unanimously in Rimini on August 6:

“The Conference solemnly declares to all workers of the world that the Italian Federation of the International Working Men’s Association severs all solidarity with the General Council in London, proclaiming instead, all the louder, its economic solidarity with all workers, and urges all sections that do not share the authoritarian principles of the General Council to send their representatives on September 2, 1872 not to The Hague, but to Neuchâtel in Switzerland in order to open the general anti-authoritarian Congress there on the same day.”

First published in Der Volksstaat, No. 68, August 24, 1872

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time
Frederick Engels

[ADDRESS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL
TO THE ITALIAN SECTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION
CONCERNING THE RIMINI CONFERENCE]^{162}

33, Rathbone Place, London
August 23, 1872

We have received a resolution, dated Rimini, August 6, from
the Conference of what claims to be the Italian Federation of the
International Working Men’s Association, breaking all solidarity
with the General Council in London and calling on its own
authority an anti-authoritarian Congress\(^a\) in Neuchâtel, Switzerland,
to which all sections of the same opinion are invited to send
delegates, instead of to The Hague, where the regular Congress of
the International is to be held.

It should be pointed out that of the 21 sections whose delegates
have signed this resolution, there is only one (Naples) which
belongs to the International. None of the other 20 sections has
ever fulfilled any of the conditions prescribed by our General
Rules and Regulations for the admission of new sections. An
Italian federation of the Working Men’s Association therefore
does not exist. Those who want to found it, form their own
international outside the great Working Men’s Association.

It will be the task of the Hague Congress to deliberate on these
usurpations.

In the name and by order of the General Council
Secretary for Italy,

Frederick Engels\(^b\)

---

\(^a\) The rough copy of the letter has “a so-called anti-authoritarian Congress”. — Ed.

\(^b\) In *Il Popolino* the letter begins with the address: “To the Turin Sections”; there is the postscript after the signature: “N.B. The letter containing the 25 lire
was not received.” — Ed.
Karl Marx

[RESOLUTION ON THE BEHAVIOUR OF MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL AT THE CONGRESS]^{163}

No member of the General Council should have the right to accuse another before the International Working Men's Congress until discussion of the election of members of the General Council.

Adopted at the sitting of the Sub-Committee on August 28, 1872

First published, in Russian, in Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1871-1872, Moscow, 1965

Printed according to the manuscript

Translated from the French
Karl Marx

REPORT OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL
TO THE FIFTH ANNUAL CONGRESS
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION,
HELD AT THE HAGUE,

FROM THE 2nd TO THE 7th SEPTEMBER 1872

[The International Herald, No. 27, October 5, 1872]

Citizens,—Since our last Congress at Basel, two great wars have changed the face of Europe: the Franco-German War and the Civil War in France. Both of these wars were preceded, accompanied, and followed by a third war—the war against the International Working Men's Association.

The Paris members of the International had told the French people publicly and emphatically, that voting the plebiscite was voting despotism at home and war abroad. Under the pretext of having participated in a plot for the assassination of Louis Bonaparte, they were arrested on the eve of the plebiscite, the 23rd of April, 1870. Simultaneous arrests of Internationalists took place at Lyons, Rouen, Marseilles, Brest, and other towns. In its declaration of May 3rd, 1870, the General Council stated:

"This last plot will worthily range with its two predecessors of grotesque memory. The noisy and violent measures against our French sections are exclusively intended to serve one single purpose—the manipulation of the plebiscite."

---

a The leaflet and Der Volksstaat have "working men" instead of "citizens".—Ed.
b In L'Internationale, La Liberté and other newspapers this sentence begins as follows: "When the empire demanded that France should sanctify its existence with a new plebiscite, the Paris members..."—Ed.
c "Manifeste antiplébiscitaire des sections parisiennes fédérées de l'Internationale et de la chambre fédérale des sociétés ouvrières. A tous les travailleurs français" published in La Marseillaise, No. 125, April 24, 1870, and as a leaflet in Paris, 1870.—Ed.
d K. Marx, "Concerning the Persecution of the Members of the French Sections" (cf. present edition, Vol. 21, p. 128).—Ed.
e Here the leaflet and Der Volksstaat have: "We were right."—Ed.
In point of fact, after the downfall of the December empire its governmental successors published documentary evidence to the effect that this last plot had been fabricated by the Bonapartist police itself, and that on the eve of the plebiscite, Ollivier, in a private circular, directly told his subordinates,

"The leaders of the International must be arrested or else the voting of the plebiscite could not be satisfactorily proceeded with."

The plebiscitary farce once over, the members of the Paris Federal Council were indeed condemned, on the 8th of July, by Louis Bonaparte's own judges, but for the simple crime of belonging to the International and not for any participation in the sham plot. Thus the Bonapartist government considered it necessary to initiate the most ruinous war that was ever brought down upon France, by a preliminary campaign against the French sections of the International Working Men's Association. Let us not forget that the working class in France rose like one man to reject the plebiscite. Let us no more forget that "the stock-exchanges, the cabinets, the ruling classes, and the press of Europe celebrated the plebiscite as a signal victory of the French emperor over the French working class."—(Address of General Council on the Franco-Prussian War, 23rd July, 1870.)

A few weeks after the plebiscite, when the imperialist press commenced to fan the warlike passions amongst the French people, the Paris Internationalists, nothing daunted by the government persecutions, issued their appeal of the 12th of July, "to the workmen of all nations", denounced the intended war as a "criminal absurdity", telling their "brothers of Germany", that

their "division would only result in the complete triumph of despotism on both sides of the Rhine", and declaring that "we, the members of the International Association, know of no frontiers."\(^{b}\)

Their appeal met with an enthusiastic echo from Germany, so that the General Council was entitled to state,

"The very fact that while official France and Germany are rushing into a fratricidal feud, the workmen of France and Germany send each other messages of peace and good will—this great fact, unparalleled in the history of the past—opens the vista of a brighter future. It proves that in contrast to old society with


\(^{b}\) "Aux travailleurs de toutes les nations", *Le Réveil*, No. 409, July 12, 1870.—*Ed.*
its economical miseries and its political delirium, a new society is springing up whose international rule will be peace, because its national ruler will be everywhere the same—Labour. The pioneer of that new society is the International Working Men’s Association.”—(Address of July 23rd, 1870.)

Up to the proclamation of the Republic, the members of the Paris Federal Council remained in prison, while the other members of the Association were daily denounced to the mob as traitors acting in the pay of Prussia.

With the capitulation of Sedan, when the second empire ended as it began, by a parody,¹⁶⁷ the Franco-German War entered upon its second phase. It became war against the French people. After her repeated solemn declarations to take up arms for the sole purpose of repelling foreign aggression, Prussia now dropped the mask and proclaimed a war of conquest. From that moment she found herself compelled not only to fight the Republic in France, but simultaneously the International in Germany. We can here but hint at a few incidents of that conflict.

[The International Herald, No. 28, October 12, 1872]

Immediately after the declaration of war, the greater part of the territory of the North German Confederation, Hanover, Oldenburg, Bremen, Hamburg, Brunswick, Schleswig-Holstein, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, and the province of Prussia, were placed in a state of siege, and handed over to the tender mercies of General Vogel von Falckenstein. This state of siege, proclaimed as a safeguard against the threatening foreign invasion, was at once turned into a state of war against the German Internationals.

The day after the proclamation of the Republic at Paris, the Brunswick Central Committee of the German Democratic Socialist Working Men’s Party, which forms a section of the International within the limits imposed by the law of the country, issued a manifesto (5th September) calling upon the working class to oppose by all means in their power the dismemberment of France, to claim a peace honourable for that country, and to agitate for the recognition of the French Republic.¹⁶⁸ The manifesto denounced the proposed annexation of Alsace and Lorraine as a crime tending to transform all Germany into a Prussian barracks, and to establish war as a permanent European institution. On the 9th September, Vogel von Falckenstein had the members of the Brunswick Committee arrested, and marched off in chains, a distance of 600 miles, to Loetzen, a Prussian fortress, on the Russian frontier, where their ignominious treatment was to serve
as a foil to the ostentatious feasting of the Imperial guest at Wilhelmshöhe. As arrests, the hunting of workmen from one German state to another, suppression of proletarian papers, military brutality, and police-chicane in all forms, did not prevent the International vanguard of the German working class from acting up to the Brunswick manifesto, Vogel von Falckenstein, by an ukase of September 21st, interdicted all meetings of the Democratic Socialist party. That interdict was cancelled by another ukase of October 5th, wherein he naively commands the police spies

"to denounce to him personally all individuals who, by public demonstrations, shall encourage France in her resistance against the conditions of peace imposed by Germany, so as to enable him to render such individuals innocuous during the continuance of the war".

Leaving the cares of the war abroad to Moltke, the King of Prussia contrived to give a new turn to the war at home. By his personal order of the 17th October, Vogel von Falckenstein was to lend his Loetzencaptives to the Brunswick District Tribunal, the which, on its part, was either to find grounds for their legal durance, or else return them to the safe keeping of the dread general.

Vogel von Falckenstein's proceedings were, of course, imitated throughout Germany, while Bismarck, in a diplomatic circular, mocked Europe by standing forth as the indignant champion of the right of free utterance of opinion, free press, and free meetings, on the part of the peace party in France. At the very same time that he demanded a freely-elected National Assembly for France, in Germany he had Bebel and Liebknecht imprisoned for having, in opposition to him, represented the International in the German Parliament, and in order to get them out of the way during the impending general elections. His master, William the Conqueror, supported him, by a decree from Versailles, prolonging the state of siege, that is to say, the suspension of all civil law, for the whole period of the elections. In fact, the King did not allow the state of siege to be raised in Germany until two months after the conclusion of peace with France. The stubbornness with which he was insisting upon the state of war at home, and his repeated personal meddling with his own German captives, prove the awe in which he, amidst the din of victorious arms and the frantic cheers of the whole middle class,

---

a 1870.—Ed.
b William I.—Ed.
held the rising party of the proletariat. It was the involuntary homage paid by physical force to moral power.

If the war against the International had been localised, first in France, from the days of the plebiscite to the downfall of the Empire, then in Germany during the whole period of the resistance of the Republic against Prussia, it became general since the rise, and after the fall, of the Paris Commune.

On the 6th of June, 1871, Jules Favre issued his circular to the Foreign Powers demanding the extradition of the refugees\textsuperscript{a} of the Commune as common criminals, and a general crusade against the International as the enemy of family, religion, order, and property, so adequately represented in his own person.\textsuperscript{172} Austria and Hungary caught the cue at once. On the 13th June, a raid was made on the reputed leaders of the Pesth Working Men's Union, their papers were seized, their persons sequestered, and proceedings were instituted against them for high treason.\textsuperscript{173} Several delegates of the Vienna International, happening to be on a visit to Pesth, were carried off to Vienna, there to undergo a similar treatment. Beust asked and received from his parliament a supplementary vote of £30,000,

"on behalf of expenses for political information that had become more than ever indispensable through the dangerous spread of the International all over Europe".

Since that time a true reign of terror against the working class has set in in Austria and Hungary. In its last agonies the Austrian Government seems still anxiously to cling to its old privilege of playing the Don Quixote of European reaction.

A few weeks after Jules Favre's circular, Dufaure proposed to his rurals a law which is now in force, and punishes as a crime the mere fact of belonging to the International Working Men's Association, or of sharing its principles.\textsuperscript{174} As a witness before the rural committee of enquiry on Dufaure's Bill, Thiers boasted that it was the offspring of his own ingenious brains, and that he had been the first to discover the infallible panacea of treating the Internationals as the Spanish Inquisition had treated the heretics. But even on this point he can lay no claim to originality. Long before his appointment as saviour of society, the true law which the Internationals deserve at the hands of the ruling classes had been laid down by the Vienna courts.

\textsuperscript{a} The leaflet and *Der Volksstaat* have "members" instead of "refugees".— *Ed.*
On the 26th July, 1870, the most prominent men of the Austrian proletarian party were found guilty of high treason, and sentenced to years of penal servitude, with one fast day in every month. The law laid down was this:—

The prisoners, as they themselves confess, have accepted and acted according to the programme of the German Working Men's Congress of Eisenach (1869). This programme embodies the programme of the International. The International is established for the emancipation of the working class from the rule of the propertied class, and from political dependence. That emancipation is incompatible with the existing institutions of the Austrian state. Hence, whoever accepts and propagates the principles of the International programme, commits preparatory acts for the overthrow of the Austrian Government, and is consequently guilty of high treason.

On the 27th November, 1871, judgment was passed upon the members of the Brunswick Committee. They were sentenced to various periods of imprisonment. The court expressly referred, as to a precedent, to the law laid down at Vienna.

At Pesth, the prisoners belonging to the Working Men's Union, after having undergone for nearly a year a treatment as infamous as that inflicted upon the Fenians by the British Government, were brought up for judgment on the 22nd April, 1872. The public prosecutor, here also, called upon the court to apply to them the law laid down at Vienna. They were, however, acquitted.

At Leipzig, on the 27th March, 1872, Bebel and Liebknecht were sentenced to two years imprisonment in a fortress for attempted high treason upon the strength of the law as laid down at Vienna. The only distinctive feature of this case is that the law laid down by a Vienna judge was sanctioned by a Saxon jury.

At Copenhagen the three members of the Central Committee of the International, Brix, Pio, and Geleff, were thrown into prison on the 5th of May because they had declared their firm resolve to hold an open air meeting in the teeth of a police order forbidding it. Once in prison they were told that the accusation against them was extended, that the socialist ideas in themselves were incompatible with the existence of the Danish state, and that consequently the mere act of propagating them constituted a crime against the Danish constitution. Again the law as laid down in Vienna! The accused are still in prison awaiting their trial.

The Belgian government, distinguished by its sympathetic reply to Jules Favre's demand of extradition, made haste to propose, through Malou, a hypocritical counterfeit of Dufaure's law.

\[1872.—\textit{Ed.}\]
His Holiness Pope Pius IX gave vent to his feelings in an allocation to a deputation of Swiss Catholics.

"Your government," said he, "which is republican, thinks itself bound to make a heavy sacrifice for what is called liberty. It affords an asylum to a goodly number of individuals of the worst character. It tolerates that sect of the International which desires to treat all Europe as it has treated Paris. These gentlemen of the International who are no gentlemen, are to be feared because they work for the account of the everlasting enemy of God and mankind. What is to be gained by protecting them! One must pray for them."

Hang them first and pray for them afterwards!

Supported by Bismarck, Beust, and Stieber, the Prussian spy-in-chief, the Emperors of Austria and Germany met at Salzburg in the beginning of September, 1871, for the ostensible purpose of founding a holy alliance against the International Working Men's Association.  

"Such a European Alliance," declared the North German Gazette, Bismarck's private moniteur, "is the only possible salvation of state, church, property, civilisation, in one word, of everything that constitutes European states."

Bismarck's real object, of course, was to prepare alliances for an impending war with Russia and the International was held up to Austria as a piece of red cloth is held up to a bull.

Lanza suppressed the International in Italy by simple decree. Sagasta declared it an outlaw in Spain, probably with a view to curry favour with the English stock exchange. The Russian government which, since the emancipation of the serfs, has been driven to the dangerous expedient of making timid concessions to popular claims today, and withdrawing them tomorrow, found in the general hue and cry against the International a pretext for a recrudescence of reaction at home. Abroad, with the intention of prying into the secrets of our Association, it succeeded in inducing a Swiss judge to search, in presence of a Russian spy, the house of Outine, a Russian International, and the editor of the Geneva Égalité, the organ of our Romance Federation. The republican government of Switzerland has only been prevented by the agitation of the Swiss Internationals from handing up to Thiers refugees of the Commune.

Finally, the government of Mr. Gladstone, unable to act in Great Britain, at least set forth its good intentions by the police terrorism exercised in Ireland against our sections then in course

---

a Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung.—Ed.
b Herald.—Ed.
of formation, and by ordering its representatives abroad to collect information with respect to the International Working Men's Association.

But all the measures of repression which the combined government intellect of Europe was capable of devising, vanish into nothing before the war of calumny undertaken by the lying power of the civilised world. Apocryphal histories and mysteries of the International, shameless forgeries of public documents and private letters, sensational telegrams, followed each other in rapid succession; all the sluices of slander at the disposal of the venal respectable press were opened at once to set free a deluge of infamy in which to drown the execrated foe. This war of calumny finds no parallel in history for the truly international area over which it has spread, and for the complete accord in which it has been carried on by all shades of ruling class opinion. When the great conflagration took place at Chicago, the telegraph round the world announced it as the infernal deed of the International; and it is really wonderful that to its demoniacal agency has not been attributed the hurricane ravaging the West Indies.

In its former annual reports, the General Council used to give a review of the progress of the Association since the meeting of the preceding Congress. You will appreciate, citizens, the motives which induce us to abstain from that course upon this occasion. Moreover, the reports of the delegates from the various countries, who know best how far their discretion may extend, will in a measure make up for this deficiency. We confine ourselves to the statement that since the Congress at Basel, and chiefly since the London Conference of September 1871, the International has been extended to the Irish in England and to Ireland itself, to Holland, Denmark, and Portugal, that it has been firmly organised in the United States, and that it has established ramifications in Buenos Aires, Australia, and New Zealand.

The difference between a working class without an International, and a working class with an International, becomes most evident if we look back to the period of 1848. Years were required for the working class itself to recognise the Insurrection of June, 1848, as the work of its own vanguard. The Paris Commune was at once acclaimed by the universal proletariat.

You, the delegates of the working class, meet to strengthen the militant organisation of a society aiming at the emancipation of labour and the extinction of national feuds. Almost at the same

---

a The leaflet and Der Volksstaat have "working men" instead of "citizens".—Ed.
moment, there meet at Berlin the crowned dignitaries of the old world in order to forge new chains and to hatch new wars.\footnote{181}

Long life to the International Working Men's Association!

Written in late August 1872

First published as a leaflet: Offizieller Bericht des Londoner Generalrats, verlesen in öffentlicher Sitzung des Internationalen Kongress, Brunswick, 1872, and in the newspapers: Der Volksstaat, No. 75, September 18, 1872; La Liberté, No. 39, September 29, 1872; L'Internationale, No. 195, October 6, 1872; La Emancipacion, Nos. 68 and 69, October 5 and 13, 1872; The International Herald, Nos. 27, 28 and 29, October 5, 12 and 19, 1872

Reproduced from The International Herald checked with the leaflet and newspapers
The Alliance of Socialist Democracy was founded by M. Bakunin towards the end of 1868. It was an international society claiming to function, at the same time, both within and without the International Working Men's Association. Composed of members of the Association, who demanded the right to take part in all meetings of the International's members, this society, nevertheless, wished to retain the right to organise its own local groups, national federations and congresses alongside and in addition to the Congresses of the International. Thus, right from the onset, the Alliance claimed to form a kind of aristocracy within our Association, or élite with its own programme and possessing special privileges.

The letters which were exchanged between the Central Committee of the Alliance and our General Council at that time are reproduced on pp. 7-9 of the circular *Fictitious Splits in the International*\(^a\) (appendix No. 1). The General Council refused to admit the Alliance as long as it retained its distinct international character; it promised to admit the Alliance only on the condition that the latter would dissolve its special international organisation, that its sections would become ordinary sections of our Association, and that the Council should be informed of the seat and numerical strength of each new section formed.

The following is the reply dated June 22, 1869, to these demands received from the Central Committee of the Alliance, which\(^b\) has henceforth become known as the "Geneva Section of

---

\(^a\) See this volume, pp. 86-89.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) Further the following is crossed out in the manuscript: "changed its name for the occasion".—*Ed.*
the Alliance of Socialist Democracy" in its relations with the General Council.

"As agreed between your Council and the Central Committee of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, we have consulted the various groups of the Alliance on the question of its dissolution as an organisation outside the International Working Men's Association... We are pleased to inform you that a great majority of the groups share the views of the Central Committee which intends to announce the dissolution of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy. The question of dissolution has today been decided. In communicating this decision to the various groups of the Alliance, we have invited them to follow our example and constitute themselves into sections of the International Working Men's Association, and seek recognition as such either from you or from the Federal Councils of the Association in their respective countries. Confirming receipt of your letter addressed to the former Central Committee of the Alliance, we are sending today for your perusal the rules of our section, and hereby request your official recognition of it as a section of the International Working Men's Association..." (Signed) Acting Secretary, Ch. Perron (appendix No. 2).

A copy of these rules of the Alliance may be found among appendices No. 3.

The Geneva section proved to be the only one to request admission to the International. Nothing was heard about other allegedly existing sections of the Alliance. Nevertheless, in spite of the constant intrigues of the Alliancists who sought to impose their special programme on the entire International and gain control of our Association, one was bound to accept that the Alliance had kept its word and disbanded itself. The General Council, however, has received fairly clear indications which forced it to conclude that the Alliance had never dissolved and that, in spite of its solemn undertaking, it existed and was continuing to function as a secret society, using this underground organisation to realise its original aim—that of domination. Its existence, particularly in Spain, became increasingly apparent as a result of discord within the Alliance itself, an account of which is given below. For the moment, suffice it to say that a circular drawn up by members of the old Spanish Federal Council, who were at the same time members of the Central Committee of the Alliance in Spain (see Emancipacion, No. 61, p. 3, column 2, appendix No. 4), exposed the existence of the Alliance. The circular, dated June 2, 1872
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a Further the words "from May of this year" are crossed out in the manuscript.—Ed.

b Further the following is crossed out in the manuscript: "finding it impossible to reconcile their duties within the International with their position as members of a secret society within its ranks, on June 2 they addressed".—Ed.

c Error in the rough manuscript. As is evident from what follows the circular in question was published a fortnight after that of June 2, 1872.—Ed.
and published in the *Emancipacion* (No. 59, appendix No. 5), informed all the sections of the Alliance in Spain that the signatories had dissolved themselves as a section of the Alliance and invited other sections to follow their example.184

The publication of this circular caused the Alliance newspaper, the Barcelona *Federacion* (No. 155, August 4, 1872), to publish the rules of the Alliance (*appendix No. 6*), thus putting the existence of this society beyond question.

A comparison of the rules of the secret society with the rules presented by the Geneva section of the Alliance to the General Council shows, firstly, that the introductory programme to the first document is identical to that of the second. There are merely a few changes in wording, as a result of which Bakunin's special programme is given more succinct expression in the secret rules.

Below is an exact table of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geneva rules</th>
<th>Secret rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art. 1</td>
<td>corresponds literally to Art. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 2</td>
<td>corresponds generally to Art. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 3</td>
<td>corresponds literally to Art. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts. 4. &amp; 5</td>
<td>correspond generally to Art. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 6</td>
<td>corresponds generally to Art. 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The secret rules themselves are based on the Geneva rules. Thus, Article 4 of the secret rules corresponds literally to Article 3 of the Geneva rules; Articles 8 and 9 in the Geneva rules correspond in abbreviated form to Article 10 of the secret rules, as do the Geneva Articles 15-20 to Article 3 of the secret rules.

Contrary to the actual practice of the Alliancists, the Geneva Article 7 advocates the "*strong organisation*" of the International and binds all members of the Alliance to "uphold ... the decisions of the Congresses and *the authority of the General Council*". This article is not to be found in the secret rules, but evidence of its original inclusion in these rules is provided by the fact that it is reproduced almost word for word in Article 15 of the regulations of the Madrid *sección de oficios varios* a (appendix No. 7) which also includes the programme of the Alliance.

It is, therefore, clear that we are dealing with one and the same society and not with two separate societies. At the same time as the

---

a Section combining various types of professions.— *Ed.*
Geneva Central Committee was assuring the General Council that the Alliance had been disbanded, and was admitted as a section of the International on the basis of this assurance, the ringleaders of this Central Committee led by M. Bakunin were strengthening the organisation of this same Alliance, turning it into a secret society and preserving that very international character which they had undertaken to abolish. The good faith of the General Council and of the whole International, to whom the correspondence had been submitted, was betrayed in a most disgraceful manner. Having once committed such a deception, these men were no longer held back by any scruples from their machinations to subordinate the International, or, if this were unsuccessful, to disorganise it.

Below we quote the main articles of the secret rules:

"1) The Alliance of Socialist Democracy shall consist of members of the International Working Men's Association and has as its aim the propaganda and development of the principles of its programme, and the study of all means suited to advance direct and immediate emancipation of the working class.

"2) In order to achieve the best possible results and not to compromise the development of social organisation, the Alliance shall be entirely secret.

"4) No person shall be admitted to membership if he has not accepted beforehand the principles of the programme completely and sincerely, etc.

"5) The Alliance shall do its utmost to exert from within its influence on the local workers' federation in order to prevent the latter from embarking on a reactionary or anti-revolutionary course.

"6) Any member may be dismissed from membership of the Alliance on a majority decision without any reason being given."

Thus, the Alliance is a secret society formed within the International itself, having a programme of its own differing widely from that of the International, a society which has as its aim the propaganda of that programme which it considers to be the only true revolutionary one. The society binds its members to act in such a way inside their local federation of the International as to prevent it from embarking on a reactionary or anti-revolutionary course, i.e., from the slightest deviation from the programme of the Alliance. In other words, the aim of the Alliance is to impose its sectarian programme on the whole International by means of its secret organisation. This can be most effectively achieved by taking over the local and Federal Councils and the General Council, using the power of a secret organisation to elect members of the Alliance to these bodies. This was precisely what the Alliance did in cases where it felt that it had a good chance of success, as we shall see below.

* In the manuscript mistakenly: "9".—*Ed.
Clearly no one would wish to hold it against the Alliancists for propagating their own programme. The International is composed of socialists of the most various shades of opinion. Its programme is sufficiently broad to accommodate all of them; the Bakuninist sect was admitted on the same conditions as all the others. The charge levelled against it is precisely its violation of these conditions.

The secret nature of the Alliance, however, is an entirely different matter. The International cannot ignore the fact that in many countries, Poland, France and Ireland among them, secret organisations are a legitimate means of defence against government terrorism. However, at its London Conference the International stated that it wished to remain completely dissociated from these societies and would not, consequently, recognise them as sections. Moreover, and this is the crucial point, we are dealing here with a secret society created for the purpose of combatting not a government, but the International itself.

The organisation of a secret society of this kind is a blatant violation, not only of the contractual obligations to the International, but also of the letter and spirit of our General Rules. Our Rules know only one kind of members of the International with equal rights and duties for all. The Alliance separates them into two castes: the initiated and the uninitiated, the aristocracy and the plebs, the latter destined to be led by the first by means of an organisation whose very existence is unknown to them. The International demands of its members that they should acknowledge Truth, Justice and Morality as the basis of their conduct; the Alliance imposes upon its adepts, as their first duty, mendacity, dissimulation and imposture, by ordering them to deceive the uninitiated members of the International as to the existence of the secret organisation and to the motives and aims of their words and actions. The founders of the Alliance knew only too well that the vast majority of uninitiated members of the International would never consciously submit to such an organisation were they aware of its existence. This is why they made it "entirely secret". For it is essential to emphasise that the secret nature of this Alliance is not aimed at eluding government vigilance, otherwise it would not have begun its existence as a public society; this secret nature had as its sole aim the deception of the uninitiated members of the

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{Further the word "openly" is crossed out in the manuscript.---Ed.} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{Further the words "and Regulations" are crossed out in the manuscript.---Ed.} \\
\text{c} & \quad \text{Further the following is crossed out in the manuscript: "as the facts have shown".---Ed.}
\end{align*}\]
International, proof of which is the base way in which the Alliance deceived the General Council. Thus we are dealing with a genuine conspiracy against the International. For the first time in the history of the working-class struggle, we stumble upon a secret conspiracy plotted in the midst of the working class, and intended to undermine, not the existing exploiting regime, but the very Association in which that regime finds its fiercest opponent.

Moreover, it would be ludicrous to assert that a society has made itself secret in order to protect itself from the persecution of existing governments, when that same society is everywhere advocating the emasculating doctrine of complete abstention from political action and states in its programme (Article 3, preamble to the secret rules) that it

"rejects any revolutionary action which does not have as its immediate and direct aim the triumph of the workers' cause over capital".

How then has this secret society acted within the International?

The reply to this question is already given in part in the private circular of the General Council entitled Fictitious Splits etc. But due to the fact that the General Council was not yet at that time aware of the actual size of the secret organisation, and in view of the many important events which have taken place subsequently, this reply can be regarded only as most incomplete.

Let it be said right from the start that the activities of the Alliance fall into two distinct phases. The first is characterised by the assumption that it would be successful in gaining control of the General Council and thereby securing supreme direction of our Association. It was at this stage that the Alliance urged its adherents to uphold the "strong organisation" of the International and, above all,

"the authority of the General Council and of the Federal Council and Central Committee";

and it was at this stage that gentlemen of the Alliance demanded at the Basle Congress that the General Council be invested with those wide powers which they later rejected with such horror as being authoritarian.

The Basle Congress destroyed, for the time being at least, the hopes nourished by the Alliance. a Since that time it has carried on

---

a Further the following is crossed out in the manuscript: "whose activities were reduced to local intrigue (described in detail in the private circular Fictitious Splits). It remained fairly quiet until the point ... when the London Conference re-affirmed the original programme of the International as opposed to that of the Alliance with its resolutions on working-class policy and sectarian sections." — Ed.
the intrigues referred to in the *Fictitious Splits*; in the Jura district of Switzerland, in Italy and in Spain it has not ceased to push forward its special programme in place of that of the International. The London Conference put an end to this misunderstanding with its resolutions on working-class policy and sectarian sections. The Alliance immediately went into action again. The Jura Federation, the stronghold of the Alliance in Switzerland, issued its Sonvillier circular—a against the General Council, in which the strong organisation, the authority of the General Council and the Basle resolutions, both proposed and voted for by the very people who were signatories to the circular, were denounced as *authoritarian*—a definition that, apparently, sufficed to condemn them out of hand; in which mention was made of "war, the open war that has broken out in our ranks"; in which it was demanded that the International should assume the form of an organisation adapted, not to the struggle in hand, but to some vague ideal of a future society, etc. From this point onwards tactics changed. An order was issued. Wherever the Alliance had its branches, in Italy and particularly in Spain, the authoritarian resolutions of the Basle Congress and the London Conference, as also the authoritarianism of the General Council, were subjected to the most violent attacks. Now there was nothing but talk of the autonomy of sections, free federated groups, anarchy, etc. This is quite understandable. The influence of the secret society within the International would naturally increase as the public organisation of the International weakened. The most serious obstacle in the path of the Alliance was the General Council, and this was consequently the body which came in for the most bitter attacks, although, as we shall see, the Federal Councils also received the same treatment whenever a suitable opportunity presented itself.

The Jura circular had no effect whatsoever, except in those countries where the International was more or less influenced by the Alliance, namely, in Italy and Spain. In the latter the Alliance and the International were founded simultaneously, immediately after the Basle Congress. Even the most devoted members of the International in Spain were led to believe that the programme of the Alliance was identical to that of the International, that this secret organisation existed everywhere and that it was almost the duty of all to belong to it. This illusion was destroyed by the London Conference, where the Spanish delegate, himself a

---

*a* *Circulaire à toutes les fédérations de l’Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Sonvillier, le 12 novembre 1871, Geneva, 1871.—Ed.

*b* *Anselmo Lorenzo.—Ed.*
member of the Central Committee of the Alliance in his country, could convince himself that the contrary was the fact, and also by the Jura circular itself, whose bitter attacks and lies against the Conference and the General Council were immediately taken up by all the organs of the Alliance. The first result of the Jura circular in Spain was the emergence of disagreements within the Spanish Alliance itself between those who were first and foremost members of the International and those who would not recognise it, since it had not come under Alliance control. The struggle, at first carried on in private, soon flared up in public at meetings of the International. When the Federal Council which had been elected by the Valencia Conference (September 1871) demonstrated by its actions that it preferred the International to the Alliance, the majority of its members was expelled from the local Madrid Federation, where the Alliance was in control. They were reinstated by the Saragossa Congress and two of them, Mora and Lorenzo, were re-elected to the new Federal Council, in spite of the fact that all the members of the old Council had previously announced that they would not recognise it.

The Saragossa Congress gave rise to fears on the part of the ringleaders of the Alliance that Spain might slip out of their hands. The Alliance immediately began a campaign against the authority of the Spanish Federal Council, similar to that which the Jura circular had directed against the so-called authoritarian powers of the General Council. A thoroughly democratic and at the same time coherent form of organisation had been worked out in Spain by the Barcelona Congress and the Valencia Conference. Thanks to the activity of the Federal Council elected in Valencia (activity which was approved by a special vote of the Congress), this organisation achieved the outstanding successes referred to in the general report. Moraga, the leading light of the Alliance in Spain, declared at Saragossa that the powers conferred on the Federal Council in the Spanish organisation were au-

---

a Further the following is crossed out in the manuscript: “its most active members”. — Ed.

b Further the following is crossed out in the manuscript: “meeting in Valencia”. — Ed.

c Further the following is crossed out in the manuscript: “The Congress had chosen Valencia for the seat of the Federal Council in the hope that it would prove to be neutral territory and that these disagreements would not break out afresh. However, three of the five members of the new Federal Council were henchmen of the Alliance and, as a result of co-option, their number increased to at least five. On the other hand, the Alliance, fearing lest the leadership [...]”. — Ed.

d See this volume, pp. 219-27. — Ed.
*thoritarian*, that it was essential to restrict them, and to deprive the Council of the right to accept or reject new sections and decide whether their rules were in accordance with the rules of the federation, in short, to reduce its role to that of a mere correspondence and statistics bureau. After rejecting Morago’s proposals, the Congress resolved to preserve the existing authoritarian form of organisation (see *Extracto de las actas del segundo congreso obrero*, etc., a pp. 109 and 110, appendix No. 8. The relevant evidence given by Citizen Lafargue, a delegate to the Saragossa Congress, will be of great importance).

In order to isolate the new Federal Council from the disagreements, which had arisen in Madrid, the Congress transferred it to Valencia. However, the cause of the disagreements, namely, the antagonism, which had begun to develop between the Alliance and the International, was not of a local nature. Unaware even of the existence of the Alliance, the Congress set up a new Council composed entirely of members of that society; two of them, Mora and Lorenzo, opposed it and Mora refused a seat on the Council. The General Council’s circular *Fictitious Splits*, which was a reply to the Jura circular, obliged all members of the International to make an open statement of their allegiance either to the International or to the Alliance. The polemics between *Emancipacion* on the one hand and the Alliance newspapers, the Barcelona *Federacion* and the Seville *Razon*, on the other, became increasingly virulent. Finally, on June 2 the members of the former Federal Council—the editors of the *Emancipacion* and members of the Spanish Central Committee of the Alliance—decided to address a circular to all the Spanish sections of the Alliance, in which they announced their dissolution as a section of the secret society and called on other sections to follow their example. Vengeance followed swiftly. They were immediately expelled again from the local Madrid Federation in flagrant violation of the existing regulations. Following this, they reorganised themselves into a New Madrid Federation and requested recognition from the Federal Council.

However, in the meantime the Alliancist element in the Council, strengthened by co-option, had gained complete control, causing Lorenzo to resign. The request of the New Madrid Federation met with a blank refusal on the part of the Federal Council, which was already concentrating all its efforts on ensuring the election of

---

*a* *Extracto de las actas del segundo Congreso Obrero de la Federacion regional Española, celebrado en Zaragoza en los días 4 al 11 de abril de 1872, segun las actas y las notas tomadas por la comisión nombrada al efecto en el mismo, Valencia, 1872.*—Ed.
Alliance candidates to the Congress at The Hague. To this end the Council sent a private circular to local federations dated July 7, in which, repeating the slanderous remarks of the *Federacion* concerning the General Council, it proposed that the federations should send to the Congress a single delegation from the whole of Spain elected by a majority vote, the list of those elected to be drawn up by the Council itself. (Appendix No. 9.) It is obvious to anyone familiar with the secret society existing within the International in Spain that such a procedure would have meant the election of Alliance men to attend the Congress on funds provided by members of the International. As soon as the General Council, which was not sent a copy of the circular, got to know of these facts, it addressed a letter dated July 24 to the Spanish Federal Council, which is attached as an appendix (No. 10). The Federal Council replied on August 1 to the effect that it would require time in order to translate our letter which had been written in French, and on August 3 it addressed an evasive reply to the General Council published in the *Federacion* (appendix No. 11). In this reply it sided with the Alliance. On receipt of the letter of August 1, the General Council had already published the correspondence in the *Emancipacion*.

It must be added that as soon as the secret organisation was discovered it was claimed that the Alliance had already been dissolved at the Saragossa Congress. The Central Committee had not, however, been informed to this effect (appendix No. 4).

The New Madrid Federation denies this, and it should have known. In general, the claim that the Spanish section of an international society such as the Alliance could dissolve itself without first consulting the other national sections is patently absurd.

Immediately after this the Alliance attempted a coup d'état. Realising that it would not be able to secure itself an artificial majority at the Hague Congress by means of the same manoeuvres employed at Basle and La Chaux-de-Fonds, the Alliance took advantage of the Conference held at Rimini by the self-styled Italian Federation in order to make a public announcement of the

---

a Further the following is crossed out in the manuscript: “this was the very moment when it received the first irrefutable evidence of the existence of the secret organisation”. — *Ed.*

b See this volume, pp. 211-13. — *Ed.*

c Further the following is crossed out in the manuscript: “at first trying to gain time under the pretext that the translation”. — *Ed.*

d See this volume, p. 216. — *Ed.*
split. The Conference delegates passed a unanimous resolution (see appendix No. 12). Thus the Congress of the Alliance stood in opposition to that of the International. However, it was soon realised that this plan had no chance of success. It was abandoned, and the decision was taken to go to The Hague, with the very same Italian sections, of which only one out of twenty-one belongs to our Association, having the audacity to send their delegates to the Hague Congress which they had already rejected!

Considering:

1) That the Alliance (the main organ of which is the Central Committee of the Jura Federation), founded and led by M. Bakunin, is a society hostile to the International, insofar as it aims at dominating or disorganising the latter;

2) That as a consequence of the foregoing the International and the Alliance are incompatible;

The Congress resolves:

1) That M. Bakunin and all the present members of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy be expelled from the International Working Men’s Association and be granted readmission to it only after a public renunciation of all connections with this secret society;

2) That the Jura Federation be expelled as such from the International.

Written in late August 1872
Printed according to the rough manuscript
Translated from the French
I propose to begin discussion of the second chapter of the Administrative Regulations concerning the General Council and, after that, of Articles 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Rules dealing with the same subject.

F. Engels

Submitted to the Hague Congress on September 6, 1872

First published, in Russian, in Gaagsky kongress Pervogo Internatsionala. 2-7 sentyabrya 1872. Protokoly i dokumenty, Moscow, 1970

Printed according to the manuscript

Translated from the French
We propose that the General Council for 1872-1873 be transferred to New York and be composed of the following members of the North American Federal Council: Kavanagh, Saint Clair, Cetti, Levièle, Laurel, F. J. Bertrand, F. Bolte, and C. Carl. It shall have the right to co-opt new members, but its total membership shall not exceed 15.


The Hague, September 6, 1872

Submitted to the Hague Congress on September 6, 1872


Printed according to the manuscript written by Marx

Translated from the French

---

[a] All the signatures are handwritten.— Ed.

Paul Ward, F. Engels.

La Haye
6 sept. 1872

R. Théophile, P. M. Donnell

S. Suphossi, J. S. Suphossi

M. Maxime, M. Malma, Prong

Facsimile of Marx's manuscript with a proposal to transfer the seat of the General Council to New York.
Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENERAL CONGRESS
HELD AT THE HAGUE

FROM THE 2nd TO THE 7th SEPTEMBER, 1872

I

RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE GENERAL RULES

The following article which resumes the contents of Resolution IX of the Conference of London (September 1871) to be inserted in the Rules after Article 7, viz.:-

Article 7a.—In its struggle against the collective power of the propertied classes, the working class cannot act as a class except by constituting itself into a political party, distinct from, and opposed to, all old parties formed by the propertied classes.

This constitution of the working class into a political party is indispensable in order to insure the triumph of the social revolution, and of its ultimate end, the abolition of classes.

The combination of forces which the working class has already effected by its economical struggles ought, at the same time, to serve as a lever for its struggles against the political power of landlords and capitalists.\(^a\)

The lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies, and for the enslavement of labour. The conquest of political power has therefore become the great duty of the working class.

Adopted by 29 votes against 5, and 8 abstentions.\(^b\)

---

\(^a\) The French edition has here "its exploiters" instead of "landlords and capitalists".—*Ed.*

\(^b\) The French text of the resolutions continues as follows:


"Voted against: Brismée, Coenen, Gerhard, Schweitzguébel, Van der Hout."
II

RESOLUTIONS RELATING TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS


Articles II, 2 and 6 have been replaced by the following articles:

"Article 2.—The General Council is bound to execute the Congress Resolutions, and to take care that in every country the principles and the General Rules and Regulations of the International are strictly observed.

"Article 6.—The General Council has also the right to suspend Branches, Sections, Federal Councils or committees, and federations of the International, till the meeting of the next Congress.

"Nevertheless, in the case of sections belonging to a federation, the General Council will exercise this right only after having consulted the respective Federal Council.

"In the case of the dissolution of a Federal Council, the General Council shall, at the same time, call upon the Sections of the respective Federation to elect a new Federal Council within 30 days at most.

"In the case of the suspension of an entire federation, the General Council shall immediately inform thereof the whole of the federations. If the majority of them demand it, the General Council shall convoke an extraordinary conference, composed of one delegate for each nationality, which shall meet within one month and finally decide upon the question.

"Nevertheless, it is well understood that the countries where the International is prohibited shall exercise the same rights as the regular federations.”

Article 2 was adopted by 40 votes against 4; abstentions, 11.¹

¹ The French text of the resolutions continues as follows:

"Voted for: Arnaud, Barry, J. Ph. Becker, B. Becker, Cournet, Cuno, Dereure, Dumont, Dupont, Duval, Engels, Farkas, Frankel, Friedländer, Hepner, Heim, Johannard, Kugelmann, Lafargue, Lessner, Le Moussu, Longuet, Lucain, MacDon-

"Abstained: Van den Abeele, Dave, Eberhardt, Fluse, Guillaume, Herman, Sauva, Marselau.

"The Congress officially decided to recognise as valid the votes of the delegates who could not attend the sitting because of their work in commissions. The following delegates voted for: Cuno, Lucain, Marx, Vichard, Walter, Wróblewski; 6 in all. Not a vote against.”

In Engels’ manuscript the following passage is crossed out: “As the resolution obtained more than two-thirds of the votes, according to Article 12 of the General Rules, it henceforth becomes part of the General Rules.” — Ed.
2. Contributions to be paid to the General Council:—With regard to the proposal, on the one hand to raise, on the other to reduce, the amount of their contributions, the Congress had to decide whether the actual amount of 1d. per annum, should be altered or not. The Congress maintained the penny by 17 votes against 12, and 8 abstentions.\

III

RESOLUTIONS RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONALISATION OF TRADES' SOCIETIES

The new General Council is entrusted with the special mission to establish International trades unions.

For this purpose it will, within the month following this Congress, draw up a circular which shall be translated and published in all languages, and forwarded to all trades' societies whose addresses are known, whether they are affiliated to the International or not.


"Voted against: Fluse, Gerhard, Splingard, Van der Hout.

"Abstained: Alerini, Coenen, Dave, Eberhardt, Guillaume, Herman, Morago, Marselau, Farga Pellicer, Schwitzguébel, Van den Abeele.

"Article 6—adopted by 36 votes against 6, abstentions, 16.


"Voted against: Brismée, Coenen, Fluse, Herman, Sauva, Splingard.


a The French text has "10 centimes" here and below.—Ed.

b The French text of the resolutions continues as follows:

"Voted against the contribution being altered: J. Ph. Becker, Brismée, Coenen, Cyrille, Dupont, Duval, Eberhardt, Eccarius, Farkas, Fluse, Gerhard, Herman, Hepner, Serraillier, Sorge, Swarm, Wilmot.


"Abstained: Alerini, Dave, Dereure, Guillaume, Marselau, Morago, Farga Pellicer, Schwitzguébel.

"The following delegates, obliged to leave The Hague before this question was discussed, handed in their vote in writing for the raising of the contribution: Arnaud, Cournet, Ranvier, Vaillant."—Ed.

The French text has here "societies of resistance" instead of "trades' societies".—Ed.
In this circular every Union\(^a\) shall be called upon to enter into
an International union of its respective trade.

Every Union\(^a\) shall be invited to fix itself the conditions under
which it proposes to enter the International Union of its trade.

The General Council shall, from the conditions fixed by the
Unions,\(^b\) adopting the idea of International union, draw up a
general plan, and submit it to the provisional acceptance of the
Societies.\(^c\)

The next Congress will finally settle the fundamental treaty for
the International trades unions.

(Voted unanimously minus a few abstentions, the number of
which has not been stated in the minutes.)

IV

RESOLUTIONS RELATING
TO THE ADMISSION OF SECTIONS\(^d\)

1. \textit{Section 2 (New York, French) of the North American Federation.}—This Section had been excluded by the American Federal Council. On the other hand, it had not been recognised as an independent Section by the General Council. It was not admitted by the Congress. Voted against the admission, 38; for, 9; abstained, 11.

2. \textit{Section 12 (New York, American) of the North American Federation.}—Suspended by the General Council.\(^e\)

In the course of the debate on the credentials of Section 12, the
following resolution was adopted by 47 votes against 0; abstentions, 9:

"The International Working Men's Association, based upon the
principle of the abolition of classes, cannot admit any middle class
Sections."\(^f\)

---

\(^a\) The French text has here "trades' society" instead of "Union".—\textit{Ed.}
\(^b\) The French text has here "societies" instead of "Unions".—\textit{Ed.}
\(^c\) The French text adds here: "which would wish to enter the International trades unions".—\textit{Ed.}
\(^d\) In the French edition, item 1 is preceded by the following text:
"The Mandate Commission was composed as follows: Gerhard (50 votes),
Ranvier (44), Roach (41), Marx (41), MacDonnell (39), Dereure (36), Frankel
(22)."—\textit{Ed.}
\(^e\) See this volume, p. 125.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^f\) After this the French text of the resolutions has:
"Voted for: Arnaud, J. Ph. Becker, Barry, Brismée, Courbet, Cuno, Coenen,
Dave, Dereure, Dietzgen, Dupont, Duval, Eberhardt, Fluse, Farkas, Frankel,
Section 12 was excluded by 49 votes against 0; abstentions, 9.a

3. **Section of Marseilles.**—This Section, quite unknown to the General Council, and to the French Sections in correspondence with the latter, is not admitted. Against the admission, 38; for, 0; abstentions, 14.

4. **Section of Propaganda and Revolutionary Action, at Geneva.**—This Section, which is but the resurrection of the (public) “Alliance de la Démocratie Socialiste”, of Geneva, dissolved in August 1871, had been recognised neither by the Romance Federal Committee nor by the General Council, which, indeed, had returned its contributions when sent by the Jurassian Federal Committee. The Congress resolved to suspend it till after the debate on the secondb Alliance. The suspension was voted unanimously, less a few abstentions not counted.

5. **New Federation of Madrid.**—The new Federation of Madrid was formed by the members of the previous Spanish Federal Council, after the old Federation of Madrid, in flagrant breach of the rules then in force, had expelled them for having denounced the conspiracy of the secret alliance against the International Working Men’s Association. They addressed themselves, in the first instance, to the Spanish Federal Council, which refused to affiliate the new Federation. They then addressed themselves to the General Council,c which took upon itself the responsibility of

---


a After this the French text of the resolutions has:


"Abstained: Alerini, Eccarius, Guillaume, Harcourt, Marselau, Morago, Farga Pellicer, Mottershead, Schwitzguébel."—*Ed.*

b The French text has “secret” instead of “second”. Further the following passage is crossed out in Engels’ manuscript: “Forced to stop its work right after this discussion, the Congress has not decided this question.”—*Ed.*

c In Engels’ manuscript the following passage is crossed out: “which recognised it without first asking the Spanish Federal Council, as is laid down in the Administrative Rules. In this case, the General Council was acting on its own
recognising it\textsuperscript{a} without consulting the Spanish Council, amongst whose eight members not less than five belonged to the Alliance.

The Congress admitted this Federation by 40 votes against 0; the few abstentions were not counted.

V

AUDIT OF THE ACCOUNTS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

The Committee appointed by the Congress for the auditing of the accounts of the General Council for the year 1871-72, was composed of the following citizens:—Dumont, for France; Alerini, for Spain; Farkas, for Austria and Hungary; Brismée, for Belgium; Lafargue, for the new Federation of Madrid and for Portugal; Pihl, for Denmark; J. Ph. Becker, for German Switzerland; Duval, for the Romance Swiss Federation; Schwitzguébel, for the Jurassian Swiss Federation; Dave, for Holland; Dereure, for America; and Cuno, for Germany.

The accounts submitted to this Committee were approved and signed by all its members excepting Dave, absent.

The accounts having been read, the Congress approved of them by a unanimous vote.

VI

POWERS ISSUED BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL,
AND BY FEDERAL COUNCILS

The Congress resolved, "To annul all powers issued, as well by the General Council as by any of the Federal Councils, to members of the International in such countries where the Association is prohibited, and to reserve to the new General Council the exclusive right of appointing, in those countries, the plenipotentiaries of the International Working Men's Association."

 Adopted unanimously, less a few abstentions not specially counted.

\textsuperscript{a} See this volume, p. 215.—\textit{Ed.}
The Committee charged with the inquiry regarding the (second) Alliance of Socialist Democracy, consisted of the citizens—Cuno (33 votes), Lucaïn (24), Splingard (31), Vichard (30), and Walter (29).

In its report to the Congress, the majority of this Committee declared that "the secret Alliance was established with rules entirely opposed to those of the International". It proposed:

"To exclude from the International Michael Bakounine, as founder of the Alliance, and for a personal affair."

"To exclude Guillaume and Schwitzguébel, as members of the Alliance.

"To exclude B. Malon, Bousquet* (Secretary of Police at Béziers, France), and Louis Marchand, as convicted of acts aiming at the disorganisation of the International Working Men's Association.

"To withdraw the charges against Alerini, Marselau, Morago, Farga Pellicer, and Joukowskii, upon their formal declaration that they no longer belong to the Alliance.

"To authorise the Committee to publish the documents upon which their conclusions were based."

The Congress resolved—

1. To exclude Michael Bakounine. Voted for, 27; against, 6; abstentions, 7. 
2. To exclude Guillaume. 25 for, 9 against, 8 abstentions. 

* The Committee was not acquainted with the fact that M. Bousquet, upon the demands of his Section, had already been excluded by a formal vote of the General Council.

---

a The French text has here "secret" instead of "second".—Ed.
b The French text of the resolutions continues as follows:

"Voted against: Brismée, Dave, Fluse, Herman, Coenen, Van den Abeele.

"Abstained: Alerini, Guillaume, Marselau, Morago, Sauva, Splingard, Schwitzguébel."—Ed.
c The French text of the resolutions continues as follows:

"Voted against: Brismée, Cyrille, Dave, Fluse, Herman, Coenen, Sauva, Splingard, Van den Abeele."
“3. Not to exclude Schwitzguébel. For exclusion 15; against 16; abstentions, 7.\(^a\)

“4. To refrain from voting upon the other exclusions proposed by the Committee. Adopted unanimously, minus some few abstentions.

“5. To publish the documents relating to the Alliance. Adopted unanimously, minus some few abstentions.”

It is to be noted that these votes upon the Alliance were taken after a great number of French\(^b\) and German delegates had been obliged to leave.

VIII

RESIDENCE AND COMPOSITION
OF THE NEXT GENERAL COUNCIL

1. Vote upon the change of residence of the General Council. Voted for the change, 26; against, 23; abstentions, 9.\(^c\)

2. The seat of the General Council has been transferred to New York, by 30 votes against 14, for London, and 12 abstentions.\(^d\)

\(^a\) The French text of the resolutions continues as follows:


“Voted against: Brismée, Coenen, Cyrille, Dave, Dereure, Dupont, Fluse, Frankel, Herman, Johannard, Longuet, Sauva, Serraillier, Swarm, Wilmot, Van den Abeele.

“Abstained: Alerini, Dereure, Friedländer, MacDonnell, Marselau, Morago, Farga Pellicer, Schwitzguébel.”—\(Ed.\)

\(^b\) The French text of the resolutions continues as follows:


“Voted against: Arnaud, B. Becker, Cournet, Dereure, Duval, Farkas, Frankel, Friedländer, Gerhard, Heim, Hepner, Herman, Lucain, Ludwig, Milke, Pihl, Ranvier, Schumacher, Splingard, Vaillant, Wilmot, Walter, Van der Hout.

“Abstained: Cyrille, Eberhardt, Fluse, Guillaume, Marselau, Morago, Farga Pellicer, Schwitzguébel, Alerini.”—\(Ed.\)

\(^c\) The French text of the resolutions continues as follows:


\(^d\) The French text of the resolutions continues as follows:

Page of the manuscript of the Hague Congress resolutions
3. The Congress resolved to appoint twelve members, residing in New York, to the General Council, with the faculty of adding them\(^a\) to that number. The following were elected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bertrand (German)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Carl (German)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolte (German)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>David (French)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel (Swede)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Dereure (French)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavanagh (Irish)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Fornaccieri (Italian)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Clair (Irish)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Speyer (German)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levièle (French)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ward (American)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX

PLACE OF MEETING OF NEXT CONGRESS

The proposition that the new Congress should meet in Switzerland, and that the new General Council should determine in what town, was adopted. There voted for Switzerland 15, for London 5, for Chicago 1, and for Spain 1.

X

COMMITTEE TO DRAW UP THE MINUTES

The following were appointed, without opposition:—Dupont, Engels, Frankel, Le Moussu, Marx and Serraillier.

\[
\text{Committee} \quad \begin{cases} 
E. \text{ Dupont, F. Engels, Leó Frankel,} \\
\text{Le Moussu, Karl Marx,} \\
\text{Auguste Serraillier}
\end{cases}
\]

London, 21st October, 1872

First published as a pamphlet: Réolutions du congrès général tenu à la Haye du 2 au 7 septembre 1872. London, 1872, and in the newspapers La Emancipation, No. 72, November 2, 1872, and The International Herald, No. 37, December 14, 1872

Reproduced from the text of The International Herald checked with Engels' manuscript and the pamphlet


"Abstained: Cyrille, Eberhardt, Gerhard, Guillaume, Johannard, Alerini, Marselau, Morago, Farga Pellicer, Sorge, Schwitzguébel, Van der Hout."

In the French text the number of the abstained is 13.—Ed.

\(^a\) The French text has here "three other members" instead of "them".—Ed.
In the 18th century the kings and potentates were in the habit of assembling at The Hague to discuss the interests of their dynasties.

It is there that we decided to hold our workers' congress despite the attempts to intimidate us. In the midst of the most reactionary population we wanted to affirm the existence, the spreading and hopes for the future of our great Association.

When our decision became known, there was talk of emissaries we had sent to prepare the ground. Yes, we have emissaries everywhere, we do not deny it, but the majority of them are unknown to us. Our emissaries in The Hague were the workers, whose labour is so exhausting, just as in Amsterdam they are workers too, workers who toil for sixteen hours a day. Those are our emissaries, we have no others; and in all the countries in which we make an appearance we find them ready to welcome us, for they understand very quickly that the aim we pursue is the improvement of their lot.

The Hague Congress has achieved three main things:

It has proclaimed the necessity for the working classes to fight the old disintegrating society in the political as well as the social field; and we see with satisfaction that henceforth this resolution of the London Conference will be included in our Rules.a

A group has been formed in our midst which advocates that the workers should abstain from political activity.

We regard it as our duty to stress how dangerous and fatal we considered those principles to be for our cause.

---

a See this volume, p. 243.— Ed.
One day the worker will have to seize political supremacy to establish the new organisation of labour; he will have to overthrow the old policy which supports the old institutions if he wants to escape the fate of the early Christians who, neglecting and despising politics, never saw their kingdom on earth.

But we by no means claimed that the means for achieving this goal were identical everywhere.

We know that the institutions, customs and traditions in the different countries must be taken into account; and we do not deny the existence of countries like America, England, and if I knew your institutions better I might add Holland, where the workers may achieve their aims by peaceful means. That being true we must also admit that in most countries on the Continent it is force which must be the lever of our revolution; it is force which will have to be resorted to for a time in order to establish the rule of the workers.3

The Hague Congress has endowed the General Council with new and greater powers. Indeed, at a time when the kings are assembling in Berlin and when from this meeting of powerful representatives of feudalism and the past there must result new and more severe measures of repression against us195; at a time when persecution is being organised, the Hague Congress rightly believed that it was wise and necessary to increase the powers of its General Council and to centralise, in view of the impending struggle, activity which isolation would render impotent. And, by the way, who but our enemies could take alarm at the authority of the General Council? Has it a bureaucracy and an armed police to ensure that it is obeyed? Is not its authority solely moral, and does it not submit its decisions to the Federations which have to carry them out? In these conditions, kings, with no army, no police, no magistracy, and reduced to having to maintain their power by moral influence and authority, would be feeble obstacles to the progress of the revolution.

Finally, the Hague Congress transferred the seat of the General Council to New York. Many, even of our friends, seemed to be surprised at such a decision. Are they then forgetting that America is becoming the world of workers par excellence; that every year half a million men, workers, emigrate to that other continent, and that the International must vigorously take root in that soil where the worker predominates? Moreover, the decision

---

a In place of this sentence *Der Volksstaat* has: “But this is not the case in all countries.” — Ed.
taken by the Congress gives the General Council the right to co-opt those members whom it judges necessary and useful for the good of the common cause. Let us rely on its wisdom to choose men equal to the task and able to carry with a steady hand the banner of our Association in Europe.

Citizens, let us bear in mind this fundamental principle of the International: solidarity! It is by establishing this life-giving principle on a reliable base among all the workers in all countries that we shall achieve the great aim which we pursue. The revolution must display solidarity, and we find a great example of this in the Paris Commune, which fell because there did not appear in all the centres, in Berlin, Madrid, etc., a great revolutionary movement corresponding to this supreme uprising of the Paris proletariat.

For my part I will persist in my task and will constantly work to establish among the workers this solidarity which will bear fruit for the future. No, I am not withdrawing from the International, and the rest of my life will be devoted, like my efforts in the past, to the triumph of the social ideas which one day, be sure of it, will bring about the universal rule of the proletariat.

First published in *La Liberté*, No. 37, September 15, 1872; *La Emancipacion*, No. 66, September 21, 1872; *Der Volksstaat*, No. 79, October 2, 1872

Printed according to *La Liberté* checked with *Der Volksstaat*

Translated from the French

---

*In Der Volksstaat the end of the sentence reads as follows: "which only fell because precisely this solidarity was lacking in the workers of the other countries".—Ed.*
TO THE EDITOR OF LE CORSAIRE

Dear Sir,

The Figaro of September 11 reproduces a conversation which I am alleged to have had with the correspondent of the Soir. The Figaro-type press can allow itself any calumny without anybody taking the trouble to point it out, but when the mercenary imagination of a correspondent goes so far as to put in my mouth grave accusations against my friends of the ex-General Council, I feel bound to say that he has violated all the rules of truth in daring to claim to have exchanged a single word with me.

I profit by this opportunity to let our friends and enemies know that I never dreamed of resigning from the International and that the transfer of the General Council to New York was proposed by me and several other members of the previous General Council.

It is false to report that Bakunin and his acolyte Guillaume were expelled as heads of a so-called federalist party. The expulsion of Bakunin and Guillaume was motivated by the creation within our Association of a secret society, the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, which claimed to direct the International to aims contrary to its principles.

The resolution of the London Conference on the political action of the working class was approved by the great majority of the Congress, and its insertion in the General Rules was voted.

---

a "On continue à ne pas voir...", Le Figaro, September 11, 1872. The article is signed "...".—Ed.

b See this volume, p. 243.—Ed.
The working-class public of The Hague and Amsterdam were most sympathetic towards the Congress. So much for the value of the reports in the reactionary press.

Yours sincerely,

Karl Marx

The Hague, September 12, 1872

First published in *Le Corsaire*, September 15, 1872; *Gazzettino Rosa*, No. 260, September 18, 1872; *La Emancipacion*, No. 66, September 21, 1872; *Il Popolino*, No. 19, September 22, 1872

Printed according to *Le Corsaire*

Translated from the French
Karl Marx

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY NEWS

Sir,—On my return from The Hague, I find that your paper attributes to me the intention of removing to New York, in the wake of the General Council of the I.W.A. In reply, I beg to state that I intend and always intended remaining in London. Months ago I communicated to my friends here in London, and to my correspondents on the Continent, my firm resolve not to remain a member of the General Council, or indeed of any administrative body whatsoever, as my scientific labours would not permit me to do so any longer. As to the distorted reports of the press about the proceedings of the Congress at The Hague, they will be set at rest by the impending publication of the official Congress Minutes.¹⁹⁷

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Karl Marx

Modena Villas,
Maitland Park, N.W.
September 17

First published in The Daily News, Reproduced from the newspaper No. 8235, September 18, 1872

The Congress comprised 64 delegates, sixteen of whom represented France, ten Germany, seven Belgium, five England, five North America, four Holland, four Spain, three the Romance Federation of Switzerland, two the Jura Federation of Switzerland, one Ireland, one Portugal, one Poland, one Austria, one Hungary, one Australia, and two Denmark. A number of them held mandates from two or three countries, so that the distribution given above is not quite accurate. According to their country of origin twenty of them were French, sixteen Germans, eight Belgians, six English, three Dutch, three Spanish, two Swiss, two Hungarian, one Polish, one Irish, one Danish, one Corsican. At no previous congress had so many nations been represented.

The verification of the mandates took nearly three days. The reason for this was that the affiliation of various Sections to the International was disputed. Thus No. 2 (French) Section of New York, which after taking part in the last congress of the American Federation subsequently opposed its decisions, was therefore expelled from the Federation by the American Federal Council. As it had not been recognised since then as an independent section by the General Council and its exclusion from the Congress had not been opposed, its delegate could not be admitted or its mandate acknowledged. (Administrative Regulations II, Articles 5, 6; IV, Article 4.)

The opposite was the case with the credentials of the New Madrid Federation. This comprised a number of workers who had

---

a A. Sauva.—Ed.
b Error in Der Volksstaat: "III, Article 4". See this volume, p. 12.—Ed.
been expelled from the old Madrid Federation under all sorts of pretexts and in flagrant violation of the local Rules. The real reason was that they had accused the secret society "The Alliance of Socialist Democracy" organised within the Spanish International of betraying the International. They consequently organised themselves into the New Madrid Federation and applied to the Spanish Federal Council for recognition. The Federal Council, adhering in the majority if not entirely to the Alliance, refused. The General Council, to whom they then applied, having recognised them as an independent Federation, they sent their delegate, whose credentials were disputed by the delegates of the Spanish Federation. In this case the General Council disregarded the prescriptions of the Administrative Regulations (II, 5), according to which it ought to have consulted the Spanish Federal Council before admitting the New Madrid Federation; it did not do this because, on the one hand, there was danger in delay, and secondly because the Spanish Federal Council had placed itself in rebellion against the International by openly siding with the Alliance.

The Congress approved the General Council's way of acting by a large majority, nobody voting against, and thus the New Madrid Federation was recognised.

A similar question arose in respect of the credentials of the Geneva "Section of Revolutionary Propaganda", which the General Council, on the request of the Geneva Romance Federal Committee, had not recognised. The credentials, and with them the whole section, remained suspended until the end of the Congress, and as the case could not be settled for lack of time, the section is still suspended.

The General Council's right to be represented by six delegates as at previous congresses was recognised after weak objections.

The four delegates of the Spanish Federation, who had not sent any subscriptions for the past accounting year, were not admitted until the subscriptions had been paid.

Finally, the delegate of the American Section No. 12, the one which caused all the scandal in New York (as related earlier in Der Volksstaat), was unanimously rejected after pleading a long time

---

a F. Engels, "The General Council to the New Madrid Federation", see this volume, p. 215.— 

b P. Lafargue.— 

c W. West.— 

d F. Engels, "The International in America", see this volume, pp. 177-83.—
for Section No. 12, and accordingly Section No. 12 ultimately
finds itself outside the International.

We see that under the form of verifying the mandates nearly all
the practical questions which had occupied the International for a
year were examined and settled. By a majority of from 38 to 45
against a minority of from 12 to 20, who mostly abstained
altogether from voting, every single action of the General Council
was approved by the Congress and it was given one vote of
confidence after another.

An Italian delegate had also arrived, Signor Cafiero, chairman
of the Rimini conference at which on August 6 four twenty-one
sections (twenty of which have not fulfilled a single one of the
conditions laid down by the Rules for their admission and hence
do not belong to the International) adopted a decision to break off
all solidarity with the General Council and to hold a congress of
like-minded sections on September 2, not at The Hague, but at
Neuchâtel in Switzerland.

They apparently changed their minds and Signor Cafiero came
to The Hague, but he was reasonable enough to keep his mandate
in his pocket and to attend the Congress as an onlooker, relying
on his membership card.

At the very first vote—the election of the commission to verify
the mandates—the assembly split into a majority and a minority
which, with few exceptions, remained a solid body till the end.
France, Germany, America, Poland, Denmark, Ireland, Austria,
Hungary, Portugal, the Romance Federation of Switzerland, and
Australia formed the majority. Belgium, the Spanish and the Jura
Federation, Holland, one French and one American delegate
formed the minority, which on most questions abstained entirely
or in part from voting. The English delegates voted dividedly and
unevenly. The core of the majority was formed by the Germans
and the French, who held together as though the great military,
government and state actions of the year 1870 had never
occurred. The unanimity of the German and French workers
was sealed on the second anniversary of the capitulation at
Sedan—a lesson for Bismarck no less than for Thiers!

When the matter of the mandates had been settled, came the
first urgent question—the position of the General Council. The
first debate at the public sitting on the Wednesday evening already
proved that there could be no talk of its abolition. The

\[ a \textsuperscript{a} \text{ Error in Der Volksstaat: "August 7".—Ed.}\]
high-sounding phrases about free federation, autonomy of sections and so on died away ineffectively before the compact majority who were obviously determined not to let the International develop into a plaything. The delegates of those countries where the International has to wage a real struggle against the state power, that is to say those who take the International most seriously, the Germans, French, Austrians, Hungarians, Poles, Portuguese and Irish, were of the view that the General Council should have definite powers and should not be reduced to a mere "post-box", a "correspondence and statistics bureau" as the minority demanded.

Accordingly, to Article 2, Section II of the Administrative Regulations, which reads:

"The General Council is bound to execute the Congress Resolutions",

was added the following, adopted by 40 votes for to 5 against and 4 abstentions:

"and to take care that the basic principles and the General Rules and Regulations of the International are strictly observed".

And Article 6 of the same section:

"The General Council has also the right to suspend any Section from the International till the next Congress" will henceforth read:

"The General Council has the right to suspend a Section, a Federal Council, or a Federal Committee and a whole Federation.

"Nevertheless, in the case of Sections belonging to a Federation, the General Council shall consult the respective Federal Council.

"In the case of the dissolution of a Federal Council, the General Council shall arrange the election of a new Federal Council within 30 days at most.

"In the case of the suspension of an entire Federation, the General Council shall inform thereof the whole of the Federations. If the majority of them demand it, the General Council shall convoke an extraordinary conference, composed of one delegate for each nationality, which shall meet within one month and finally decide upon the question." (36 for, 11 against, 9 abstentions.)

Thus the position of the General Council, which according to the previous Rules and Congress resolutions could have been doubtful, was made sufficiently clear. The General Council is the Association's executive committee, and as such has definite powers in respect of the Sections and Federations. These powers have not been really extended by the above-quoted decisions, they have only been formulated better and provided with such guarantees as will never allow the General Council to lose awareness of its...
responsibility. After this resolution there can be less talk of dictatorship of the General Council than ever before.

The introduction of these two articles into the Administrative Regulations satisfied the most urgent requirement. Owing to the short time available a detailed revision of the General Rules was dispensed with. Nevertheless, in this respect there still remained an important point to be discussed. Serious differences had arisen over the programme as regards the political activity of the working class. In the Jura Federation of Switzerland, in Spain and in Italy the Bakuninist sect had preached absolute abstention from all political activity, in particular from all elections, as a principle of the International. This misunderstanding had been removed by Resolution IX of the London Conference in September 1871; on the other hand, the Bakuninists had decried this resolution too, as exceeding the powers of the conference. The Congress clarified the matter once more by adopting the London\(^a\) Conference resolution by a two-thirds majority in the following formulation:

"In its struggle against the collective power of the propertied classes, the proletariat cannot act as a class except by constituting itself into a political party, distinct from, and opposed to, all old parties formed by the propertied classes. This constitution of the proletariat into a political party is indispensable in order to insure the triumph of the social revolution, and of its ultimate end, the abolition of classes.

"The combination of forces which the working class has already effected by its economical struggles ought, at the same time, to serve as a lever for its struggles against the political power of its exploiters.

"The lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies, and for the enslavement of labour. The conquest of political power has therefore become the great duty of the proletariat."

This resolution was adopted by 28 votes to 13 (including abstentions). Moreover, four French and six German delegates who had had to leave earlier had handed in their votes in writing for the new articles of the General Rules, so that the real majority amounted to 38.

This resolution has made it impossible for the abstentionists to

\(^a\) Error in Der Volksstaat: "English".—Ed.
spread the delusion that abstention from all elections and all political activity is a principle of the International. If this sect, the same one which from the very beginning has caused all the discords in the International, now finds it compatible with its principles to remain in the International, that is its business; certainly nobody will try to keep it in.

The next point was the election of the new General Council. The majority of the previous General Council—Marx, Engels, Serraillier, Dupont, Wróblewski, MacDonnell and others—moved that the General Council should be transferred to New York and the eight members of the American Federal Council appointed to it and that the American Federation should add another seven. The reason for this proposal was that most active members of the previous General Council had been obliged recently to devote all their time to the International, but were no longer in a position to do so. Marx and Engels had already informed their friends months earlier that it was possible for them to pursue their scientific work only on the condition that they retired from the General Council.

Others had similar motives. As a result, the General Council, if it were to remain in London, would be deprived of those very members who had so far been doing all the actual work, both the correspondence and the literary work. And then there were two elements in London both striving to gain the upper hand in the General Council, and in such conditions they would probably have done so.

One of these elements consisted of the French Blanquists (who, it is true, had never been recognised by Blanqui), a small coterie who replaced discernment of the real course of the movement with revolutionary talk, and propaganda activity with petty spurious conspiracy leading only to useless arrests. To hand over the leadership of the International in France to these people would mean senselessly throwing our people there into prison and disorganising again the thirty départements in which the International is flourishing. There were enough opportunities at the Congress itself for people to become convinced that the Internationals in France would put up with anything rather than the domination of these gentlemen.

The second dangerous element in London comprised those English working-class leaders in whose face Marx at the Congress had flung the words: it is a disgrace to be among these English working-class leaders, for almost all of them have sold themselves to Sir Charles Dilke, Samuel Morley, or even Gladstone. These
men, who have so far been kept down or outside by the compact Franco-German majority in the General Council, would now play quite a different role, and the activity of the International in England would not only come under the control of the bourgeois radicals, but probably even under the control of the government.

A transfer was therefore necessary, and once this was recognised, New York was the only place which combined the two necessary conditions: security for the Association's archives and an international composition of the General Council itself. It took some pains to carry this transfer through; this time the Belgians separated from the minority and voted for London, and the Germans in particular insisted on London. Nevertheless, after several votings the transfer to New York was decided and the following twelve members of the General Council were appointed, with the right to increase the number to fifteen: Kavanagh and Saint Clair (Irishmen), Laurel (a Swede), Fornaccieri (an Italian), David, Levièle, Dereure (Frenchmen), Bolte, Bertrand, Carl, Speyer (Germans), and Ward (an American).

It was further decided to hold the next Congress in Switzerland and to leave it to the General Council to determine the place.

[Der Volksstaat, No. 81, October 9, 1872]

After the election of the new General Council, Lafargue, in the name of the two Federations he represented, the Portuguese and the New Madrid Federation, tabled the following motion, which was adopted unanimously:

"The new General Council is entrusted with the special mission to establish International trades unions.

"For this purpose it will, within the month following this Congress, draw up a circular which it shall have printed and send to all the working-men's societies whose addresses it possesses, whether they are affiliated to the International or not.

"In this circular it shall call upon the working-men's societies to establish an International trades union for their respective trades.

"Every society shall also be invited to fix itself the conditions under which it wishes to enter the International Union of its trade.

"The General Council is directed to collect all the conditions proposed by the working-men's societies which have accepted the idea and to work them up into general draft Rules which will be submitted for provisional acceptance to all the societies wishing to join."
“The next Congress will finally confirm this agreement in due form.”

In this way from the very beginning the new General Council was set an important task in practical organisation the solution of which might well alone suffice to give the allegedly dead International a hitherto unknown upswing.

Finally came the question of the “Alliance”. After working for a long time the commission which had to prepare this point for the Congress at last had its report ready on Saturday—a at 9 p.m. The report declared that the Rules and the aims of the Alliance were in contradiction with those of the International and demanded the expulsion of its founder, Bakunin, of the two leaders of the Jura Federation, Guillaume and Schweitzguébel, as the chief agents of the Alliance, and moreover of B. Malon and two others besides. It was proved to the majority of the commission that the Alliance was a secret society founded for conspiracy not against the government, but against the International. At the Basle Congress the Bakuninists had still hoped they would be able to seize the leadership in the International. That was why they themselves at the time proposed the famous Basle resolutions by which the General Council’s powers were extended. Disappointed and again deprived of the fulfilment of their hopes by the London Conference, up to the time of which they had won considerable ground in Spain and Italy, they changed their tactics. The Jura Federation, which was entirely under the control of the Alliance, issued its Sonvillier circular in which the Basle resolutions once proposed by their own delegates were suddenly attacked as the source of all evil, as inspired by the evil spirit, the spirit of “authoritarianism”, and in which complete autonomy, a free alliance of independent factions was put forward as the only aim for the International. Naturally. When a secret society formed for the purpose of exercising leadership over a bigger open society cannot directly achieve supreme leadership, the best means for it to achieve its purpose is to disorganise the open society. When there is no central authority and no national central agencies or only such as are deprived of all powers, conspiring intriguers can best ensure themselves the leadership of the whole indirectly, by their concerted action. The members of the Alliance of the Jura, Spain and Italy acted with great unanimity according to this plan and the disorganisation was to be carried so far at the Hague Congress that not only the General Council, but all central

---

*a* September 7, 1872.—*Ed.*
agencies, all the Congress resolutions and even the General Rules, with the exception of the Preamble, were to be abolished. The Italians had already included this in their Rules, and the Jura delegates had received definite instructions to propose this to the Congress and to withdraw in the event of its not being adopted. But they were grossly mistaken. Original documents were laid before the commission proving the link between all these intrigues in Spain, Italy and Switzerland, making it clear that the secret link lay precisely in the “Alliance” itself, whose slogan was provided by Bakunin and to which Guillaume and Schwitzguébel belonged. In Spain, where the Alliance had long been an open secret, it had been dissolved, as the delegates from that country belonging to it assured, and on these repeated assurances they were not subjected to disciplinary measures.

The debate on this question was heated. The members of the “Alliance” did all they could to draw out the matter, for at midnight the lease of the hall expired and the Congress had to be closed. The behaviour of the members of the Alliance could not but dispel all doubt as to the existence and the ultimate aim of their conspiracy. Finally the majority succeeded in having the two main accused who were present—Guillaume and Schwitzguébel—take the floor; immediately after their defence the voting took place. Bakunin and Guillaume were expelled from the International, Schwitzguébel escaped this fate, owing to his personal popularity, by a small majority; then it was decided to amnesty the others.

These expulsions constitute an open declaration of war by the International to the “Alliance” and the whole of Mr. Bakunin’s sect. Like every other shade of proletarian socialism Bakunin’s sect was admitted in the International on the general condition of maintaining peace and observing the Rules and the Congress resolutions. Instead of doing so, this sect led by dogmatic members of the bourgeoisie having more ambition than ability tried to impose its own narrow-minded programme on the whole of the International, violated the Rules and the Congress resolutions and finally declared them to be authoritarian trash which no true revolutionary need be bound by. The almost incomprehensible patience with which the General Council put up with the intrigues and calumny of the small band of mischief-makers was rewarded only with the reproach of dictatorial behaviour. Now at last the Congress has spoken out, and clearly enough at that. Just as clear will be the language of the documents concerning the Alliance and Mr. Bakunin’s doings in general which the Commission will publish
in accordance with the Congress decision.⁹ Then people will see what
villainies the International was to be misused for.

Immediately after the voting a statement of the minority was
read out, signed jointly by the Jura, Belgian, Dutch and four
Spanish delegates, and also by one French and one American
delegate, declaring that after the rejection of all their proposals
they were still willing to remain in touch with the General Council
as regards statistics and correspondence and the payment of
subscriptions, but would suffer no interference by the General
Council in the internal life of the Federations. In the event of such
interference by the General Council all the undersigned Federations
would declare their solidarity with the Federation concerned,
such interference being justifiable only in blatant violation of the
Rules adopted by the Geneva Congress.

The signatories of this statement thus declare themselves to be
bound only by the Geneva Rules of 1866, but not by the
subsequent alterations and Congress decisions. But they are
forgetting that the Geneva Rules themselves acknowledge the
binding force of all Congress decisions and thus the whole of their
reservation falls to pieces. For the rest, this document signifies
absolutely nothing and was received by the Congress with the
indifference it deserves. The signatories exceeded their powers
inasmuch as they wish

1. to oblige their respective Federations to set up a separate
alliance²⁹² within the International and

2. to oblige these Federations to acknowledge only the Geneva
Rules as being valid and to invalidate all other, subsequent
Congress decisions.

The whole document, apparently forced on the duped minority
only by the Alliance blusterers, is therefore worthless. And if a
Section or a Federation were to try to contest the validity of the
International's Congress decisions collected in our Rules and
Administrative Regulations, the new General Council will not
hesitate to do its duty as the old one did in respect of American
Section No. 12. That is still a long way off for the separate
alliance.

We note further that in the course of the same afternoon
(Saturday) the General Council's accounts for the past financial
year were audited, found correct and approved.

After yet another address from the Hague Section to the

---

⁹ K. Marx, F. Engels, "The Alliance of Socialist Democracy and the
International Working Men's Association" (see this volume, pp. 454-580).—Ed
Congress had been read out the Congress was closed at half-past midnight with shouts of: “Long live the International Working Men’s Association!”

Written after September 17, 1872
First published in Der Volksstaat, Nos. 78 and 81, September 28 and October 9, 1872

Printed according to the newspaper
Dear Bignami,

From September 2 to 7, the 64 delegates of the International Working Men's Association held their sittings at The Hague. Of these delegates 16 represented France; 10, Germany; 7, Belgium; 5, England; 5, America; 4, Holland; 4, Spain; 3, the Romance Federation (Switzerland); 2, the Jura Federation (idem); 1, Ireland; 1, Austria; 1, Hungary; 1, Poland; 1, Portugal; 1, Australia; and 2, Denmark. According to nationalities there were: 20 Frenchmen, 16 Germans, 8 Belgians, 6 Englishmen, 1 Pole, 1 Irishman, 1 Corsican, and 1 Dane.

The verification of the mandates took more than two days. In this form, all the internal questions which had occupied the International since the last Congress were examined, and in almost every case it was a question of the General Council's activity.

Of the three mandates held by Citizen Lafargue, representing Portugal and two Spanish local federations, one, that of the New Madrid Federation, was contested by the other Spanish delegates. The New Madrid Federation, formed by members of the International arbitrarily expelled from the old federation in violation of the General Rules, had not been recognised by the Spanish Federal Council; it had then applied directly to the General Council in London, which had recognised it.¹

The Congress unanimously confirmed that decision.

The six delegates whom the General Council had sent, basing itself on the action of previous congresses, and who, by the way, with one exception, were also provided with other mandates, were

¹ See this volume, p. 215.—*Ed.*
admitted. The mandate of the delegate sent by the Section of Propaganda and Revolutionary Action of Geneva, a section not recognised by the General Council, was suspended for the whole duration of the Congress, and the section was not recognised. The four delegates of the Spanish Federation were not admitted until they had paid the subscriptions they were owing to the General Council for the year 1871-1872. And finally, the delegate of Section No. 12 of New York, b which had been suspended by the General Council, was not admitted to the Congress, despite a speech which lasted more than an hour. All these decisions, adopted by a majority of three quarters of the votes, were at the same time expressions of confidence in the General Council, whose “authoritarian” action (as some are pleased to call it) was entirely approved by the immense majority of the Congress.

After these discussions, which smoothed out many differences which had arisen within the International, and which were therefore by no means without profit, the question of the General Council was posed. Was it necessary to abolish it? In the event of its being preserved, was it to retain its powers, or was it to be reduced to a mere correspondence and statistics bureau, a boîte aux lettres, c so to speak? The answer of the Congress left no doubt on this score: Article 2, Section II of the Administrative Regulations was formulated as follows:

“The General Council is bound to execute the Congress resolutions.”

To this the Congress at The Hague added:

“and to take care that in every country the principles and the General Rules and Regulations of the International are strictly observed” (40 votes for this addition, 5 against, and 11 abstentions).

Article 6 of the same section, which confers on the General Council the right to suspend a section, was formulated as follows:

“Article 6. The General Council has also the right to suspend sections, federal councils or committees, and federations of the International, till the meeting of the next Congress.

“Nevertheless, in the case of sections belonging to a federation, the General Council will exercise this right only after having consulted the respective Federal Council [...]”

---

a N. Zhukovsky.— Ed.
b W. West.— Ed.
c Letter-box.— Ed.
d Engels omits one paragraph from the Hague Congress Resolution on Article 6, Section II of the Administrative Regulations (cf. this volume, p. 244).— Ed.
"In the case of the suspension of an entire federation, the General Council shall immediately inform thereof all federations. If the majority of them demand it, the General Council shall convene an extraordinary conference, composed of one delegate for each nationality, which shall meet within one month and finally decide upon the question.

"Nevertheless, it is well understood that the countries where the International is prohibited shall exercise the same rights as the regular federations."

It is clear that this new article of the Regulations defining with great clarity the powers of the General Council, contains the necessary guarantees against their abuse.

The Congress declared its will that the General Council should be invested with authority, but responsible. This article was adopted by a majority of 36 votes to 11 with 9 abstentions.

Then came the question of the new General Council. If the General Council, whose powers were on the point of expiring, wished to be re-elected as a whole or partially, it was sure of an almost unanimous vote, since the Belgians and the Dutch had separated from the minority on this question and voted for London. A proof that Marx, Engels, Serraillier, Wróblewski, Dupont, and the other members of the previous Council had by no means demanded wider and better defined powers of the General Council for themselves personally was their motion that the General Council should be transferred to New York, this being the only place, besides London, where the principal conditions were ensured, namely safety of the archives and the international character of the Council's composition. Of all the proposals moved by the previous Council, this was the only one which encountered any difficulty, since all the delegates, with the exception of the Jura Federation representatives and the Spaniards, agreed to leave the direction of the International in the same hands as it had been before. Only after the most active and well-known members of the previous Council had stated that they declined to be re-elected, was the transfer to New York adopted by a majority vote. The Congress went on to the election of the New Council, which was composed of 2 Irishmen, 1 Swede, 1 Italian, 3 Frenchmen, 1 American, and 4 Germans, with the right to co-opt three other members.

It is known that Resolution IX of the London Conference (September 1871) on the political action of the working class was vigorously opposed as being allegedly contrary to the principles of the International by the Jurassians, some of the Spaniards and the
majority of the Italians. Nevertheless, that resolution now constitutes Article 8\(^a\) of the General Rules of the International, which is as follows:

"Article 8. In its struggle against the collective power of the propertied classes, the proletariat cannot act as a class except by constituting itself into a political party, distinct from, and opposed to, all old parties formed by the propertied classes.

"This constitution of the proletariat into a political party is indispensable in order to insure the triumph of the social revolution, and of its ultimate end, the abolition of classes. The combination of forces which the working class has already effected by its economical struggles ought, at the same time, to serve as a lever for its struggles against the political power of its exploiters. The lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies, and for the enslavement of labour. The conquest of political power has therefore become the great duty of the proletariat."

This resolution was adopted by 28 votes to 13 (counting the abstentions), and as the majority exceeded two-thirds, this resolution has been included in the General Rules. To this majority we must also add the votes of 6 German and 4 French delegates who were obliged to leave The Hague and had left their vote in writing for the resolution; thus abstention from politics was condemned by a majority of three-quarters of the votes to one quarter.

There remained only one important question. The General Council had denounced to the Congress the existence within the International of a secret society directed not against the existing governments, but against our Association itself. The members of this secret society, headed by its founder, Mikhail Bakunin, were divided into three categories according to the degree of their initiation. It set itself the aim of seizing the central leadership of the International, or, failing that, to disorganise it in order thus the better to ensure their own influence. With this objective, slogans on the autonomy of sections and resistance to the "authoritarian" tendencies of the General Council were spread.

---

\(^a\) Under this number the article entered the draft of the General Rules and Administrative Regulations formulated by the General Council in the summer of 1872 (cf. this volume, p. 201). The Hague Congress included it into the General Rules under No. 7a.— Ed.

\(^b\) Cf. this volume, p. 243.— Ed.
The Congress appointed a commission to investigate the question of this society, and its report was read out at the closing sitting. The report contained proof of the existence of this secret society and of its hostile character. The report ended with a motion to expel from the International Bakunin, Guillaume, Schwitzguébel, Malon and two others.

The conclusions of this report concerning the Alliance were accepted by the Congress; as for the individuals, Bakunin and Guillaume were expelled, Schwitzguébel was saved by a small minority, and the others were amnestied.

These were the principal decisions of the Hague Congress; they are definite enough, and at the same time extremely moderate. The General Council, supported by a majority of three to one, did its utmost to ensure for the new Council a clear and well defined position, to establish with clarity the political programme of the International which had been placed in doubt by a sectarian minority and to eliminate a secret society which, instead of conspiring against the existing governments, conspired against the International itself. Then the General Council refused to have itself re-elected and had to go to great trouble for its resignation to be accepted.

The majority at the Congress was composed mainly of French, German, Hungarian, Danish, Polish, Portuguese, Irish, Australian and American delegates and the delegates of Romance Switzerland; the minority consisted of Belgians, Dutchmen, Spaniards, the delegates of the Jura Federation, and one American. The English delegates were divided in various ways at the voting. Not once did the minority (including the abstainers) exceed 20 out of 64 delegates; generally it numbered between 12 and 16.

There was one Italian delegate present, the chairman of the federation established at Rimini,\(^a\) but he did not submit his mandate; the Congress would certainly not have accepted it. He attended the sittings as a spectator.

On my return from The Hague, I found in the Mantua Favilla an article signed Atheist which disputed the correctness of the assertion that out of the 21 sections whose delegates signed the Rimini resolution, only one (that of Naples) belonged to the International.

“In saying further that only the Naples section is in order, the Big Council is lying. The Milan workers’ circle, the Girgenti society, that of Ravenna, that of

\(^a\) Carlo Cafiero.— Ed.
Rome, and the Turin section, which was the initiator, have long since paid the ten centesimi fixed by the General Rules."a

In order to make sure who is lying, the General Council or Mr. Atheist, it is sufficient to note that neither the Milan section nor that of Girgenti, nor that of Turin appear among the signatories of the Rimini resolution, and that the Rome section did not apply to the General Council until after that conference (and I believe it was not the same section which was represented at Rimini).

The Italian Internationals may rest assured that as long as an International, a Congress, a General Council, General Rules and Regulations exist, no section will be recognised by the Congress or by the Council so long as it refuses to recognise the conditions fixed by the General Rules and Regulations, which are the same for all.

Frederick Engels

First published in La Plebe, No. 106, October 5, 1872
Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the Italian

---
a [C. Terzaghi,] "Correspondence from Turin", La Favilla, No. 184, September 3, 1872. Signed: “Ateo”.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

IMPERATIVE MANDATES
AT THE HAGUE CONGRESS

The betrayals of their electors committed recently by many deputies to parliament have caused the return to fashion of the old imperative mandates of the Middle Ages which had been abolished by the Revolution of 1789. We shall not discuss here the principle of such mandates. We shall only note that if all electors gave their delegates imperative mandates concerning all points on the agenda, meetings and debates of the delegates would be superfluous. It would be sufficient to send the mandates to a central counting office which would count up the votes and announce the results. This would be much cheaper.

What is important for us to show is the most unusual situation in which imperative mandates place their holders at the Hague Congress—a situation which can serve as a very good lesson to the enthusiastic supporters of such mandates.

The delegates of the Spanish Federation, elected, as we know, owing to the influence of the Federal Council, had an imperative mandate to ask

"that the votes be counted according to the number of those represented by the delegates holding an imperative mandate; that the votes of those represented by delegates not provided with an imperative mandate will not count until the sections or federations which they represent have discussed and voted on the questions debated at the Congress... In case the Congress persists in the traditional system of

---

*See this volume, p. 208. The mandate for the delegates of the Spanish Federation quoted below was published as a separate leaflet (Mandato Imperativo. In: Asociacion Internacional de los Trabajadores. Federacion Regional Española. Circular. Valencia. August 22, 1872).—Ed.*
voting, our delegates will take part in the discussion, but will abstain from voting."*

This mandate therefore demands that the Congress, before dealing with anything else, should adopt the following three decisions:

1. To change the articles of the Administrative Regulations dealing with the mode of voting.
2. To decree that delegates not holding an imperative mandate should not have the right to vote.
3. To declare that these changes would apply immediately to the present Congress.

It was immediately pointed out to the delegates of the Spanish Federation that even if the Congress adopted their petitions Nos. 1 and 2, petition No. 3 would be inadmissible. The Hague Congress had been called on the basis of certain of the Association's organisational rules. It certainly had the right to change them, but if it did change them, it would at the same time have destroyed the basis of its own existence and would have placed itself in the absolute necessity to dissolve itself immediately, after convoking a new congress, whose delegates would be elected on the basis of the new organisational rules. To apply these new rules to the present Congress would be to make them retroactive and to violate every principle of justice. Consequently, whether or not the Congress adopted proposals Nos. 1 and 2, it could by no means adopt proposal No. 3; and if the Spanish delegates had received and accepted a mandate which was in flagrant contradiction with itself, a mandate which made it impossible for them to vote at any session of the Congress, whose fault was it?

The case was so clear that neither the minority, nor even the delegates of our region, found words to contest it. Consequently they remained present at the Congress without voting, and this ultimately so much exasperated the Dutch that one of them asked:

* The Jura Bulletin, which is known to be the organ of the Alliance leaders, published in its latest issue a short account of the sessions of the Hague Congress, the authenticity of which can be judged by the following, which we translate word for word: "The Spaniards, who are supported by the Belgians and the Jurassians, demanded that the voting should be conducted not by individuals, but by federations." Is this what the mandate of the Spanish Federation demanded?

a [J. Guillaume,] "Le Congrès de la Haye", Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne..., No. 17-18, September 15-October 1, 1872.— Ed.

b Isaac Salomon Van der Hout.— Ed.
"Why didn't you stay at home if you have a mandate which forbids you to vote and deprives the minority of four votes every time a vote is taken?"

But for a real Alliance mandate and an Alliance way of using it, the Jura Federation had no peers.

Here is the mandate of its delegates:

"The delegates of the Jura Federation are given an imperative mandate to present to the Congress of The Hague the following principles as the basis of the organisation of the International:

"Any group of workers which accepts the programme of the International as it has been formulated by the preamble to the General Rules voted at the Geneva Congress, and which undertakes to observe economic solidarity in respect of all the workers and groups of workers in the struggle against monopoly capital shall be a section of the International enjoying full rights."

Here, indeed, the General Rules and Regulations are abolished. If the preamble is allowed to remain, that is only because, no conclusions being drawn from it, it is simply lacking in common sense.

"The federal principle being the basis of the organisation of the International," the mandate continues, "the sections federate freely among themselves and the federations federate freely among themselves, and do so with full autonomy, setting up, in accordance with their needs, all the organs of correspondence, statistics bureaux etc., which they deem suitable.

"The Jura Federation sees as a consequence of the above-mentioned principles the suppression of the General Council and of all authority in the International."

Thus, the General Council, the federal councils, the local councils, and various kinds of rules and regulations which possess "authority" are to be abolished. Each one will act as he thinks fit, "with full autonomy".

"The Jura delegates must act in complete solidarity with the Spanish, Italian and French delegates and all those who openly protest against the authoritarian principle. Consequently, refusal to admit a delegate of these federations must lead to the immediate withdrawal of the Jura delegates. Similarly, if the Congress does not accept the organisational principles of the International set forth above, the delegates will have to withdraw in agreement with the delegates of the anti-authoritarian federations."

Let us now see what use the Jura delegates made of this imperative mandate. In the first place, there were no French anti-authoritarian delegates at the Congress except one, a madman, who did, in fact, "withdraw" very noisily many times, but

---

a The mandate for the delegates of the Jura Federation to the Hague Congress was published in the Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne..., No. 15-16, August 15-September 1, 1872.— Ed.

b Victor Cyrille.— Ed.
always returned because he could never get a single other anti-authoritarian delegate to follow him. The mandate of Sauva of Section No. 2 (anti-authoritarian) of New York was annulled, but the Jurassians remained at the Congress. That of the Section of Propaganda and Revolutionary Socialist Action in Geneva—a section which belonged directly to the Jura Federation—remained suspended until the end of the Congress, and the Jurassians behaved as though nothing had happened. The mandate of Section No. 12 of New York which they themselves had encouraged to resist the General Council, was annulled, and the Jurassians remained undisturbed. As for the mandate of the Italian delegate that was present, they did not even attempt to present it.

But were the principles of organisation—or rather disorganisation—proposed by the Jurassians, adopted by the Congress? Not at all; exactly the opposite: the Congress decided to strengthen the organisation, that is, according to them, the authority. Did they withdraw after this? Nothing of the sort. They merely declared that they would abstain from voting in future.

So this was the proper way to use an imperative mandate. The delegate complies with it if it suits him and if not, he pleads unforeseen circumstances and ultimately does what is to his advantage. After all, is it not a duty for the anti-authoritarians to disregard the authority of imperative mandates just as all other authority? The radically Alliancist spirit which was so well revealed in the imperative mandate of the Jurassians was supplemented by the really anarchist manner in which they ignored that mandate. Does it not follow from this that these delegates are more initiated members of the Alliance than their Spanish counterparts?

The Jura mandate gives occasion for other reflections too. This mandate reveals on the whole the activities taking place in the Alliance, where, despite all the talk about anarchy, autonomy, free federation etc., there are in reality only two things: authority and obedience. A few weeks before Schwitzguébel and Guillaume wrote their own mandates, abolishing the General Rules except for the preamble, their friends, delegates, who did not belong to the International, at the Rimini Conference, drew up the rules of the self-styled Italian Federation, consisting of the preamble to the general rules and the regulations of the federation. Thus the

---

a See this volume, p. 246.—Ed.
b Ibid, p. 247.—Ed.
c Ibid, pp. 246-47.—Ed.
d Carlo Cafiero.—Ed.
organisation whose creation had been voted by the Rimini Conference rejected the General Rules. It is obvious that in their activities the men of the Alliance always obey secret and uniform orders. It was such secret orders that were undoubtedly obeyed by the Barcelona Federacion too, when it unexpectedly started preaching the disorganisation of the International. This was because the strong organisation of our Association in Spain was becoming a threat to the secret leaders of the Alliance. This organisation gives the working class too much strength and creates thereby difficulties to the secret rule of the gentlemen of the Alliance, who know perfectly well that fish are best caught in troubled waters.

Destroy the organisation, and the waters will be as troubled as you can wish. Destroy above all the trade unions, declare war on strikes, reduce working-class solidarity to empty words and you will have complete freedom for your pompous but empty and doctrinaire phrases. That is, if the workers of our region allow you to destroy the result of their four years of work, the organisation, which is, beyond doubt, the best in the whole of the International.

Returning to the imperative mandates, we still have one question to solve: Why do the Alliancists, who are inveterate enemies of the principle of authority in any form, so obstinately insist on the authority of imperative mandates? Because for a secret society like theirs, one existing within a public organisation like the International, there is nothing more convenient than the imperative mandate. The mandates of the Alliance members will all be identical, while the mandates of the sections not influenced by the Alliance or opposing it will contradict one another, so that very often the absolute majority, and always the relative majority, will belong to the secret society; whereas at a congress where there are no imperative mandates, the common sense of the independent delegates will swiftly unite them in a common party against the party of the secret society. This is an extremely effective means of domination, which is why the Alliance, despite all its anarchism, supports its authority.

Before finishing we must say that for the Spanish Federal Council, consisting of Alliancists, the most convenient form of action was the creation of a collective imperative mandate, a fact which was bound to lead to this mandate being the mandate of the Federal Council, or, what is the same, an Alliance mandate. All federations of our region that accepted the proposal of the Council contrary to the Regulations, sent extraordinary subscrip-
tions to Valencia to pay the travelling expenses of the delegates, 
and together with these subscriptions the results of the voting in 
each local federation, and together with the results of the 
voting—the imperative mandate of the federation, in order to 
“unite all the mandates and create a collective imperative mandate”. 
We readily admit that given a loyal attitude and good will, the 
Regional Council would have been able to count the votes of all 
the local federations, but to join in one the different opinions of 
all the federations, the Regional Council needed either supreme 
intelligence or a miraculous crucible in which it would probably 
have fused the various imperative mandates. And what came out 
of this new sort of crucible? What was bound to come out—the 
opinion of the Regional Council. We defy all the Alliancists to 
point out to us a chemico-electoral procedure which could 
produce another result.

The Spanish Federal Council, so anti-authoritarian, so anarchis-
tic etc., thus centralised subscriptions in its hands so as to send 
delegates to The Hague; it conducted the elections of those 
delegates itself, and did it so skilfully that only Alliancists were 
elected, and, to crown it all, it composed the collective imperative 
mandate, which, it maintained, expressed the will of the members 
of the International in Spain.

Greater respect cannot be paid to autonomy.

Written before October 4, 1872

First published in La Emancipacion, No. 69, October 13, 1872

Printed according to the newspaper

Translated from the Spanish
LETTERS FROM LONDON

II

[MORE ABOUT THE HAGUE CONGRESS]

London, October 5, 1872

I hope that the outcome of the Hague Congress will make our Italian "autonomous" friends think. They ought to know that wherever there is an organisation, some autonomy is sacrificed for the sake of unity of action. If they do not realise that the International is a society organised for struggle, and not for fine theories, I am very sorry, but one thing is certain: the great International will leave Italy to act on its own until it agrees to accept the conditions common to all.

In the secret Alliance of Socialist Democracy there are three grades: international brethren (a tiny number), national brethren, and mere Alliancists. C.\(^a\) is an international brother, just as Guillaume (chief of Bakunin's general staff) and one or two Spaniards.

Among the French delegates, five came from France under fictitious names, the others are refugees of the Commune. I attach the list, in which the names and localities of the French sections are not given so as not to betray them to the police.\(^b\) But we have re-organised in more than thirty of the French départements and the International there is stronger and more active than ever.

It was gratifying to see the French and the Germans always voting in agreement at The Hague: it was obvious that all the wars, the conquests, the national hatred did not exist for the International. It was this union of the French and the Germans that led to all the resolutions without exception being adopted.

The reason for the transfer of the General Council to New York was: 1. The firm determination of Marx, Serraillier, Dupont and

\(^a\) Carlo Cafiero.— Ed.

\(^b\) Liste nominale des délégués composant le 5-me Congrès universel, tenu à la Haye (Hollande), du 2 au 7 Septembre 1872, Amsterdam [1872].— Ed.
Engels not to accept a new mandate. Marx and Engels have scientific works to complete and have not had time for this in the past two years; 2. The certainty that in the event of their resignation a General Council in London would be composed as far as the French were concerned of Blanquist who, with their simulation of conspiracy, would lead to the arrest of the majority of our members in France—if they were accepted by these at all; as far as the English were concerned, of corrupt men used to selling themselves to the liberal bourgeoisie and to Mr. Gladstone’s radical agents; and as for all the other nationalities, they would not be represented at all, since Wróblewski, MacDonnell and Frankel did not want to remain on it without Marx and the others.

Whatever the bourgeois press may say, we were well received by the workers of The Hague. Once the reactionaries sent a handful of drunks to us to sing the Dutch national royal anthem after the ending of the sitting. We let them sing and, passing through them, replied with the Marseillaise. Even the minority at the Congress would have been sufficient to disperse them by force. At the last sitting, on the Saturday, a numerous public gave the speakers a lot of applause.

First published in La Plebe, No. 107, October 8, 1872
Signed: Federico Engels
“Our correspondence”

Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the Italian

---

a September 7.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

TO THE BRITISH FEDERAL COUNCIL,
INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION
[CONCERNING PORTUGUESE STRIKES]\a

122 Regent's Park Road. N.W.
London, 16th October, 1872

Citizens,

I had the honour of submitting to you, by citizen Dupont, at your
meeting of September 26, a communication addressed to me by the
Lisbon Federal Council regarding some trade matters of Inter-
national Sections there, which required immediate action here.\b I
have seen this communication published in The International Herald\b
but have not had any intimation that the Federal Council has taken
any further steps in the matter.

As I am bound to give an account to my Lisbon Correspondents
of what I have done on behalf of the parties interested, I hope the
Federal Council will be good enough to let me know whether
anything, and what, has been done by the Council with regard to
the subject in question.

I remain Citizens fraternally yours,

F. E.

---


Karl Marx

TO THE EDITORS OF DER VOLKSSTAAT

The leading article in No. 84 of the Volksstaat—"Vom Haager Kongress. III"—contains a factual error concerning me which I consider it necessary to rectify, and that, be it noted, only because it has slipped into the Volksstaat. If I considered it worth the trouble to rectify the lies, calumnies, infamy and even involuntary "errors" of the press which is hostile to me, I would not have a minute left for actual work!

The article cited says:

"Lafargue, far from being Marx's 'adjutant', abstained from voting when it was a question of expelling Schwitzguébel, Guillaume's comrade, although the motion for expulsion was tabled by Marx."

That motion was tabled by the commission of inquiry appointed by the Congress, not by me. What I proposed at the Congress was the expulsion of the Alliance and the appointment of a commission of inquiry for that purpose. I appeared in front of this commission, just like others, as a witness for the prosecution. Only towards the end of the inquiry, at the last moment, and indeed during a sitting of the Congress, was I called upon. Previously, one of the members of the commission had desired a private meeting with me to elucidate purely factual questions. I refused, in order to avoid even the appearance of any personal influence on the commission.

When I was questioned by the commission I did not say a word about Schwitzguébel or his bell-wether, Guillaume. I mentioned

---

a Of October 19, 1872; the article was written by A. Hepner.—Ed
only one of the Alliancists attending the Congress and expressed my conviction that either he was not a member of the “secret” Alliance or that in any case he had for a long time been excluded from it.

I voted at the last Congress sitting for Schwitzguébel’s expulsion because the proofs of his membership of the “secret” Alliance were exactly the same as those of Guillaume’s. In these circumstances, Schwitzguébel’s emotional poor-sinner’s speech could not shake my conviction. Let it be noted in passing that Mr. Guillaume lies—as incidentally every member of a “secret” society is obliged to do—intentionally in the Bulletin jurassienne when he avers that Schwitzguébel had declared solidarity with him. On the contrary. Guillaume stated with great emphasis that Schwitzguébel would stand or fall with him, but Schwitzguébel turned a deaf ear to this cry in extremis! His poor-sinner’s speech made no mention of Guillaume, and it was this poor-sinner’s speech that bribed the majority. As a member of the commission for publication of the Congress proceedings I naturally had to go very carefully into the official Minutes of the Congress.

In respect of Lafargue it must be noted that the honest Biedermann is lying when he designates him as delegate for Barcelona. Lafargue was delegated by the Portuguese Federal Council, the New Madrid Federation and also by a Spanish Section.

London, October 20, 1872

Karl Marx

First published in Der Volksstaat, No. 86, October 26, 1872

Printed according to the newspaper

---

a Tomás Morago.—Ed.
b [J. Guillaume,] “Le Congrès de la Haye”, Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne..., No. 17-18, September 15-October 1, 1872.—Ed.
c At the point of death.—Ed.
d A pun on Biedermann, which means “honest man” and was also the name of the editor of the Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung.—Ed.
1. SPAIN

In Spain the International was originally founded as a mere appendix to Bakounine’s secret society, the *Alliance*, to which it was to serve as a kind of recruiting ground and at the same time as the lever by which to control the whole proletarian movement. You will see by and by that their Alliance intends openly to restore the Spanish International, at the present time, to this same subordinate position.

In consequence of this dependance, the special doctrines of the Alliance: immediate abolition of the state, anarchy, anti-authoritarism, abstention from all political action etc. were preached in Spain as the *doctrines* of the International. At the same time, every prominent member of the International was at once received into the secret organization and made to believe that this system of controlling the public association by the secret society existed everywhere and was a matter of course.

This took place in 1869 and the first man who introduced the International into Spain, along with the Alliance, was the Italian *Fanelli* who now, in spite of his abstentional convictions, is a member of the Italian parliament. In June 1870 took place the first Congress of the Spanish International at Barcelona and here the plan of organization was adopted which, afterwards fully developed by the Conference of Valencia (September 1871), is now in force and has given the most excellent results.

As everywhere else, the part taken by (and also that ascribed to) our Association in the revolution of the Paris Commune, brought the International into prominence in Spain also. This prominence and the first attempted Government prosecutions following immediately afterwards, swelled our ranks in Spain very much.
Still, at the time of the Valencia Conference there existed only 13 local federations in Spain, besides single isolated Sections in various places.

The Conference of Valencia had left the Federal Council in Madrid where it had been placed by the Barcelona Congress, and had left its composition much the same as before; one important individual however, Tomas Gonzalez Moràgo (delegate at the Hague) had not been reelected. When, during the first Government prosecutions in June 1871, the Federal Council had for a time to seek a refuge in Lisbon, Moràgo abandoned his post at the moment of danger and this was the cause of his exclusion from the new Federal Council. From that moment began the secret war, which ended in an open split.

Immediately after the Valencia Conference, the Conference of London (September 1871) took place.\(^1\) The Spaniards sent a delegate, Anselmo Lorenzo, who for the first time brought the news back to Spain that the secret “Alliance” was \textit{not} an understood thing throughout our Association and that on the contrary the General Council and the majority of the Federations were directly opposed to the Alliance, as far as its existence was then known.

Shortly afterwards \textit{Sagasta} began his prosecutions against the International which he declared was outside the law.\(^2\) Moràgo, then still member of the Local Council of Madrid, again deserted his post and resigned. But the government threats were not followed up by any serious action; the right of \textit{public} meeting was indeed denied to the International, but the sections and councils continued to hold their meetings undisturbed. The only effect of this government interference was an immense increase in the number of adherents to the International. At the Congress of Saragossa, April 1872,\(^3\) the Association numbered 70 local federations regularly constituted, while in 100 other localities the work of organization and propaganda was actively pursued. There were moreover 8 Trades organized in Unions all over the country and under the control of the International, and the great union of all the mill-hands in Spain (mechanics, spinners and weavers) was upon the point of being constituted.

In the interval the secret war within the International had been carried on and it now commenced to take another and more important turn. The personal spite of Moràgo (who exercised great local influence in Madrid, his repeated desertions notwithstanding) against the members of the new Federal Council appointed at Valencia, was no longer the sole motive power of this
war. The resolutions of the London Conference on the public branch of the Alliance and on the political action of the working class had aroused the fury of the leaders of the secret Alliance, and especially of the men in the higher degrees of secret initiation who received their instructions direct from Bakounine, and of whom Moràgo was one. This fury was expressed in the Sonvillier circular of the Jura Federation demanding the immediate convocation of an extraordinary Congress. In this question, the Federal Council of Spain, in accordance with many of the sections, hesitated to take part against the General Council and the London Conference, and this constituted a new crime. Moreover in January 1872 Paul Lafargue came to Madrid, and having entered into friendly relations with the members of the Federal Council, soon convinced them, by numerous facts, that the whole Jurassian affair was an intrigue, based upon calumny, to disorganize the International. From that moment their fate was doomed. The members of the Federal Council being at the same time editors of the Emancipacion, the Local Council picked a quarrel with that paper and then had them expelled from the Local Federation of Madrid. This expulsion was annulled by the Congress of Saragossa, but the immediate end was attained: to render the continuance of the Federal Council at Madrid impossible by personal squabbles. The Federal Council was indeed removed to Valencia and its composition entirely changed. Of the members of the previous Council, who were reelected, Mora declined at once and Lorenzo resigned very soon on the account of differences which ensued. The members who remained, were mostly members of the secret Alliance.3

After the Congress of Saragossa the split between the men of the Alliance and those who preferred the International to the Alliance became more and more apparent. At last, on June 2d 1872, the members of the previous Federal Council (Mesa, Mora, Pauly, Pagés and others), who formed at the same time the majority of the Madrid section of the Alliance, issued a circular to all the sections of the same secret Society, announcing their dissolution as such section and inviting them to follow their example.215 The next day, they were under a false pretence, and by an open breach of the rules, expelled from the Local Federation of the Madrid International. Out of 130 members only

---

3 Then follows the sentence crossed out in the manuscript: “As the International Congress of September 1872 approached, the manoeuvres of the Alliance to secure to itself a majority at the Congress, became more evident.” — Ed.
15 had been present at this vote. They then formed a new Federation, but the Federal Council refused to recognise them; the General Council, upon application, recognised them without consulting the Spanish Federal Council, and this act was sanctioned by the Congress at the Hague.

The reason why the late General Council did not consult the Spanish Council on this occasion, was this. The General Council, having at last received sufficient evidence of the existence and action of the Alliance in Spain and of the fact that a majority, if not all, of the members of the Spanish Council belonged to it, had written to that council, demanding explications and informations regarding the secret society. In its reply, dated 3d August 1872, the Spanish Council openly took sides with the Alliance, stating moreover that the Alliance was dissolved. To refer to a Council which, in a collision between the International and a secret society within its ranks, had already taken the part of that secret society, would have evidently been more than superfluous, and the Hague Congress has fully sanctioned the action of the General Council.

To insure the election of men of the Alliance as delegates to the Hague, the Federal Council, by a private circular, never communicated by them to the General Council, resorted to manoeuvres, exposed at the Congress, manoeuvres which, had it not been for the uncommon leniency of the majority at the Hague, might have sufficed to invalidate the credentials of the four delegates sent by the Spanish Federation.

Thus, the state of things in Spain now is as follows:

There exist in Spain only two local federations which openly and thoroughly acknowledge the resolutions of the Hague Congress and the new General Council: the new federation of Madrid and the federation of Alcalá de Henares. Unless they can succeed in drawing over to their side the bulk of the Spanish International, they will form the nucleus of a new Spanish Federation.

The great bulk of the Spanish International are still under the leadership of the Alliance which predominates in the Federal Council as well as in the most important Local Councils. But there are plenty of symptoms to show that the Congress resolutions have not been without great effect upon the masses in Spain. There the name of the International has a great weight, and its official expression, the Congress, a great moral influence. Thus, the men

---

a New Madrid Federation.—Ed.
b See this volume, pp. 211-13.—Ed.
c Moràgo, Alerini, Farga Pellicer, Marselau.—Ed.
of the Alliance have a hard struggle to convince the masses that they are in the right. The opposition begins to become serious. The factory workers of Catalonia, with a Trades Union, counting 40,000 members, are taking the lead and demand the convocation of an extraordinary Spanish Congress to hear the reports of the delegates to the Hague and to examine into the conduct of the Federal Council. The organ of the New Madrid Federation, La Emancipacion, perhaps the best paper the International now possesses anywhere, exposes the Alliance every week, and from the numbers I have sent over to cit. Sorge, the General Council can convince themselves, with what energy, good sense, and theoretical insight into the principles of our Association it carries on the struggle. Its present editor, José Mesa, is without doubt by far the most superior man we have in Spain, both as to character and talent and indeed one of the best men we have anywhere.

I have taken upon myself to advise our Spanish friends not to be in too great a hurry to force on the extraordinary Congress, but to prepare for it as much as possible. In the meantime I have contributed to the Emancipacion both Congress reports and other articles and continue to do so, because Mesa, the only one now at Madrid who can use the pen with effect, cannot do everything, in spite of the wonderful energy, he displays. And I have no doubt that, if our friends in Spain are seconded well by the action of the General Council, we shall there overcome every obstacle and rescue from the influence of the Alliance humbugs one of the finest organizations within the International.

Fred. Engels,
Ex-Secretary for Spain

London, October 31, 1872

First published, in English, in 
Briefe und Auszüge aus Briefen
von Joh. Phil. Becker, Jos. Dietzgen,
Friedrich Engels, Karl Marx u.A. an
F. A. Sorge und Andere, Stuttgart,
1906

Reproduced from the manuscript

---
a See this volume, pp. 277-82.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

TO THE WORKERS' AND PEASANTS' ASSOCIATION
OF LOWER LOMBARDY
(SECTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL) IN LODI

London, November 13, 1872

Citizens,

It is with great pleasure that I have received the news of your formation as a section of the International, and I have immediately informed the new General Council in New York. I append below the address for direct correspondence with the General Council, while I remain always at your disposal for any information, clarification or service you may desire.

Fraternal greetings,

Frederick Engels

First published in La Plebe, No. 117, November 17, 1872
Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the Italian
Published in English for the first time
Frederick Engels

LETTERS FROM LONDON

III

[MEETING IN HYDE PARK]

London, November 14, 1872

The Liberal English Government has at the moment no less than 42 Irish political prisoners in its prisons and treats them with quite exceptional cruelty, far worse than thieves and murderers. In the good old days of King Bomba, a the head of the present Liberal cabinet, Mr. Gladstone, travelled to Italy and visited political prisoners in Naples; on his return to England he published a pamphlet b which disgraced the Neapolitan government before Europe for its unworthy treatment of political prisoners.

This does not prevent this selfsame Mr. Gladstone from treating in the very same way the Irish political prisoners, whom he continues to keep under lock and key. The Irish members of the International in London decided to organise a giant demonstration in Hyde Park (the largest public park in London, where all the big popular meetings take place during political campaigns) to demand a general amnesty. They contacted all London's democratic organisations and formed a committee which included McDonnell (an Irishman), Murray (an Englishman) and Lessner (a German)—all members of the last General Council of the International.

A difficulty arose: at the last session of Parliament the government passed a law which gave it the right to regulate public meetings in London's parks. It made use of this and had the regulation posted up to warn those who wanted to hold such a

---

a Ferdinand II; further on La Plebe has "son".— Ed.
b W. Gladstone, Two Letters to the Earl of Aberdeen on the State Persecutions of the Neapolitan Government, London, 1851.— Ed.
public meeting that they must give a written notification to the police two days prior to calling it, indicating the names of the speakers. This regulation carefully kept hidden from the London press destroyed with one stroke of the pen one of the most precious rights of London's working people—the right to hold meetings in parks when and how they please. To submit to this regulation would be to sacrifice one of the people's rights.

The Irish, who represent the most revolutionary element of the population, were not men to display such weakness. The committee unanimously decided to act as if it did not know of the existence of this regulation and to hold their meeting in defiance of the government's decree.

Last Sunday at about three o'clock in the afternoon two enormous processions with bands and banners marched towards Hyde Park. The bands played Irish songs and the *Marseillaise*; almost all the banners were Irish (green with a gold harp in the middle) or red. There were only a few police agents at the entrances to the park and the columns of demonstrators marched in without meeting with any resistance. They assembled at the appointed place and the speeches began.

The spectators numbered at least thirty thousand and at least half had a green ribbon or a green leaf in their buttonhole to show they were Irish; the rest were English, German and French. The crowd was too large for all to be able to hear the speeches and so a second meeting was organised nearby with other orators speaking on the same theme. Forceful resolutions were adopted demanding a general amnesty and the repeal of the coercion laws which keep Ireland under a permanent state of siege. At about five o'clock the demonstrators formed up into files again and left the park, thus having flouted the regulation of Gladstone's government.

This is the first time an Irish demonstration has been held in Hyde Park; it was very successful and even the London bourgeois press cannot deny this. It is also the first time the English and Irish sections of our population have united in friendship. These two elements of the working class, whose enmity towards each other was so much in the interests of the government and wealthy classes, are now offering one another the hand of friendship; this gratifying fact is due principally to the influence of the last

---

*a* This refers to the Act for the Regulation of the Royal Parks and Gardens of June 27, 1872.—*Ed.*

*b* November 3, 1872.—*Ed.*
General Council of the International, which has always directed all its efforts to unite the workers of both nations on a basis of complete equality. This meeting, of November 3, will usher in a new era in the history of London's working-class movement.

You might ask: "What is the government doing? Can it be that it is willing to reconcile itself to this slight? Will it allow its regulation to be flouted with impunity?"

Well, this is what it has done: it placed two police inspectors and two agents by the platforms in Hyde Park and they took down the names of the speakers. On the following day, these two inspectors brought a suit against the speakers before the justice of the peace. The justice sent them a summons and they have to appear before him next Saturday. This course of action makes it quite clear that they don't intend to undertake extensive proceedings against them. The government seems to have admitted that the Irish or, as they say here, the Fenians have beaten it and will be satisfied with a small fine. The debate in court will certainly be interesting and I shall inform you of it in my next letter. Of one thing there can be no doubt: the Irish, thanks to their energetic efforts, have saved the right of the people of London to hold meetings in parks when and how they please.

First published in La Plebe, No. 117, November 17, 1872
Signed: F. Engels

Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the Italian

---

\( ^a \) See this volume, pp. 298-300.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

MANDATE TO E. LARROQUE

[Draft] [London,] December 9, 72
122, Regent's Park Road

A. Serraillier

I, the undersigned, charged by the G. C. of the Assoc. with the receipt and payment, through its hands, of sums of money which may be remitted to me for it, by virtue of powers dated the 27/10/72

Authorise Citizen E. Larroque of Bordeaux to collect and forward to me all sums of money due, either to the preceding G. C. or to the present C., for subscriptions, stamps, printed matter, etc., in the Midi of France.

This authorisation is subject to the confirmation of the G. C. to which it has been communicated.

Signed F. E.

For the signature of the G. C.

A. Serraillier


Translated from the French

Published in English for the first time

Printed according to the manuscript
Frederick Engels

LETTERS FROM LONDON

IV

[MEETING IN HYDE PARK.—SITUATION IN SPAIN]

London, December 11, 1872

The trial by the British government of speakers at the Irish meeting in Hyde Park\(^a\) has brought a storm on its head. It is true that the justice of the peace made the accused pay a fine of five pounds. But the trial has completely proved the illegality in several respects of the new regulation on public parks, such that the Court of Appeal, which is now handling the case, will have to absolve the accused.

And this is not all: after this first meeting, not a Sunday goes by without public assemblies in Hyde Park; and the government dare not disturb a single orator. On one occasion there was a meeting there in support of policemen, who had come out on strike; on another a meeting was held simply to reaffirm the right of assembly in parks.

A strike by policemen? I hear you say. Yes indeed; England is a devil of a country in which strikes penetrate everywhere. I remember that fifteen years ago the policemen of Manchester went on strike for a wage increase and were completely successful after just two days. A few weeks ago the policemen of the capital threatened to strike because a wage increase of about 20 per cent had been refused them. At the last moment the government deemed it expedient to comply with all their demands. By way of reprisal, however, it punished the secretary of the resistance society which the policemen had formed; and as he did not agree to submit to the punishment inflicted on him he was removed from office. A re-action then broke out in the ranks of the police and the Hyde Park meeting was announced. The government gave

\(^{a}\) See this volume, pp. 294-96.—Ed
way once again, granting the rebels an amnesty before the meeting took place—with the exception of the aforementioned secretary. This goes to show that in England—beneath its utterly aristocratic appearance—the spirit of the bourgeoisie has penetrated everywhere. What other nation is so bourgeois as to be able to permit itself resistance societies and strikes among policemen?

The news that has reached us of the attitude of the various federations of the International to the resolutions of the Hague Congress is most satisfying. In Holland (where that country’s delegates had voted with the minority) a regional congress deliberated in conformity with the spirit of the great Association.\(^{219}\) It was agreed that the Rules and Regulations of the General Council in New York should be followed, while reserving the right to make observations which are considered necessary at the Universal Congress, to be held in September 1873, and not to recognise the right of any other Congress to make decrees on the general interests of the Association.

In Spain too, where the leaders of the Hague minority thought they held absolute sway, the good sense of the workers is making headway. The partisans of the Alliance, who are at the head of the Federal Council, have called a regional Congress for December 25 in Cordova. This Congress, following the agenda voted at the previous one in Saragossa, should deal with the matter of bringing the Spanish federal organisation into line with the resolutions to be adopted by the international general Congress.\(^{220}\) And yet the Federal Council has put on the agenda a choice between the resolutions of the international Congress at The Hague and the anti-international Congress at Saint-Imier.\(^{221}\) This constitutes a flagrant violation of the General Rules. The New Federation of Madrid has consequently launched an appeal to all the truly international federations (namely those which recognise the General Rules and resolutions of Congresses) to elect a new provisional Federal Council.\(^{a}\) Important federations and sections, such as those of Lérida, Badalona, Denia and Pont de Vilumara, have already responded with their support. In addition, the federations of Gracia, Toledo, Alcalá and a large number of those in Cádiz and Valencia have declared themselves against the present Federal Council. In Gracia, a manufacturing suburb of Barcelona, after three nights of discussions sustained by the

\(^{a}\) "La Nueva Federacion Madrileña á todas las federaciones, secciones é individuos de la Asociacion Internacional en España", *La Emancipacion*, No. 73, November 9, 1872.—*Ed*
Alliancists of Barcelona, the local federation—500 members strong—unanimously deliberated all the Hague resolutions and agreed to rebuke the Spanish delegates for their conduct at the last General Congress. In Valencia the Federal Council itself, seeing that it was in danger of being beaten in plenary session, blocked a vote which might have gone against it—a step which provoked splits. And this is just the beginning of the movement in Spain. In a few weeks it will be strong enough to prove that the Spanish workers are not going to let the *International* be thrown into disarray for the profit of the leaders of a handful of secret societies.

The Hague Congress dealt with a certain Bousquet, secretary of the police commissariat at Béziers, who had infiltrated the ranks of the *International*, but who had in fact already been expelled at his section’s request by the last General Council. This gentleman, who was subsequently promoted by M. Thiers to the rank of chief of the police brigade in his town, found a defender in issue No. 21 of the *Bulletin jurassien*. Hardly surprising, given that from the ranks of the Jura Federation have emerged two gentlemen—Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc—who are currently collaborating with M. Louis Napoleon.

First published in *La Plebe*, No. 122, December 14, 1872

Signed: F. Engels

Printed according to the newspaper

Translated from the Italian

Published in English for the first time

---

a See this volume, p. 249.—Ed.

b J. Montels, “Compagnons rédacteurs...”, *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne*..., No. 20/21, November 10, 1872.—Ed.
Dear Citizen,—We have hitherto considered it superfluous to reply to the slanders and lies which the “autonomous” Mr. John Hales never tires spreading, with reference to us. But when such calumnies are bandied about under the name, and with the pretended authority of the British Federal Council, they are calculated to do harm to the International generally, and we are compelled to break our silence.

This Mr. Hales, who all at once turns up as the champion of the “autonomy” of sections and federations, practically interprets that autonomy as his own personal autocracy. He has got himself appointed, firstly, minute secretary; secondly, corresponding secretary (at home and abroad); thirdly, treasurer of the British Federal Council; but as he cannot fulfil all these duties at once, he, fourthly, appoints other members of that Council to do so in the capacity of his servants. And fifthly, he writes letters to all parts of the world in the name, but without the knowledge or sanction of the British Federal Council.

Thus, we find in No. 23 of the Bulletin jurassien, an official letter of the secessionist Jurassien Committee addressed to the British Federal Council,¹ in reply to a letter, also published, of Mr. John Hales.² The existence of this letter, we are sure, was quite unknown to the British Federal Council.

He asserts therein:

---
¹ "Le Comité fédéral jurassien a adressé la réponse suivante au Conseil fédéral anglais".— Ed.
² J. Hales, “Au Comité fédéral de la Fédération jurassienne. Londres, le 6 novembre 1872”.— Ed.
“This Congress” (at the Hague) “has ... unmasked the hypocrisy of the men of the late General Council, who attempted to organise a vast secret society within our association, and that under the pretext of destroying another secret society, the existence of which they invented for their own purposes.”

Mr. Hales is an admirable logician. The exclusion from the International, by Congress, of the *alliance*, proves to him the hypocrisy of the late General Council in disowning that body. As to the *alliance* invented, and the secret conspiracy organised by the General Council, citizen Jung, now a member of the Federal Council, is best adapted to give it all the information required. As former secretary for Switzerland, he knows the doings of the “Alliance”, and as member of the Executive Committee of the late General Council 224 he knows all about the “Conspiracy” invented by John Hales. The performances of the public “Alliance” have been already publicly exposed in the circular of the late General Council, *Les prétendues scissions*, etc. a The secret action of that society will be brought to daylight by the publication, now preparing, of the documents in the hands of the committee of inquiry appointed by the Hague Congress. b

Mr. Hales complains that

“while I was General Secretary of the Council, I never knew, and never could obtain, the addresses of the Continental Federations”.

When secretary to the General Council, and its only paid officer, Mr. Hales had no other duties than to prepare the minutes, to send an extract of them to the press, and to correspond with English Sections and Trades’ Unions.

The correspondence with other federations, continental or otherwise, was entrusted to unpaid secretaries with whose action he had no business to meddle. How he fulfilled his duty of correspondence within his own department, is shown by a special resolution of the General Council transferring that duty to Citizen Milner.225

Mr. Hales states further:

“One day the British Federal Council received a very important letter from the Spanish Federal Council, but the writer, Citizen Anselmo Lorenzo, had forgotten to give his address; the British Federal Council requested Citizen Engels, then corresponding secretary for Spain, to give them the address of Lorenzo; Citizen Engels refused formally. Lately, he gave us the same refusal with regard to the Lisbon Federal Council.”

---
a See this volume, pp. 79-123.— *Ed.*
b Ibid., pp. 454-580.— *Ed.*
All that Citizen Engels knows about the matter is, that the Spanish letter in question was sent to him by Citizen Jung with the simple request to translate it, which he did. Of a request of the British Federal Council to have Lorenzo's address, he knows nothing, and would be thankful for an extract of its minutes to that effect.

As to the Lisbon affair, the Portuguese Council applied to Engels for his assistance in a strike, and the very first thing Engels did was to request the co-operation of the British Federal Council, while at the same time he took such other measures as were in his power. After repeated verbal applications, through members of the Federal Council, and after one written application, Engels received, about two months later, a letter from Mr. Hales, stating that the Council had taken some action in the matter, and applying for the Lisbon address. To this letter Engels sent no reply, being then fully aware that Hales wanted such addresses merely for the purpose of his own personal intrigues. As to other members of the British Federal Council, no such reserve was ever thought of. When Jung, in the name of the Federal Council, demanded the addresses in Berlin, Leipzig, and Vienna, they were at once forwarded to him.

The publication of extracts from the minutes of the late General Council, mostly written by Mr. Hales himself, will lay bare the motives of his rancour against that body. To speak in the words of his own letter to the Jurassien Committee, it will then be seen that

"whoever has not been closely acquainted with the defunct General Council, cannot form an idea of the way in which facts are distorted"

by Mr. John Hales.

Yours fraternally,

F. Engels,

Karl Marx

Written on December 19-20, 1872

First published in The International Herald, No. 38, December 21, 1872 and in La Emancipacion, No. 80, December 28, 1872

Reproduced from The International Herald

---

a See this volume, p. 285.—Ed.
Fellow Working Men,

We feel compelled to address you in reply to a circular issued by those who call themselves the majority of the British Federal Council, and appealing to you to join them in open rebellion against the fundamental compact of our association.\(^a\)

In that circular the majority of the Federal Council asserts that the minority have rendered all work impossible, and brought matters to a deadlock, owing to the last meeting having been dissolved by the chairman\(^b\) in the midst of business in order to prevent discussion.\(^228\)

It appears strange, at the first glance, that a majority should be brought to a deadlock by a minority, when a simple vote would have sufficed to silence that minority. Hitherto minorities have seceded often enough. This is the first instance of a majority seceding; and this fact alone is sufficient to render the whole proceeding more than suspicious. As to the pretence of the action of the chairman at one solitary meeting, we are credibly informed that, on that occasion, the chairman dissolved the meeting half an hour after the time for breaking up, at half past eleven, because members of the majority insisted upon interrupting the order of the day.

The Federal Council is divided, according to the circular, upon the question whether the resolutions of the General Congress of

\(^a\) To the Branches, Sections and Members of the British Federation of the International Working Men's Association. [Signed:] Hales, J., Bennett, G. [London,] December 10, 1872.—Ed.

\(^b\) Samuel Vickery.—Ed.
our Association, held at The Hague in September last, are to be considered valid or not. Now, for members of the International, this is not a question at all. According to its General Rules, Article 3, the duty of the General Congress is to “take the measures required for the successful working of our Association”. The Congress is its legislative power. Its resolutions are binding upon all. Those who do not like them may either leave the Association, or try to reverse them at the next Congress. But no individual member, no section, no Federal Council, no local or national congress, has the right to declare them null and void, while pretending to remain within the International.

The signatories of the circular pretend that the Hague Congress was not fairly constituted, and in no way represented the majority of the members of the Association. That Congress was regularly convoked by the General Council, in accordance with Art. 4 of the General Rules. It was attended by 64 delegates, representing 15 different nationalities, and belonging, individually, to 12 different nationalities. No previous Congress could boast of such a truly international composition. That the resolutions taken were penetrated by the true spirit of internationalism is proved by the fact that they were almost all taken by majorities of three to one, and that the delegates of the two nations lately involved in fratricidal war—the French and the Germans—almost always voted for them to a man. If England, through its own fault, was not very numerously represented, is that a reason to invalidate the Congress?

The circular complains of the Congress resolution as to the political action of the working class. They say it was taken after the majority of the delegates had left. The official report published in No. 37 of The International Herald (December 14th), shows that 48 delegates out of 64 voted on the question, out of which 35 voted in favour of the resolution. Among these 35 we find the name of Mr. Mottershead, who now signs a circular repudiating it.

Now what is this resolution? It is the same in substance, and mostly in words too, as that adopted at the General Conference held in London in September, 1871, and published officially, along with the rest of the resolutions, on the 17th October of that year by the General Council, and has the signatures, among

---

\(^{a}\) Cf. this volume, p. 4.— Ed.

\(^{b}\) See ibid., p. 243.— Ed.

\(^{c}\) K. Marx and F. Engels, Resolutions of the Conference of Delegates of the
The General Council being bound to enforce the Conference resolutions, how is it that none of these citizens then thought fit to resign his seat on the General Council, and to protest against this resolution, now found out, all at once, to be so dangerous?

The circular totally falsifies the purport of this resolution, as will be easily seen by referring to its text as published in No. 37 of *The International Herald*. The resolution does not, as is pretended, make political action obligatory upon Trades' Unions and other politically neutral bodies. It merely demands the formation, in every country, of a distinct working class party, opposed to all middle class parties. That is to say, it calls here in England upon the working class to refuse any longer to serve as the fag-end of the "great Liberal party", and to form an independent party of their own, as they did in the glorious times of the great Chartist movement.

Thus the alleged breach of faith towards the Trades' Unions turns out to be a pure invention. But, we may be allowed to ask, where are the Trades' Unions now that at one time had affiliated themselves to the International? The cash accounts of last year show that they had almost every one disappeared during Citizen Hales' secretari ship.

The next complaint is that the General Council has been removed to New York, and that there are neither English nor Americans upon it. The new General Council is composed of men of five different nationalities, and if the English in New York keep aloof from the International, they have but themselves to blame, if they are not represented at the Council. While that Council was in London, the English were always far more strongly represented than any other nation, and very often formed the absolute majority; while the French, for instance, at one time were not represented at all. But the English cannot claim this as a vested right. The Hague Congress, when, in virtue of the duty and right conferred upon it by Art. 3 of the General Rules, it elected the new General Council, chose what was in its opinion the best locality, and in that locality the best men. The signatories of the Circular may be of a different opinion, but that does not affect the right of the Congress.

The Circular pretends that, by this action, the sections and

*International Working Men's Association Assembled at London from 17th to 23rd September 1871.—Ed.*
federations are deprived of the right they possessed, of deciding upon the policy to be pursued in their respective countries. This is again untrue. Whether the General Council sit in London, in New York, or anywhere else, the rights of the sections and federations remain the same. But, says the Circular, to prevent disobedience upon this point,

"the Congress armed this General Council with the power of suspending any section, federation, or federal council whenever it pleased, without assigning any reason for so doing".

Untrue, again. The right of suspending any section had been already conferred upon the General Council by the Basel Congress (1869). The official publication of the Hague Congress Resolutions, resolution II, art. 1, (The International Herald, No. 37) shows that, if the powers of the General Council have been increased, or rather better defined, they have also been surrounded by safeguards previously not existing. Thus, if the General Council dissolve a Federal Council, it has to provide within 30 days, for the election of a new one; and thus, after all, the federation itself remains the ultimate judge. If the General Council suspend a whole federation, it has, if the rest of the federations demand it, to submit its decision within one month to the final judgment of a conference of delegates of all federations. And this is what the circular calls: the power of suspension without assigning any reason!

Fellow working men! whether you individually approve or disapprove of the resolutions passed at the Hague, they are at this moment the law of the International. If there are those among you who disapprove of them, they have their remedy at the next Congress. But neither any section, nor the British Federal Council, nor any national Congress called by it, has the right to repudiate resolutions of a General Congress lawfully convened. Whoever attempts such a thing, places himself virtually outside the pale of the International, and that, in effect, the signatories of the circular have done. To allow such action to rule the International would be tantamount to its dissolution.

Even in the countries whose delegates formed the minority at the Hague, a strong re-action has set in against the secessionist tendencies fostered by those delegates. While in America, in France, in Germany, in Poland, in Austria, in Hungary, in Portugal, and in the whole of Switzerland, with the exception of a little knot of scarcely 200 men, the Hague resolutions are gladly

---

a See this volume, p. 244.—Ed.
accepted, the Dutch Internationals, in Congress assembled, have
resolved to stand by the New York General Council, and to lay
any grievances they may have before the next lawful General
Congress of September, 1873, and before no other. In Spain,
where a secessionist movement similar to that inaugurated by the
circular in question, was attempted by the Federal Council, the
resistance against it is growing stronger every day, and section
after section adheres to the Hague resolutions.

Fellow working men! for all these reasons, we protest against the
convocation of any British Congress which is to sit in judgment
upon the law of the Association as established by the delegates of
all nations represented in it.

We protest against any Congress convoked at such a short notice
as that called for the 5th January.

We urge upon all sections to submit the foregoing to the
consideration of their members, remembering that the future of
our Association in England rests upon their action in the present
crisis.

It is necessary that we recognise as legitimate delegates to the
Federal Council only those who will uphold the authority of the
Congress of the Hague, and endeavour to carry out the
resolutions passed there.

Adopted at the general meeting of the Manchester Foreign
Section, held on Saturday, 21st December, 1872.

Fraternal greeting to all members of our Association.

P. Zürcher, Chairman of the Meeting
F. Kupfer, General and German Secretary
O. Wyss, French Secretary

Written on about December 20, 1872
First published as a leaflet on December 23, 1872
Karl Marx

ADDRESS OF THE BRITISH FEDERAL COUNCIL TO THE SECTIONS, BRANCHES, AFFILIATED SOCIETIES AND MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

Citizens,

At our sitting of December 19th, 1872, our attention was called to a Manifesto issued by the representatives of the party of secession in England. We at once took the resolution to forward to every section a notice calling upon them to suspend their judgment thereon until they had our reply before them, which we promised to get out at once, and at a special meeting of the British Federal Council, held on Monday evening, December 23rd, the following was unanimously adopted in reply to the allegations made in the above mentioned Manifesto.

(1). The dead-lock has been caused by the constant introduction of Hales' personal matter; both he and Mottershead have already, on the General Council, by their mutual charges of corruption, attempted to cause a similar dead-lock there. The dead-lock at the meeting alluded to was caused by Mottershead, being drunk, rendering the dissolution of the meeting necessary, at half-past eleven, by constantly repeating violent personal charges against the Chairman; such dissolution being demanded by none more than by Hales. The members will long ago have seen in The International Herald that the South Lambeth Section withdrew its delegate because the majority obstructed all real business.

(2). The real reason of this circular is an understanding between the secessionist minority of the Hague Congress to call all sorts of

---

a To the Branches, Sections and Members of the British Federation of the International Working Men's Association. [Signed:] Hales, J., Bennett, G. [London. December 10, 1872.—Ed.

b Samuel Vickery (see also the previous document, pp. 304-06).—Ed.
congresses in all countries about Christmas and to get them to confirm their secessionist action. Thus similar congresses have been called in Belgium and in Spain for the 25th December (against which in Spain there is a strong opposition, getting stronger every day).232 The English Sections are to be now bamboozled into assisting the plot without knowing what is going on.

(3). The circular now before us has not been laid before the Federal Council. Nothing shows better how its authors feared discussion, than that they concocted it, behind the back of the Council, in a hole and corner meeting. Has it ever been seen before that a majority, instead of outvoting a minority seceded from it? What do the majority want a special Congress for, when a simple vote of the Council which they profess to command, will decide the question in their favour?

(4). The signatories of this circular dare not yet go the full length of the continental secessionists, who plainly state that they repudiate the authority of every Congress except the first held at Geneva. In the mean time, they begin by impugning the validity of the Congress of the Hague, the most International and indeed the first really International Congress of the Association, because it was the first where the majority was not national or even merely local. If that congress was not fairly constituted, why did Citizen Roach who was a member of the Committee for examination of credentials, sign the report of that Committee? Yet he now signs the circular protesting against the Congress.

(5). They say they will stand by the General Rules as they existed prior to the Congress of the Hague. These Rules say, art. 3. "The Congress will have to take the measures required for the successful working of the Association and appoint the General Council of the Society." Art. 12. "The present Rules may be revised by each Congress provided that two-thirds of the delegates present are in favour of such revision."a The General Rules give no right whatever to any Local or Federal Congresses to revise the resolutions of any General Congress. Therefore the signatories of this circular declare themselves in open revolt not only against the Constitution of the International as fixed by the Congress of the Hague, but also against those General Rules which they declare they will stand by.

Now which are the resolutions of the Hague Congress which are so distasteful to the signatories of the circular?

---

a Cf. this volume, pp. 4 and 8.—Ed.
The first is the resolution about the political action of the Working Class which, they assert, has been passed after the majority of the Delegates had left. This is so far from true, that out of the 64 Delegates who took part in the Congress, 48 took part in the vote on this resolution, and out of these 35, or more than two-thirds, voted for it, amongst whom Citizen Mottershead, who has nevertheless signed the present circular. Moreover, most of the Delegates who had left, had also left with the chairman a written declaration that they were in favour of the resolution.

The resolution itself is nothing but an extract from the resolution No. IX. of the Conference of London, September, 1871, published, along with the other resolutions, by the General Council on the 17th October, 1871, and to which are appended the names of Citizens Bradnick, Mayo, Mottershead, Jung, Roach, and Hales, the latter as general Secretary. This resolution of the Conference quotes the general rules, the Inaugural Address, a Resolution of the Congress of Lausanne, and all the action of the General Council from the beginning, to prove that what it asserts is merely an explanation, in the same sense, of what has always been the officially adopted policy of the Association. Before the Hague Congress, the General Council resolved unanimously to propose to that Congress the introduction of this very resolution into the General Rules; Citizen Jung was acting as secretary that evening, Hales having been suspended. And even the Nottingham Congress, to the resolutions of which the circular refers, as to a precedent, adopted a resolution virtually the same.

As to the pretended turning adrift of Trades Unions by this resolution, the Congress, quite on the contrary, has even gone further than the General Rules or any previous Congress in favour of Trades Unions. It charged the New General Council to constitute an International Bond between the Trades Unions, to admit to it even Trades Unions that do not belong to the International, to invite every Trades Union to state itself the terms upon which it will enter such bond, and to draw up a general plan to be submitted to the provisional acceptance of all Trades Unions adhering, previous to its final sanction by the next Congress.

The next complaint is the removal of the General Council to New York. This amounts simply to the assertion that no General

---

a See this volume, p. 243.—Ed.

b K. Marx and F. Engels, Resolutions of the Conference of Delegates of the International Working Men's Association Assembled at London from 17th to 23rd September 1871.—Ed.
Council upon which Messrs Hales, Mottershead, Jung, Bradnick, Mayo and Roach do not sit, can pretend to represent the International.

Another complaint is that the powers of this General Council have been increased. Now the first resolution to that effect taken at the Hague was the following: "The General Council is bound to execute the Congress Resolutions, and to take care that in every country the principles and the General Rules and Regulations of the International are strictly observed." This resolution was proposed to the Congress in consequence of a unanimous vote of the late General Council. How could it be put in force if the General Council had not the power to suspend bodies acting within the International, against the International? Besides, the Hague resolutions relating to the right of suspension of Sections, Federal Councils and Federations, have in reality limited the power given by the Congress of Basle (see Administrative Regulation 2, article 6 & 7), and subjected in every case the action of the General Council to a counter check.

Everywhere on the Continent, the governments and the middle-class press are supporting the attempts of the men who try to provoke a secession in the ranks of the Association, while those who cling to the International are everywhere arrested, and their newspapers prosecuted by the police. While the secessionists glory in the assertion, that the International by their exertions is everywhere in a state of dissolution, and in rebellion against the Hague resolutions, the fact is that the Association is stronger than ever, and that the Hague resolutions are fully endorsed in France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Portugal, America, Denmark, Poland, and Switzerland, excepting, in the latter country, some 150 secessionists. In Holland, although the delegates of that country voted at the Hague with the minority, a Congress has been held which resolved to remain faithful to the General Council, and to recognise no other General Congress but the regular one of September, 1873, to be held in Switzerland. In Spain where the secessionists expected to carry everything before them, because they had the Federal Council on their side, the opposition against them is growing stronger every day. Even in Italy Sections are continuing to send in their adhesion to the New General Council, and this New English Congress dodge is the last resource the secessionists are driven to.

---
a See this volume, p. 244.—Ed.
b Ibid., pp. 244 and 10.—Ed.
In reply to the propositions of the circular, we have to submit
the following:—

(1). We declare any Congress held in England for the purpose
of revising the resolutions passed at the Congress of the Hague to
be illegal, because every Federation has the right of objecting at
the next General Congress. Further the only legal Congress of the
British Federation is the one to be held in Manchester at
Whitsuntide next,\(^{237}\) in accordance with the resolution passed at
the Nottingham Congress of July, 1872.

(2). We call upon the Sections to revoke the powers given to the
subscribers of the circular and to send new delegates to represent
them on the Federal Council.

(3). We call upon the Sections to appoint a Committee to which
the minutes of the Federal Council will be submitted and who will
draw its own conclusions as to who obstructed and who forwarded
the work of the Association, and who acted in the interest of the
enemies of the working classes.

(4). We call upon the Sections to appoint a commission to
inquire into the organisation, number of members and date of
establishment of the Sections, and particularly the respective
number of delegates they used to send to the Federal Council.

The Sections now being in possession of both Manifestoes, we
leave the matter in their hands and only ask that their decision
may be communicated to us at once.

But we unhesitatingly affirm that we are acting in accordance
with the rules and constitution of the Association, and in the real
interest of the working classes.

Long life to the International Working Men’s Association.

\[(1)\quad F. \text{ Hurry}, \text{ South Lambeth Section, Chairman}\]
\[(2)\quad E. \text{ Hills}, \text{ West End Section}\]
\[(3)\quad F. \text{ Lessner}, \text{ Nottingham Congress, ex-member of the General Council,}\]
\[(4)\quad \text{Founder of the I.W.M.A.}\]
\[(5)\quad W. H. \text{ Riley}, \text{ Nottingham Congress}\]
\[(6)\quad Ch. \text{ Murray}, \text{ Normanby Section, ex-member of the General Council}\]
\[(7)\quad G. \text{ Milner}, \text{ National Reform League, ex-member of the General Council}\]
\[(8)\quad J. \text{ Mitchell}, \text{ Hinckley Section, Leicestershire}\]
\[(9)\quad G. A. \text{ Weiler}, \text{ London German Section}\]
S. Vickery, Birkenhead Section
Eugène Dupont, Manchester Section,
ex-member of the General Council,
Founder of the I.W.M.A.

All communications to be sent to Citizen Riley, Editor of The
International Herald, 7, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, London.

London, December 23rd, 1872
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THE HOUSING QUESTION

Part I

HOW PROUDHON SOLVES
THE HOUSING QUESTION

In No. 10 and the following issues of the Volksstaat may be found a series of six articles on the housing question. These articles are worthy of attention only because, apart from some long-forgotten would-be literary writings of the forties, they are the first attempt to transplant the Proudhonist school to Germany. This represents such an enormous step backward in comparison with the whole course of development of German socialism, which delivered a decisive blow precisely to the Proudhonist ideas as far back as twenty-five years ago,* that it is worth while answering this attempt immediately.

The so-called housing shortage, which plays such a great role in the press nowadays, does not consist in the fact that the working class generally lives in bad, overcrowded and unhealthy dwellings. This shortage is not something peculiar to the present; it is not even one of the sufferings peculiar to the modern proletariat in contradistinction to all earlier oppressed classes. On the contrary, all oppressed classes in all periods suffered rather uniformly from it. In order to put an end to this housing shortage there is only one means: to abolish altogether the exploitation and oppression of the working class by the ruling class.—What is meant today by housing shortage is the peculiar intensification of the bad housing conditions of the workers as a result of the sudden rush of population to the big cities; a colossal increase in rents, still greater


[a A. Mülberger,] "Die Wohnungsfrage", Der Volksstaat, Nos. 10-13, 15, 19, February 3, 7, 10, 14, 21, March 6, 1872.—Ed.
congestion in the separate houses, and, for some, the impossibility of finding a place to live in at all. And this housing shortage gets talked of so much only because it is not confined to the working class but has affected the petty bourgeoisie as well.

The housing shortage from which the workers and part of the petty bourgeoisie suffer in our modern big cities is one of the innumerable smaller, secondary evils which result from the present-day capitalist mode of production. It is not at all a direct result of the exploitation of the worker as worker by the capitalist. This exploitation is the basic evil which the social revolution wants to abolish by abolishing the capitalist mode of production. The cornerstone of the capitalist mode of production is, however, the fact that our present social order enables the capitalist to buy the labour power of the worker at its value, but to extract from it much more than its value by making the worker work longer than is necessary to reproduce the price paid for the labour power. The surplus value produced in this fashion is divided among the whole class of capitalists and landowners, together with their paid servants, from the Pope and the Emperor down to the night watchman and below. We are not concerned here with how this distribution comes about, but this much is certain: that all those who do not work can live only on the pickings from this surplus value, which reach them in one way or another. (Compare Marx's "Capital", where this was propounded for the first time.)

The distribution of this surplus value, produced by the working class and taken from it without payment, among the non-working classes proceeds amid extremely edifying squabblings and mutual swindling. In so far as this distribution takes place by means of buying and selling, one of its chief methods is the cheating of the buyer by the seller; and in retail trade, particularly in the big cities, this has become an absolute condition of existence for the seller. When, however, the worker is cheated by his grocer or his baker, either in regard to the price or the quality of the merchandise, this does not happen to him in his specific capacity as a worker. On the contrary, as soon as a certain average measure of cheating has become the social rule in any place, it must in the long run be adjusted by a corresponding increase in wages. The worker appears before the shopkeeper as a buyer, that is, as the owner of money or credit, and hence not at all in his capacity as a worker, that is, as a seller of labour power. The cheating may hit him, and the poorer class as a whole, harder than it hits the richer social classes, but it is not an evil which hits him exclusively, which is peculiar to his class.
And it is just the same with the housing shortage. The expansion of the big modern cities gives the land in certain sections of them, particularly in those which are centrally situated, an artificial and often enormously increasing value; the buildings erected in these areas depress this value, instead of increasing it, because they no longer correspond to the changed circumstances; they are pulled down and replaced by others. This takes place above all with centrally located workers' houses, whose rents, even with the greatest overcrowding, can never, or only very slowly, increase above a certain maximum. They are pulled down and in their stead shops, warehouses and public buildings are erected. Through its Haussmann in Paris, a Bonapartism exploited this tendency tremendously for swindling and private enrichment. But the spirit of Haussmann has also been abroad in London, Manchester and Liverpool, and seems to feel itself just as much at home in Berlin and Vienna. The result is that the workers are forced out of the centre of the towns towards the outskirts; that workers' dwellings, and small dwellings in general, become rare and expensive and often altogether unobtainable, for under these circumstances the building industry, which is offered a much better field for speculation by more expensive dwelling houses, builds workers' dwellings only by way of exception.

This housing shortage, therefore, certainly hits the worker harder than it hits any more prosperous class, but it is just as little an evil which burdens the working class exclusively as is the cheating of the shopkeeper, and, as far as the working class is concerned, when this evil reaches a certain level and attains a certain permanency, it must similarly find a certain economic adjustment.

It is largely with just such sufferings as these, which the working class endures in common with other classes, and particularly the petty bourgeoisie, that petty-bourgeois socialism, to which Proudhon belongs, prefers to occupy itself. And thus it is not at all accidental that our German Proudhonist seizes chiefly upon the housing question, which, as we have seen, is by no means exclusively a working-class question; and that he declares it to be, on the contrary, a true, exclusively working-class question.

"The tenant is in the same position in relation to the house-owner as the wage-worker in relation to the capitalist." "

---

a The words "in Paris" were added by Engels in the 1887 edition.— Ed.

b [A. Mülberger.] op. cit., Der Volksstaat, No. 12, February 10, 1872.— Ed.
This is totally untrue.

In the housing question we have two parties confronting each other: the tenant and the landlord, or house-owner. The former wishes to purchase from the latter the temporary use of a dwelling; he has money or credit, even if he has to buy this credit from the house-owner himself at a usurious price in the shape of an addition to the rent. It is a simple commodity sale; it is not a transaction between proletarian and bourgeois, between worker and capitalist. The tenant—even if he is a worker—appears as a man with money; he must already have sold his commodity, a commodity peculiarly his own, his labour power, to be able to appear with the proceeds as the buyer of the use of a dwelling or he must be in a position to give a guarantee of the impending sale of this labour power. The peculiar results which attend the sale of labour power to the capitalist are completely absent here. The capitalist causes the purchased labour power first to produce its own value but secondly to produce a surplus value, which remains in his hands for the time being, subject to distribution among the capitalist class. In this case, therefore, an excess value is produced, the sum total of the existing value is increased. In a renting transaction the situation is quite different. No matter how much the landlord may overreach the tenant it is still only a transfer of already existing, previously produced value, and the total sum of values possessed by the landlord and the tenant together remains the same after as it was before. The worker is always cheated of a part of the product of his labour, whether that labour is paid for by the capitalist below, above or at its value; the tenant, only when he is compelled to pay for the dwelling above its value. It is therefore a complete misrepresentation of the relation between landlord and tenant to attempt to make it equivalent to the relation between worker and capitalist. On the contrary, we are dealing here with a quite ordinary commodity transaction between two citizens, and this transaction proceeds according to the economic laws which govern the sale of commodities in general, and in particular the sale of the commodity "landed property". The building and maintenance costs of the house or of the part of the house in question enter first into the calculation; the value of the land, determined by the more or less favourable situation of the house, comes next; the relation between supply and demand existing at the moment decides in the end. This simple economic relation expresses itself in the mind of our Proudhonist as follows:

"The house, once it has been built, serves as a perpetual legal title to a definite fraction of social labour although the real value of the house has been paid to the
owner long ago more than adequately in the form of rent. Thus it comes about that a house which, for instance, was built fifty years ago, during this period covers the original cost price two, three, five, ten and more times over in its rent yield.”

Here we have at once Proudhon in his entirety. First, it is forgotten that the rent must not only pay the interest on the building costs, but must also cover repairs and the average amount of bad debts and unpaid rents as well as the occasional periods when the house is untenanted, and finally must pay off in annual instalments the building capital which has been invested in a house, which is perishable and which in time becomes uninhabitable and worthless. Secondly, it is forgotten that the house rent must also pay interest on the increased value of the land upon which the building is erected and that, therefore, a part of it consists of ground rent. Our Proudhonist immediately declares, it is true, that since this increment is brought about without the landowner having contributed anything, it does not equitably belong to him but to society as a whole. However, he overlooks the fact that he is thereby in reality demanding the abolition of landed property, a point which would lead us too far if we went into it here. And finally he overlooks the fact that the whole transaction is not at all one of buying the house from its owner, but of buying only its use for a certain time. Proudhon, who never bothered himself about the real, the actual conditions under which any economic phenomenon occurs, is naturally also unable to explain how the original cost price of a house is under certain circumstances paid back ten times over in the course of fifty years in the form of rent. Instead of examining this not at all difficult question economically and establishing whether it is really in contradiction to economic laws, and if so how, Proudhon resorts to a bold leap from economics into jurisprudence: “The house, once it has been built, serves as a perpetual legal title” to a certain annual payment. How this comes about, how the house becomes a legal title, on this Proudhon is silent. And yet that is just what he should have explained. Had he examined this question he would have found that all the legal titles in the world, no matter how perpetual, could not give a house the power of obtaining its cost price back ten times, over the course of fifty years, in the form of rent, but that only economic conditions (which may have obtained social recognition in the form of legal titles) can accomplish this. And with this he would again be where he started from.

---

a [A. Mülberger,] op. cit., Der Volksstaat, No. 10, February 3, 1872.—Ed.
b The rest of the sentence was added by Engels in the 1887 edition.—Ed.
The whole Proudhonist teaching rests on this saving leap from economic reality into legal phraseology. Every time our good Proudhon loses the economic hang of things—and this happens to him with every serious problem—he takes refuge in the sphere of law and appeals to eternal justice.

"Proudhon begins by taking his ideal of justice, of 'justice éternelle', from the juridical relations that correspond to the production of commodities; thereby, it may be noted, he proves, to the consolation of all good citizens, that the production of commodities is a form of production as everlasting as justice. Then he turns round and seeks to reform the actual production of commodities, and the actual legal system corresponding thereto, in accordance with this ideal. What opinion should we have of a chemist, who, instead of studying the actual laws of the molecular changes in the composition and decomposition of matter, and on that foundation solving definite problems, claimed to regulate the composition and decomposition of matter by means of the 'eternal ideas', of 'naturalité and affinité'? Do we really know any more about 'usury', when we say it contradicts 'justice éternelle', 'équité éternelle', 'mutualité éternelle', and other 'vérités éternelles'; than the fathers of the church did when they said it was incompatible with 'grâce éternelle', 'foi éternelle', and 'la volonté éternelle de Dieu'?" (Marx, Capital, p. 45a).

Our Proudhonist does not fare any better than his lord and master:

"The rent agreement is one of the thousand exchanges which are as necessary in the life of modern society as the circulation of the blood in the bodies of animals. Naturally, it would be in the interest of this society if all these exchanges were pervaded by a conception of right, that is to say, if they were carried out everywhere according to the strict demands of justice. In a word, the economic life of society must, as Proudhon says, raise itself to the heights of economic right. In reality, as we know, exactly the opposite takes place."

Is it credible that five years after Marx had characterised Proudhonism so summarily and convincingly precisely from this decisive angle, one can still print such confused stuff in the German language? What does this rigmarole mean? Nothing more than that the practical effects of the economic laws which govern present-day society run contrary to the author's sense of justice and that he cherishes the pious wish that the matter might be so

---

a Engels quotes from the first (1867) German edition of Volume One of Capital; see also the English edition which was edited by Engels (Capital, Vol. I, London, 1887, p. 56).—Ed.

b [A. Mülberger,] op. cit., Der Volksstaat, No. 11, February 7, 1872.—Ed.
arranged as to remedy this situation.—Yes, if toads had tails they
would no longer be toads! And is then the capitalist mode of
production not “pervaded by a conception of right”, namely, that
of its own right to exploit the workers? And if the author tells us
this is not his conception of right, are we one step further?

But let us go back to the housing question. Our Proudhonianist
now gives his “conception of right” free rein and treats us to the
following moving declamation:

“We do not hesitate to assert that there is no more terrible mockery of the
whole culture of our lauded century than the fact that in the big cities 90 per cent
and more of the population have no place that they can call their own. The real
nodal point of moral and family existence, hearth and home, is being swept away
by the social whirlpool... In this respect we are far below the savages. The
trogloidyte has his cave, the Australian his clay hut, the Indian his own hearth, but
the modern proletarian is practically suspended in mid-air,” etc.

In this jeremiad we have Proudhonism in its whole reactionary
form. In order to create the modern revolutionary class of the
proletariat it was absolutely necessary to cut the umbilical cord
which still bound the worker of the past to the land. The hand
weaver who had his little house, garden and field along with his
loom was a quiet, contented man, “godly and honourable” despite
all misery and despite all political pressure; he doffed his cap to
the rich, to the priest and to the officials of the state and inwardly
was altogether a slave. It is precisely modern large-scale industry
which has turned the worker, formerly chained to the land, into a
completely propertyless proletarian, liberated from all traditional
fetters, a free outlaw; it is precisely this economic revolution which
has created the sole conditions under which the exploitation of the
working class in its final form, in capitalist production, can be
overthrown. And now comes this tearful Proudhonianist and bewails
the driving of the workers from hearth and home as though it
were a great retrogression instead of being the very first condition
of their intellectual emancipation.

Twenty-seven years ago I described, in The Condition of the
Working-Class in England, the main features of just this process of
driving the workers from hearth and home, as it took place in the
eighteenth century in England. The infamies of which the land
and factory owners were guilty in so doing, and the deleterious
effects, material and moral, which this expulsion inevitably had on
the workers concerned in the first place, are there also described

---

a Ibid.—Ed.
b Der Volksstaat has “culture” instead of “fetters”—Ed.
as they deserve. But could it enter my head to regard this, which was in the circumstances an absolutely necessary historical process of development, as a retrogression “below the savages”? Impossible! The English proletarian of 1872 is on an infinitely higher level than the rural weaver of 1772 with his “hearth and home”. And will the troglodyte with his cave, the Australian with his clay hut or the Indian with his own hearth ever accomplish a June insurrection or a Paris Commune?

That the situation of the workers has on the whole become materially worse since the introduction of capitalist production on a large scale is doubted only by the bourgeois. But should we therefore look backward longingly to the (likewise very meagre) fleshpots of Egypt, to rural small-scale industry, which produced only servile souls, or to “the savages”? On the contrary. Only the proletariat created by modern large-scale industry, liberated from all inherited fetters including those which chained it to the land, and herded together in the big cities, is in a position to accomplish the great social transformation which will put an end to all class exploitation and all class rule. The old rural hand weavers with hearth and home would never have been able to do it; they would never have been able to conceive such an idea, not to speak of desiring to carry it out.

For Proudhon, on the other hand, the whole industrial revolution of the last hundred years, the introduction of steam power and large-scale factory production which substitutes machinery for hand labour and increases the productivity of labour a thousandfold, is a highly repugnant occurrence, something which really ought never to have taken place. The petty bourgeois Proudhon aspires to a world in which each person turns out a separate and independent product that is immediately consumable and exchangeable in the market. Then, as long as each person receives back the full value of his labour in the form of another product, “eternal justice” is satisfied and the best possible world created. But this best possible world of Proudhon has already been nipped in the bud and trodden underfoot by the advance of industrial development, which long ago destroyed individual labour in all the big branches of industry and which is destroying it daily more and more in the smaller and even smallest branches, which is setting social labour supported by machinery and the harnessed forces of nature in its place, and whose finished product, immediately exchangeable or consumable, is the joint work of the many individuals through whose hands it has had to pass. And it is precisely this industrial revolution which has raised
the productive power of human labour to such a high level that—for the first time in the history of mankind—the possibility exists, given a rational division of labour among all, of producing not only enough for the plentiful consumption of all members of society and for an abundant reserve fund, but also of leaving each individual sufficient leisure so that what is really worth preserving in historically inherited culture—science, art, forms of intercourse, etc.—may not only be preserved but converted from a monopoly of the ruling class into the common property of the whole of society, and may be further developed. And here is the decisive point: as soon as the productive power of human labour has risen to this height, every excuse disappears for the existence of a ruling class. After all, the ultimate basis on which class differences were defended was always: there must be a class which need not plague itself with the production of its daily subsistence, in order that it may have time to look after the intellectual work of society. This talk, which up to now had its great historical justification, has been cut off at the root once and for all by the industrial revolution of the last hundred years. The existence of a ruling class is becoming daily more and more a hindrance to the development of industrial productive power, and equally so to that of science, art and especially of forms of cultural intercourse. There never were greater boors than our modern bourgeois.

All this is nothing to friend Proudhon. He wants “eternal justice” and nothing else. Each shall receive in exchange for his product the full proceeds of his labour, the full value of his labour. But to calculate this in a product of modern industry is a complicated matter. For modern industry obscures the particular share of the individual in the total product, which in the old individual handicraft was obviously represented by the finished product. Further, modern industry eliminates more and more individual exchange, on which Proudhon's whole system is built up,^a^ namely, direct exchange between two producers each of whom takes the product of the other in order to consume it. Consequently a reactionary streak runs through the whole of Proudhonism; an aversion to the industrial revolution and the desire, sometimes overtly, sometimes covertly expressed, to drive the whole of modern industry out of the temple—steam engines, mechanical looms and the rest of the business—and to return to old, respectable hand labour. That we would then lose nine hundred and ninety-nine thousandths of our productive power,

---

^a^ The rest of the sentence was added by Engels in the 1887 edition.—*Ed.*
that the whole of humanity would be condemned to the worst possible labour slavery, that starvation would become the general rule—what does all that matter if only we succeed in organising exchange in such a fashion that each receives “the full proceeds of his labour”, and that “eternal justice” is realised? *Fiat justitia, pereat mundus!*\(^a\)

Let justice be done though the whole world perish!

And the world would perish in this Proudhonist counter-revolution if it were at all possible to carry it out.

It is, however, self-evident that, even with social production conditioned by modern large-scale industry, it is possible to assure each person “the full proceeds of his labour”, so far as this phrase has any meaning at all.\(^b\) And it has a meaning only if it is extended to purport not that each individual worker becomes the possessor of “the full proceeds of his labour”, but that the whole of society, consisting entirely of workers, becomes the possessor of the total product of their labour, which product it partly distributes among its members for consumption, partly uses for replacing and increasing its means of production, and partly stores up as a reserve fund for production and consumption.

After what has been said above, we already know in advance how our Proudhonist will solve the great housing question. On the one hand, we have the demand that each worker have and own his own home in order that we may no longer be *below the savages*. On the other hand, we have the assurance that the two, three, five or tenfold repayment of the original cost price of a house in the form of rent, as it actually takes place, is based on a *legal title*, and that this legal title is in contradiction to “*eternal justice*”. The solution is simple: we abolish the legal title and by virtue of eternal justice declare the rent paid to be a payment on account of the cost of the dwelling itself. If one has so arranged one’s premisses that they already contain the conclusion, then of course it requires no greater skill than any charlatan possesses to produce the result, prepared beforehand, from the bag and proudly point to unshakeable logic whose result it is.

And so it happens here. The abolition of rented dwellings is proclaimed a necessity, and couched in the form of a demand that every tenant be turned into the owner of his dwelling. How are we to do that? Very simply:

\(^a\) The motto of Ferdinand I, emperor of the Holy Roman Empire.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) The next sentence was added by Engels in the 1887 edition.—*Ed.*
"Rented dwellings will be redeemed... The previous house-owner will be paid the value of his house to the last farthing. Hitherto the tenant has paid rent as his tribute to the perpetual title of capital, now, from the day when the redemption of rented dwellings is proclaimed, the exactly fixed sum paid by the tenant will become the annual instalment paid for the dwelling which has passed into his possession... Society ... transforms itself in this way into a totality of free and independent owners of dwellings."a

The Proudhonist finds it a crime against eternal justice that the house-owner can without working obtain ground rent and interest b out of the capital he has invested in the house. He decrees that this must cease, that capital invested in houses shall no longer yield interest; nor ground rent either, so far as it represents purchased landed property. Now we have seen that the capitalist mode of production, the basis of present-day society, is in no way affected hereby. The pivot on which the exploitation of the worker turns is the sale of his labour power to the capitalist and the use which the capitalist makes of this transaction, the fact that he compels the worker to produce far more than the paid value of his labour power amounts to. It is this transaction between capitalist and worker which produces all the surplus value afterwards divided in the form of ground rent, commercial profit, interest on capital, c taxes, etc., among the diverse varieties of capitalists and their servitors. And now our Proudhonist comes along and believes that if we were to prohibit one single variety of capitalists, and at that of capitalists who purchase no labour power directly and therefore also cause no surplus value to be produced, from making profit or receiving interest, d it would be a step forward! The mass of unpaid labour taken from the working class would remain exactly the same even if house-owners were to be deprived tomorrow of the possibility of receiving ground rent and interest. e However, this does not prevent our Proudhonist from declaring:

"The abolition of rented dwellings is thus one of the most fruitful and magnificent aspirations which have ever sprung from the womb of the revolutionary idea and it must become one of the primary demands of the Social-Democracy."f

---

a [A. Mülberger,] op. cit., Der Volksstaat, No. 12, February 10, 1872.— Ed.
b Der Volksstaat has "profit" instead of "interest".— Ed.
c The words "interest on capital" were added by Engels in the 1887 edition.— Ed.
d The words "or receiving interest" were added by Engels in the 1887 edition.— Ed.
e Der Volksstaat has "profit" instead of "interest".— Ed.
f [A. Mülberger,] op. cit., Der Volksstaat, No. 12, February 10, 1872.— Ed.
This is exactly the type of market cry of the master Proudhon himself, whose cackling was always in inverse ratio to the size of the eggs laid.

And now imagine the fine state of things if each worker, petty bourgeois and bourgeois were compelled by paying annual instalments to become first part owner and then full owner of his dwelling! In the industrial districts in England, where there is large-scale industry but small workers' houses and each married worker occupies a little house of his own, there might possibly be some sense in it. But the small-scale industry in Paris and in most of the big cities on the Continent is supplemented by large houses in each of which ten, twenty or thirty families live together. Supposing that on the day of the world-delivering decree, when the redemption of rent dwellings is proclaimed, Peter is working in an engineering works in Berlin. A year later he is owner of, if you like, the fifteenth part of his flat consisting of a little room on the fifth floor of a house somewhere in the neighbourhood of the Hamburger Tor. He then loses his job and soon afterwards finds himself in a similar flat on the third floor of a house in the Pothof in Hanover with a wonderful view of the courtyard. After five months' stay there he has just acquired $\frac{1}{36}$ part of this property when a strike sends him to Munich and compels him by a stay of eleven months to assume ownership of exactly $\frac{11}{180}$ of a rather gloomy abode on the street level behind the Ober-Angergasse. Subsequent removals, such as nowadays are so frequent with workers, saddle him further with $\frac{7}{360}$ of a no less desirable residence in Saint Gall, $\frac{23}{180}$ of another one in Leeds, and $\frac{347}{56223}$, figured out exactly in order that "eternal justice" may have nothing to complain about, of a third flat in Seraing. And now, of what use are all these shares in flats to our Peter? Who is to give him the real value of these shares? Where is he to find the owner or owners of the remaining shares in his various one-time flats? And what exactly are the property relations regarding any big house whose floors hold, let us say, twenty flats and which, when the redemption period has elapsed and rented flats are abolished, belongs to perhaps three hundred part owners who are scattered all over the world? Our Proudhonist will answer that by that time the Proudhonist exchange bank $^{241}$ will exist, which will pay to anyone at any time the full labour proceeds for any labour product, and will therefore pay out also the full value of a share in a flat. But in the first place we are not at all concerned here with the Proudhonist exchange bank since it is nowhere mentioned in the articles on the housing question; secondly it rests on the
peculiar error that if someone wants to sell a commodity he will necessarily always find a buyer for its full value, and thirdly it went bankrupt in England more than once under the name of Labour Exchange Bazaar, before Proudhon invented it.

The whole conception that the worker should buy his dwelling rests again on the reactionary basic outlook, already emphasised, of Proudhonism, according to which the conditions created by modern large-scale industry are morbid excrescences, and society must be brought forcibly, that is, against the trend which it has been following for a hundred years, to a condition in which the old stable handicraft of the individual is the rule, and which, generally speaking, is nothing but an idealised restoration of small-scale enterprise, which has gone and is still going to rack and ruin. Once the workers are flung back into these stable conditions and the "social whirlpool" has been happily removed, the worker can naturally again make use of property in "hearth and home", and the above redemption theory appears less absurd. Proudhon only forgets that in order to accomplish all this he must first of all put back the clock of world history a hundred years, and that if he did he would turn the present-day workers into just such narrow-minded, crawling, sneaking servile souls as their great-great-grandfathers were.

As far, however, as this Proudhonist solution of the housing question contains any rational and practically applicable content it is already being carried out today, but this realisation does not spring from "the womb of the revolutionary idea", but from—the big bourgeois themselves. Let us listen to an excellent Spanish newspaper, La Emancipacion, of Madrid, of March 16, 1872:

"There is still another means of solving the housing question, the way proposed by Proudhon, which dazzles at first glance, but on closer examination reveals its utter impotence. Proudhon proposed that tenants should be converted into buyers on the instalment plan, that the rent paid annually be booked as an instalment on the redemption payment of the value of the particular dwelling, so that after a certain time the tenant would become its owner. This method, which Proudhon considered very revolutionary, is being put into operation in all countries by companies of speculators who thus secure double and treble the value of the houses by raising the rents. M. Dollfus and other big manufacturers in North-Eastern France have carried out this system not only in order to make money but, in addition, with a political idea at the back of their minds.

"The cleverest leaders of the ruling class have always directed their efforts towards increasing the number of small owners in order to build an army for themselves against the proletariat. The bourgeois revolutions of the last century
divided up the big estates of the nobility and the church into small allotments, just as the Spanish republicans propose to do today with the still existing large estates, and created thereby a class of small landowners which has since become the most reactionary element in society and a permanent hindrance to the revolutionary movement of the urban proletariat. Napoleon III aimed at creating a similar class in the towns by reducing the denominations of the individual bonds of the public debt, and M. Dollfus and his colleagues sought to stifle all revolutionary spirit in their workers by selling them small dwellings to be paid for in annual instalments, and at the same time to chain the workers by this property to the factory once they worked in it. Thus the Proudhon plan, far from bringing the working class any relief, even turned directly against it. 

How is the housing question to be settled, then? In present-day society, just as any other social question is settled: by the gradual economic levelling of demand and supply, a settlement which reproduces the question itself again and again and therefore is no settlement. How a social revolution would settle this question not only depends on the circumstances in each particular case, but is also connected with much more far-reaching questions, one of the most fundamental of which is the abolition of the antithesis between town and country. As it is not our task to create utopian systems for the organisation of the future society, it would be more than idle to go into the question here. But one thing is certain: there is already a sufficient quantity of houses in the big cities to remedy immediately all real "housing shortage", provided they are used judiciously. This can naturally only occur through the expropriation of the present owners by quartering in their houses homeless workers or workers overcrowded in their present homes. As soon as the proletariat has won political power, such a measure prompted by concern for the common good will be just as easy to carry out as are other expropriations and billetings by the present-day state.

However, our Proudhonist is not satisfied with his previous achievements in the housing question. He must raise the question

* How this solution of the housing question by means of chaining the worker to his own "home" is arising spontaneously in the neighbourhood of big or rapidly rising American towns can be seen from the following passage of a letter by Eleanor Marx-Aveling, Indianapolis, November 28, 1886: "In, or rather near, Kansas City we saw some miserable little wooden shacks, containing about three rooms each, still in the wilds; the land cost 600 dollars and was just big enough to put the little house on it; the latter cost a further 600 dollars, that is, together, 4,800 marks, for a miserable little thing, an hour away from the town, in a muddy desert." In this way the workers must shoulder heavy mortgage debts in order to obtain even these dwellings, and now indeed become the slaves of their employers. They are tied to their houses, they cannot go away, and must put up with whatever working conditions are offered them. [Note by Engels to the 1887 edition.]
from the level ground into the sphere of higher socialism in order that it may prove there also an essential "fractional part of the social question":

"Let us now assume that the productivity of capital is really taken by the horns, as it must be sooner or later, for instance, by a transitional law which fixes the interest on all capitals at one per cent, but mark you, with the tendency to make even this rate of interest approximate more and more to the zero point, so that finally nothing more will be paid than the labour necessary to turn over the capital. Like all other products, houses and dwellings are naturally also included within the purview of this law... The owner himself will be the first one to agree to a sale because otherwise his house would be unused and the capital invested in it simply useless." a

This passage contains one of the chief articles of faith of the Proudhonist catechism and offers a striking example of the confusion prevailing in it.

The "productivity of capital" is an absurdity that Proudhon takes over uncritically from the bourgeois economists. The bourgeois economists, it is true, also begin with the proposition that labour is the source of all wealth and the measure of value of all commodities; but they likewise have to explain how it comes about that the capitalist who advances capital for an industrial or handicraft business receives back at the end of it not only the capital which he advanced but also a profit over and above it. In consequence they are compelled to entangle themselves in all sorts of contradictions and to ascribe also to capital a certain productivity. Nothing proves more clearly how completely Proudhon remains enmeshed in bourgeois thinking than the fact that he has taken over this phrase about the productivity of capital. We have seen at the very beginning that the so-called "productivity of capital" is nothing but the quality inherent in it (under present-day social relations, without which it would not be capital at all) of being able to appropriate the unpaid labour of wage-workers.

However, Proudhon differs from the bourgeois economists in that he does not approve of this "productivity of capital," but on the contrary, discovers in it a violation of "eternal justice". It is this productivity which prevents the worker from receiving the full proceeds of his labour. It must therefore be abolished. But how? By lowering the rate of interest by compulsory legislation and finally reducing it to zero. Then, according to our Proudhonist, capital will cease to be productive.

The interest on loaned money capital is only a part of profit; profit, whether on industrial or commercial capital, is only a part

---

a [A. Mülberger,] op. cit., Der Volksstaat, No. 13, February 14, 1872.— Ed.
of the surplus value taken by the capitalist class from the working class in the form of unpaid labour. The economic laws which govern the rate of interest are as independent of those which govern the rate of surplus value as could possibly be the case with laws of one and the same form of society. But as far as the distribution of this surplus value among the individual capitalists is concerned, it is clear that for industrialists and merchants who have in their businesses large amounts of capital advanced by other capitalists the rate of profit must rise—all other things being equal—to the same extent as the rate of interest falls. The reduction and final abolition of interest would, therefore, by no means really take the so-called "productivity of capital" "by the horns". It would do no more than re-arrange the distribution among the individual capitalists of the unpaid surplus value taken from the working class. It would not give an advantage to the worker as against the industrial capitalist, but to the industrial capitalist as against the rentier.

Proudhon, from his legal standpoint, explains the rate of interest, as he does all economic facts, not by the conditions of social production, but by the state laws in which these conditions receive their general expression. From this point of view, which lacks any inkling of the interconnection between the state laws and the conditions of production in society, these state laws necessarily appear as purely arbitrary orders which at any moment could be replaced just as well by their exact opposites. Nothing is, therefore, easier for Proudhon than to issue a decree—as soon as he has the power to do so—reducing the rate of interest to one per cent. And if all the other social conditions remain as they were, this Proudhonist decree will simply exist on paper only. The rate of interest will continue to be governed by the economic laws to which it is subject today, all decrees notwithstanding. Persons possessing credit will continue to borrow money at two, three, four and more per cent, according to circumstances, just as before, and the only difference will be that rentiers will be very careful to advance money only to persons with whom no litigation is to be expected. Moreover, this great plan to deprive capital of its "productivity" is as old as the hills; it is as old as—the usury laws which aim at nothing else but limiting the rate of interest, and which have since been abolished everywhere because in practice they were continually broken or circumvented, and the state was compelled to admit its impotence against the laws of social production. And the re-introduction of these medieval and unworkable laws is "to take the productivity of capital by the
horns”? One sees that the closer Proudhonism is examined the more reactionary it appears.

And when thereupon the rate of interest has been reduced to zero in this fashion, and interest on capital therefore abolished, then “nothing more will be paid than the labour necessary to turn over the capital”. This is supposed to mean that the abolition of the rate of interest is equivalent to the abolition of profit and even of surplus value. But if it were possible really to abolish interest by decree, what would be the consequence? The class of rentiers would no longer have any inducement to loan out their capital in the form of advances, but would invest it industrially, either on their own or through joint-stock companies. The mass of surplus value extracted from the working class by the capitalist class would remain the same; only its distribution would be altered, and even that not much.

In fact, our Proudhonist fails to see that already now, in commodity purchase in bourgeois society, no more is paid on the average than “the labour necessary to turn over the capital” (it should read, necessary for the production of the commodity in question). Labour is the measure of value of all commodities, and in present-day society—apart from fluctuations of the market—it is absolutely impossible that in the aggregate more should be paid on the average for commodities than the labour necessary for their production. No, no, my dear Proudhonist, the difficulty lies elsewhere. It is contained in the fact that “the labour necessary to turn over the capital” (to use your confused terminology) is simply not fully paid for! How this comes about you can look up in Marx (Capital, pp. 128-60).

But that is not enough. If interest on capital is abolished, house rent is abolished with it; for, “like all other products, houses and dwellings are naturally also included within the purview of this law”. This is quite in the spirit of the old Major who summoned his one-year volunteer recruit and declared:

“I say, I hear you are a doctor; you might report from time to time at my quarters; when one has a wife and seven children there is always something to patch up.”

Recruit: “Excuse me, Major, but I am a doctor of philosophy.”

Major: “That’s all the same to me; one sawbones is the same as another.”

Our Proudhonist behaves the same way: house rent or interest

---

on capital, it is all the same to him. Interest is interest; sawbones is sawbones.

We have seen above that the rent price, commonly called house rent, is composed as follows: 1) a part which is ground rent; 2) a part which is interest on the building capital, including the profit of the builder; 3) a part which goes for repairs and insurance; 4) a part which has to amortise the building capital inclusive of profit in annual deductions according to the rate at which the house gradually depreciates.

And now it must have become clear even to the blindest that

"the owner himself will be the first one to agree to a sale because otherwise his house would be unused and the capital invested in it simply useless".

Of course. If the interest on loaned capital is abolished, no house-owner can thereafter obtain a penny piece in rent for his house, simply because house rent may also be spoken of as rent interest and because such rent interest contains a part which is really interest on capital. Sawbones is sawbones. Whereas the usury laws relating to ordinary interest on capital could be made ineffective only by circumventing them, yet they never touched the rate of house rent even remotely. It was reserved for Proudhon to imagine that his new usury law would without more ado regulate and gradually abolish not only simple interest on capital but also the complicated house rent for dwellings. Why then the "simply useless" house should be purchased for good money from the house-owner, and how it is that under such circumstances the

---

a The original has "Zins ist Zins"; a pun on "Mietzins" (house rent) and "Kapitalzins" (interest on capital).—Ed.

b The passage "We have seen above ... house rent for dwellings" was edited by Engels for the 1887 edition; in Der Volksstaat No. 53 of July 3, 1872 it runs as follows:

"We have seen above that the rent price, commonly called house rent, is composed as follows: 1) a part which is ground rent, 2) a part which is profit, not interest, on the building capital, 3) a part which is the cost of repairs, maintenance, and insurance. It contains no part which is interest on capital, unless the house is encumbered with a mortgage debt.

"And now it must have become clear even to the blindest that 'the owner himself will be the first one to agree to a sale because otherwise his house would be unused and the capital invested in it simply useless'. Of course. If the interest on loaned capital is abolished, no house-owner can thereafter obtain a penny piece in rent for his house, simply because house rent may also be spoken of as rent interest. Sawbones is sawbones."

After the sentence "It contains no part which is interest on capital, unless the house is encumbered with a mortgage debt" in the 1872 separate reprint of Part I of The Housing Question Engels made the following note, omitted in the 1887 edition:
house-owner would not pay money himself to get rid of this "simply useless" house in order to save himself the cost of repairs—about this we are left in the dark.

After this triumphant achievement in the sphere of higher socialism (Master Proudhon called it suprasocialism\(^a\)) our Proudhonist considers himself justified in flying still higher:

"All that still has to be done now is to draw some conclusions in order to cast complete light from all sides on our so important subject."

And what are these conclusions? Things which follow as little from what has been said before as the worthlessness of dwelling houses from the abolition of interest. Stripped of the pompous and solemn phraseology of our author, they mean nothing more than that, in order to facilitate the business of redemption of rented dwellings, the following is desirable: 1) exact statistics on the subject; 2) a good sanitary inspection force; 3) co-operatives of building workers to undertake the building of new houses. All these things are certainly very fine and good, but, despite all the vociferous phrases in which they are enveloped, they by no means cast "complete light" into the obscurity of Proudhonist mental confusion.

One who has achieved such great things has the right to address a serious exhortation to the German workers:

"Such and similar questions, it would seem to us, are well worth the attention of the Social-Democracy.... Let it seek to clarify its mind, as here on the housing question, so also on other and equally important questions, such as credit, state debts, private debts, taxes," etc.\(^c\)

Thus, our Proudhonist here confronts us with the prospect of a whole series of articles on "similar questions", and if he deals with them all as thoroughly as with the present "so important subject", the Volksstaat will have copy enough for a year. But we are in a position to anticipate—it all amounts to what has already been said: interest on capital is to be abolished and with that the interest


\(^b\) [A. Müüberger,] op. cit., *Der Volksstaat*, No. 13, February 14, 1872.—Ed.

\(^c\) Ibid.—Ed.
on public and private debts disappears, credit will be gratis, etc. The same magic formula is applied to any and every subject and in each particular case the same astonishing result is obtained with inexorable logic, namely, that when interest on capital has been abolished no more interest will have to be paid on borrowed money.

They are fine questions, by the way, with which our Proudhonist threatens us: Credit! What credit does the worker need besides that from week to week, or the credit he obtains at the pawnshop? Whether he gets this credit free or at interest, even at the usurious interest charged by the pawnshop, how much difference does that make to him? And if he did, generally speaking, obtain some advantage from it, that is to say, if the cost of production of labour power were reduced, would not the price of labour power be bound to fall?—But to the bourgeois, and in particular to the petty bourgeois, credit is an important matter, and it would be a very fine thing for the petty bourgeois in particular if credit could be obtained at any time, and besides without payment of interest.

"State debts!" The working class knows that it did not make them, and when it comes to power it will leave the payment of them to those who contracted them. "Private debts!"—see credit. "Taxes!" A matter that interests the bourgeoisie very much but the worker only very little. What the worker pays in taxes goes in the long run into the cost of production of labour power and must therefore be compensated for by the capitalist. All these things which are held up to us here as highly important questions for the working class are in reality of essential interest only to the bourgeois, and still more so to the petty bourgeois; and, despite Proudhon, we maintain that the working class is not called upon to safeguard the interests of these classes.

Our Proudhonist has not a word to say about the great question which really concerns the workers, that of the relation between capitalist and wage-worker, the question of how it comes about that the capitalist can enrich himself by the labour of his workers. True enough, his lord and master did occupy himself with it, but introduced absolutely no clearness into the matter. Even in his latest writings he has got essentially no farther than he was in his Philosophie de la misère, which Marx so strikingly reduced to nothingness in 1847.}

\[a\] K. Marx, The Poverty of Philosophy. Answer to the "Philosophy of Poverty" by M. Proudhon.—Ed.
It was bad enough that for twenty-five years the workers speaking Romance languages had almost no other socialist mental pabulum than the writings of this "socialist of the Second Empire", and it would be a double misfortune if the Proudhonist theory were now to inundate Germany too. However, there need be no fear of this. The theoretical standpoint of the German workers is fifty years ahead of that of Proudhonism, and it will be sufficient to make an example of this one question, the housing question, to save further trouble in this respect.

Part II
HOW THE BOURGEOISIE SOLVES
THE HOUSING QUESTION

I

In the section on the Proudhonist solution of the housing question it was shown how greatly the petty bourgeoisie is directly interested in this question. However, the big bourgeoisie is also very much interested in it, even if indirectly. Modern natural science has proved that the so-called "bad districts", in which the workers are crowded together, are the breeding places of all those epidemics which from time to time afflict our towns. Cholera, typhus, typhoid fever, small-pox and other ravaging diseases spread their germs in the pestilential air and the poisoned water of these working-class quarters. Here the germs hardly ever die out completely, and as soon as circumstances permit they develop into epidemics and then spread beyond their breeding places into the more airy and healthy parts of the town inhabited by Messrs. the capitalists. Capitalist rule cannot allow itself the pleasure of generating epidemic diseases among the working class with impunity; the consequences fall back on it and the angel of death rages in the ranks of the capitalists as ruthlessly as in the ranks of the workers.

As soon as this fact had been scientifically established the philanthropic bourgeoisie became inflamed with a noble spirit of competition in their solicitude for the health of their workers. Societies were founded, books were written, proposals drawn up, laws debated and passed, in order to stop up the sources of the ever-recurring epidemics. The housing conditions of the workers were investigated and attempts made to remedy the most crying evils. In England particularly, where the largest number of big
towns existed and where the bourgeoisie itself was, therefore, running the greatest risk, extensive activity began. Government commissions were appointed to inquire into the hygienic conditions of the working classes. Their reports, honourably distinguished from all continental sources by their accuracy, completeness and impartiality, provided the basis for new, more or less thoroughgoing laws. Imperfect as these laws are, they are still infinitely superior to everything that has been done in this direction up to the present on the Continent. Nevertheless, the capitalist order of society reproduces again and again the evils to be remedied, and does so with such inevitable necessity that even in England the remedying of them has hardly advanced a single step.

Germany, as usual, needed a much longer time before the chronic sources of infection existing there also reached the acute stage necessary to arouse the somnolent big bourgeois. But he who goes slowly goes surely, and so among us too there finally has arisen a bourgeois literature on public health and the housing question, a watery extract of its foreign, and in particular its English, predecessors, to which it is sought fraudulently to impart a semblance of higher conception by means of fine-sounding and unctuous phrases. Die Wohnungszustände der arbeitenden Classen und ihre Reform, by Dr. Emil Sax, Vienna, 1869, belongs to this literature.

I have selected this book for a presentation of the bourgeois treatment of the housing question only because it makes the attempt to summarise as far as possible the bourgeois literature on the subject. And a fine literature it is which serves our author as his "sources"! Of the English parliamentary reports, the real main sources, only three, the very oldest, are mentioned by name; the whole book proves that its author has never glanced at even a single one of them. On the other hand, a whole series of banal bourgeois, well-meaning philistine and hypocritical philanthropic writings are enumerated: Ducpétiaux, Roberts, Hole, Huber, the proceedings of the English social science (or rather social bosh) congresses, the Zeitschrift des Vereins für das Wohl der arbeitenden Klassen in Prussia, the official Austrian report on the World Exhibition in Paris, the official Bonapartist reports on the same

---

a For 1837, 1839 and 1842.—Ed.
b Transactions of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, London, 1859-1865.—Ed.
c Bericht über die Welt-Ausstellung zu Paris im Jahre 1867, Vienna, 1869.—Ed.
subject, \textit{The Illustrated London News}, and finally "a recognised authority," a man of "acute practical perception", of "convincing impressiveness of speech", namely—\textit{Julius Faucher}! All that is missing in this list of sources is the \textit{Gartenlaube}, \textit{Kladderadatsch} and the Fusilier Kutschke.

In order that no misunderstanding may arise concerning the standpoint of Herr Sax, he declares on page 22:

"By social economy we mean the doctrine of national economy in its application to social questions; or to put it more precisely, the totality of the ways and means which this science offers us for raising the so-called" (I) "propertyless classes to the level of the propertied classes, on the basis of its 'iron' laws within the framework of the order of society at present prevailing."

We shall not go into the confused idea that generally speaking "the doctrine of national economy", or political economy, deals with other than "social" questions. We shall get down to the main point immediately. Dr. Sax demands that the "iron laws" of bourgeois economics, the "framework of the order of society at present prevailing", in other words, the capitalist mode of production, must continue to exist unchanged, but nevertheless the "so-called propertyless classes" are to be raised "to the level of the propertied classes". Now, it is an unavoidable preliminary condition of the capitalist mode of production that a really, and not a so-called, propertyless class, should exist, a class which has nothing to sell but its labour power and which is therefore compelled to sell its labour power to the industrial capitalists. The task of the new science of social economy invented by Herr Sax is, therefore, to find ways and means—in a state of society founded on the antagonism of capitalists, owners of all raw materials, instruments of production and means of subsistence, on the one hand, and of propertyless wage-workers, who call only their labour power and nothing else their own, on the other hand—by which,
under this state of society, all wage-workers can be turned into capitalists without ceasing to be wage-workers. Herr Sax thinks he has solved this question. Perhaps he would be so good as to show us how all the soldiers of the French army, each of whom carries a marshal’s baton in his knapsack since the days of the old Napoleon, can be turned into field marshals without at the same time ceasing to be privates. Or how it could be brought about that all the forty million subjects of the German Empire could be made German emperors.

It is the essence of bourgeois socialism to want to maintain the basis of all the evils of present-day society and at same time to want to abolish the evils themselves. As already pointed out in the *Communist Manifesto*, the bourgeois socialists are desirous of “redressing social grievances, in order to secure the continued existence of bourgeois society”; they want “a bourgeoisie without a proletariat”.\(^a\) We have seen that Herr Sax formulates the problem in exactly the same fashion. Its solution he finds in the solution of the housing problem. He is of the opinion that

“by improving the housing of the labouring classes it would be possible successfully to remedy the material and spiritual misery which has been described, and thereby”—by a radical improvement of the housing conditions *alone*—“to raise the greater part of these classes out of the morass of their often hardly human conditions of existence to the pure heights of material and spiritual well-being” (page 14).

Incidentally, it is in the interest of the bourgeoisie to gloss over the fact of the existence of a proletariat created by the bourgeois relations of production and determining the continued existence of these relations. Therefore Herr Sax tells us (page 21) that the expression labouring classes is to be understood as including all “impecunious social classes”, “and, in general, people in a small way, such as handicraftsmen, widows, pensioners” (!), “subordinate officials, etc.” as well as actual workers. Bourgeois socialism extends its hand to the petty-bourgeois variety.

Whence the housing shortage then? How did it arise? As a good bourgeois, Herr Sax is not supposed to know that it is a necessary product of the bourgeois social order; that it cannot fail to be present in a society in which the great labouring masses are exclusively dependent upon wages, that is to say, upon the quantity of means of subsistence necessary for their existence and for the propagation of their kind; in which improvements of the machinery, etc., continually throw masses of workers out of

---

\(^a\) See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 513.—*Ed.*
employment; in which violent and regularly recurring industrial fluctuations determine on the one hand the existence of a large reserve army of unemployed workers, and on the other hand drive the mass of the workers from time to time on to the streets unemployed; in which the workers are crowded together in masses in the big towns at a quicker rate than dwellings come into existence for them under the prevailing conditions, in which, therefore, there must always be tenants even for the most infamous pigsties; and in which finally the house-owner in his capacity as capitalist has not only the right but, by reason of competition, to a certain extent also the duty of ruthlessly making as much out of his property in house rent as he possibly can. In such a society the housing shortage is no accident; it is a necessary institution and can be abolished together with all its effects on health, etc., only if the whole social order from which it springs is fundamentally refashioned. That, however, bourgeois socialism dare not know. It dare not explain the housing shortage as arising from the existing conditions. And therefore it has no other way but to explain the housing shortage by moralising that it is the result of the wickedness of man, the result of original sin, so to speak.

"And here we cannot fail to recognise—and in consequence we cannot deny" (daring conclusion!)—"that the blame ... rests partly with the workers themselves, those who want dwellings, and partly, the much greater part, it is true, with those who undertake to supply the need or those who, although they have sufficient means at their command, make no attempt to supply the need, namely, the propertied, higher social classes. The latter are to be blamed ... because they do not make it their business to provide for a sufficient supply of good dwellings." [Page 25.]

Just as Proudhon takes us from the sphere of economics into the sphere of legal phrases, so our bourgeois socialist takes us here from the economic sphere into the moral sphere. And nothing is more natural. Whoever declares that the capitalist mode of production, the "iron laws" of present-day bourgeois society, are inviolable, and yet at the same time would like to abolish their unpleasant but necessary consequences, has no other recourse but to deliver moral sermons to the capitalists, moral sermons whose emotional effects immediately evaporate under the influence of private interest and, if necessary, of competition. These moral sermons are in effect exactly the same as those of the hen at the edge of the pond in which she sees the brood of ducklings she has hatched out gaily swimming. Ducklings take to the water although it has no beams, and capitalists pounce on profit although it is
heartless. "There is no room for sentiment in money matters," was already said by old Hansemann, who knew more about it than Herr Sax.

"Good dwellings are so expensive that it is absolutely impossible for the greater part of the workers to make use of them. Big capital ... is shy of investing in houses for the working classes ... and as a result these classes and their housing needs fall mostly a prey to the speculators." [Page 27.]

Disgusting speculation—big capital naturally never speculates! But it is not ill will, it is only ignorance which prevents big capital from speculating in workers' houses:

"House-owners do not know at all what a great and important role ... is played by a normal satisfaction of housing needs; they do not know what they are doing to the people when they offer them, as a general rule so irresponsibly, bad and harmful dwellings, and, finally, they do not know how they damage themselves thereby." (Page 27.)

However, the ignorance of the capitalists must be supplemented by the ignorance of the workers before a housing shortage can be created. After Herr Sax has admitted that "the very lowest sections" of the workers "are obliged" (!) "to seek a night's lodging wherever and however they can find it in order not to remain altogether without shelter and in this connection are absolutely defenceless and helpless", he tells us:

"For it is a well-known fact that many among them" (the workers) "from carelessness, but chiefly from ignorance, deprive their bodies, one is almost inclined to say, with virtuosity, of the conditions of natural development and healthy existence, in that they have not the faintest idea of rational hygiene and, in particular, of the enormous importance that attaches to the dwelling in this hygiene." (Page 27.)

Here however the bourgeois donkey's ears protrude. Where the capitalists are concerned "blame" evaporates into ignorance, but where the workers are concerned ignorance is made the cause of their guilt. Listen:

"Thus it comes" (namely, through ignorance) "that if they can only save something on the rent they will move into dark, damp and inadequate dwellings, which are in short a mockery of all the demands of hygiene ... that often several families together rent a single dwelling, and even a single room—all this in order to spend as little as possible on rent, while on the other hand they squander their income in truly sinful fashion on drink and all sorts of idle pleasures"

The money which the workers "waste on spirits and tobacco" (page 28), the "life in the pubs with all its regrettable consequen-

---

*a D. Hansemann's speech at the 34th sitting of the First United Diet, June 8, 1847. Preussens Erster Reichstag, Part 7, Berlin, 1847, p. 55.— Ed.*
ces, which drags the workers again and again like a dead weight back into the mire”, lies indeed like a dead weight in Herr Sax’s stomach. The fact that under the existing circumstances drunkenness among the workers is a necessary product of their living conditions, just as necessary as typhus, crime, vermin, bailiff and other social ills, so necessary in fact that the average figures of those who succumb to inebriety can be calculated in advance, is again something that Herr Sax cannot allow himself to know. My old primary school teacher used to say, by the way: “The common people go to the pubs and the people of quality go to the clubs,” and as I have been in both I am in a position to confirm it.

The whole talk about the “ignorance” of both parties amounts to nothing but the old phrases about the harmony of interests of labour and capital. If the capitalists knew their true interests, they would give the workers good houses and improve their position in general; and if the workers understood their true interests, they would not go on strike, they would not go in for Social-Democracy, they would not play politics, but would be nice and follow their betters, the capitalists. Unfortunately, both sides find their interests altogether elsewhere than in the sermons of Herr Sax and his countless predecessors. The gospel of harmony between capital and labour has been preached for almost fifty years now, and bourgeois philanthropy has expended large sums of money to prove this harmony by building model institutions; yet, as we shall see later, we are today exactly where we were fifty years ago.

Our author now proceeds to the practical solution of the problem. How little revolutionary Proudhon’s proposal to make the workers owners of their dwellings was can be seen from the fact that bourgeois socialism even before him tried to carry this proposal out in practice and is still trying to do so. Herr Sax also declares that the housing problem can be completely solved only by transferring property in dwellings to the workers. (Pages 58 and 59.) More than that, he goes into poetic raptures at the idea, giving vent to his feelings in the following outburst of enthusiasm:

“There is something peculiar about the longing inherent in man to own land; it is an urge which not even the feverishly pulsating business life of the present day has been able to abate. It is the unconscious appreciation of the significance of the economic achievement represented by landownership. With it the individual obtains a secure hold; he is rooted firmly in the earth, as it were, and every enterprise” (!) “has its most permanent basis in it. However, the blessings of landownership extend far beyond these material advantages. Whoever is fortunate enough to call a piece of land his own has reached the highest conceivable stage of economic independence; he has a territory on which he can rule with sovereign power; he is his
own master; he has a certain power and a sure support in time of need; his self-confidence develops and with this his moral strength. Hence the deep significance of property in the question before us... The worker, today helplessly exposed to all the vicissitudes of economic life and in constant dependence on his employer, would thereby be saved to a certain extent from this precarious situation; he would become a capitalist and be safeguarded against the dangers of unemployment or incapacitation as a result of the credit which his real estate would open to him. He would thus be raised from the ranks of the propertyless into the propertied class.” (Page 63.)

Herr Sax seems to assume that man is essentially a peasant, otherwise he would not falsely impute to the workers of our big cities a longing to own land, a longing which no one else has discovered in them. For our workers in the big cities freedom of movement is the prime condition of existence, and landownership can only be a fetter to them. Give them their own houses, chain them once again to the soil and you break their power of resistance to the wage cutting of the factory owners. The individual worker might be able to sell his house on occasion, but during a big strike or a general industrial crisis all the houses belonging to the workers affected would have to be put up for sale and would therefore find no purchasers or be sold off far below their cost price. And even if they all found purchasers, Herr Sax’s whole grand housing reform would have come to nothing and he would have to start from the beginning again. However, poets live in a world of fantasy, and so does Herr Sax, who imagines that a landowner has “reached the highest stage of economic independence”, that he has “a sure support”, that “he would become a capitalist and be safeguarded against the dangers of unemployment or incapacitation as a result of the credit which his real estate would open to him”, etc. Herr Sax should take a look at the French and our own Rhenish small peasants. Their houses and fields are loaded down with mortgages, their harvests belong to their creditors before they are reaped, and it is not they who rule with sovereign power on their “territory” but the usurer, the lawyer and the bailiff. That certainly represents the highest conceivable stage of economic independence—for the usurer! And in order that the workers may bring their little houses as quickly as possible under the same sovereignty of the usurer, our well-meaning Herr Sax carefully points to the credit which their real estate can secure them in times of unemployment or incapacitation instead of their becoming a burden on the poor rate.

---

* The words “or a general industrial crisis” were added by Engels in the 1887 edition.—Ed.
In any case, Herr Sax has solved the question raised in the beginning: the worker "becomes a capitalist" by acquiring his own little house.

Capital is the command over the unpaid labour of others. The little house of the worker can therefore become capital only if he rents it to a third person and appropriates a part of the labour product of this third person in the form of rent. But the house is prevented from becoming capital precisely by the fact that the worker lives in it himself, just as a coat ceases to be capital the moment I buy it from the tailor and put it on. The worker who owns a little house to the value of a thousand thalers is, true enough, no longer a proletarian, but it takes Herr Sax to call him a capitalist.

However, this capitalist streak of our worker has still another side. Let us assume that in a given industrial area it has become the rule that each worker owns his own little house. In that case the working class of that area lives rent-free; housing expenses no longer enter into the value of its labour power. Every reduction in the cost of production of labour power, that is to say, every permanent price reduction in the worker's necessities of life is equivalent "on the basis of the iron laws of the doctrine of national economy" to a depression of the value of labour power and will therefore finally result in a corresponding drop in wages. Wages would thus fall on an average as much as the average sum saved on rent, that is, the worker would pay for his own house, but not, as formerly, in money to the house-owner, but in unpaid labour to the factory owner for whom he works. In this way the savings of the worker invested in his little house would in a certain sense become capital, however not capital for him but for the capitalist employing him.

Herr Sax thus lacks the ability to turn his worker into a capitalist even on paper.

Incidentally, what has been said above applies to all so-called social reforms which can be reduced to saving schemes or to cheapening the means of subsistence of the worker. Either they become general and then they are followed by a corresponding reduction of wages or they remain quite isolated experiments and then their very existence as isolated exceptions proves that their realisation on an extensive scale is incompatible with the existing capitalist mode of production. Let us assume that in a certain area a general introduction of consumers' co-operatives succeeds in reducing the cost of the means of subsistence for the workers by 20 per cent. Hence in the long run wages would fall in that area
by approximately 20 per cent, that is to say, in the same proportion as the means of subsistence in question enter into the budget of the workers. If the worker, for example, spends three-quarters of his weekly wage on these means of subsistence, wages would in the end fall by $\frac{3}{4} \times 20 = 15$ per cent. In short, as soon as any such saving reform has become general, the worker's wages diminish by as much as his savings permit him to live cheaper. Give every worker an independent income of 52 thalers, achieved by saving, and his weekly wage must finally fall one thaler. Therefore, the more he saves the less he will receive in wages. He saves, therefore, not in his own interest but in the interest of the capitalist. What else is needed to "stimulate" in him "in the most powerful fashion ... the primary economic virtue, thrift"? (Page 64.)

Incidentally, Herr Sax tells us immediately afterwards that the workers are to become house-owners not so much in their own interest as in the interest of the capitalists:

"However, not only the working class but society as a whole has the greatest interest in seeing as many of its members as possible bound" (!) "to the land" (I should like to see Herr Sax himself even for once in this posture).\(^3\) "...All the secret forces which set on fire the volcano called the social question which glows under our feet, the proletarian bitterness, the hatred, ... the dangerous confusion of ideas, ... must all disappear like mist before the morning sun when ... the workers themselves enter in this fashion into the ranks of the propertied class." (Page 65.)

In other words, Herr Sax hopes that by a shift in their proletarian status, such as would be brought about by the acquisition of a house, the workers would also lose their proletarian character and become once again obedient toadies like their forefathers, who were also house-owners. The Proudhonists should lay this thing to heart.

Herr Sax believes he has thereby solved the social question:

"A juster distribution of goods, the riddle of the Sphinx which so many have already tried in vain to solve, does it not now lie before us as a tangible fact, has it not thereby been taken from the regions of ideals and brought into the realm of reality? And if it is carried out, does this not mean the achievement of one of the highest aims, one which even the socialists of the most extreme tendency present as the culminating point of their theories?" (Page 66.)

It is really lucky that we have worked our way through as far as this, because this shout of triumph is the "summit" of the Saxian book. From now on we once more gently descend from "the

\(^3\) In the 1887 edition, Engels made the quotation shorter by deleting here the following sentence: "Landownership ... diminishes the number of those who struggle against the rule of the propertied class." — Ed.
regions of ideals” to flat reality, and when we get down we shall find that nothing, nothing at all, has changed in our absence.

Our guide takes us the first step down by informing us that there are two systems of workers’ dwellings: the cottage system, in which each working-class family has its own little house and if possible a little garden as well, as in England; and the barrack system of the large tenement houses containing numerous workers’ dwellings, as in Paris, Vienna, etc. Between the two is the system prevailing in Northern Germany. Now it is true, he tells us, that the cottage system is the only correct one, and the only one whereby the worker can acquire the ownership of his own house; besides, he argues, the barrack system has very great disadvantages with regard to hygiene, morality and domestic peace. But, alas and alack! says he, the cottage system is not realisable in the centres of the housing shortage, in the big cities, on account of the high cost of land, and one should, therefore, be glad if houses were built containing from four to six flats instead of big barracks, or if the main disadvantages of the barrack system were alleviated by various ingenious building devices. (Pages 71-92.)

We have come down quite a bit already, haven’t we? The transformation of the workers into capitalists, the solution of the social question, a house of his own for each worker—all these things have been left behind, up above in “the regions of ideals”. All that remains for us to do is to introduce the cottage system into the countryside and to make the workers’ barracks in the cities as tolerable as possible.

On its own admission, therefore, the bourgeois solution of the housing question has come to grief—it has come to grief owing to the antithesis between town and country. And with this we have arrived at the kernel of the problem. The housing question can be solved only when society has been sufficiently transformed for a start to be made towards abolishing the antithesis between town and country, which has been brought to its extreme point by present-day capitalist society. Far from being able to abolish this antithesis, capitalist society on the contrary is compelled to intensify it day by day. On the other hand, already the first modern utopian socialists, Owen and Fourier, correctly recognised this. In their model structures the antithesis between town and country no longer exists. Consequently there takes place exactly the opposite of what Herr Sax contends: it is not that the solution of the housing question simultaneously solves the social question, but that only by the solution of the social question, that is, by the abolition of the capitalist mode of production, is the solution of
the housing question made possible. To want to solve the housing question while at the same time desiring to maintain the modern big cities is an absurdity. The modern big cities, however, will be abolished only by the abolition of the capitalist mode of production, and when this is once set going there will be quite other issues than supplying each worker with a little house of his own.

In the beginning, however, each social revolution will have to take things as it finds them and do its best to get rid of the most crying evils with the means at its disposal. And we have already seen that the housing shortage can be remedied immediately by expropriating a part of the luxury dwellings belonging to the propertied classes and by compulsory quartering in the remaining part.

If now Herr Sax, continuing, once more leaves the big cities and delivers a verbose discourse on working-class colonies to be established near the towns, if he describes all the beauties of such colonies with their common "water supply, gas lighting, air or hot-water heating, laundries, drying-rooms, bath-rooms, etc.", each with its "nursery, school, prayer hall" (!), "reading-room, library, ... wine and bear hall, dancing and concert hall in all respectability", with steam power fitted to all the houses so that "to a certain extent production can be transferred back from the factory to the domestic workshop"—this does not alter the situation at all. The colony he describes has been directly borrowed by Herr Huber from the socialists Owen and Fourier and merely made entirely bourgeois by discarding everything socialist about it. Thereby, however, it has become really utopian. No capitalist has any interest in establishing such colonies, and in fact none such exists anywhere in the world, except in Guise in France, and that was built by a follower of Fourier, not as profitable speculation but as a socialist experiment.* Herr Sax might just as well have quoted in support of his bourgeois project-spinning the example of the communist colony Harmony Hall founded by Owen in Hampshire at the beginning of the forties and long since defunct.

* And this one also has finally become a mere site of working-class exploitation. See the Paris Socialiste of 1886. [Note by Engels to the 1887 edition.]

---

a V. A. Huber, "Ueber innere Colonisation", Janus, 1846, Parts 7 and 8.— Ed.
b "Le Familistère de Guise" and "Le programme de M. Godin", Le Socialiste, Nos. 45 and 48, July 3 and 24, 1886.— Ed.
In any case, all this talk about building colonies is nothing more than a lame attempt to soar again into "the regions of ideals" and it is immediately afterwards again abandoned. We descend rapidly again. The simplest solution now is

"that the employers, the factory owners, should assist the workers to obtain suitable dwellings, whether they do so by building such themselves or by encouraging and assisting the workers to do their own building, providing them with land, advancing them building capital, etc." (Page 106.)

With this we are once again out of the big towns, where there can be no question of anything of the sort, and back in the country. Herr Sax now proves that here it is in the interest of the factory owners themselves that they should assist their workers to obtain tolerable dwellings, on the one hand because it is a good investment, and on the other hand because the inevitably

"resulting uplift of the workers ... must entail an increase of their mental and physical working capacity, which naturally is of ... no less ... advantage to the employers. With this, however, the right point of view for the participation of the latter in the solution of the housing question is given. It appears as the outcome of a latent association, as the outcome of the care of the employers for the physical and economic, mental and moral well-being of their workers, which is concealed for the most part under the cloak of humanitarian endeavours and which is its own pecuniary reward because of its successful results: the producing and maintaining of a diligent, skilled, willing, contented and devoted working class." (Page 108.)

The phrase "latent association" with which Huber attempts to endow this bourgeois philanthropic drivel with a "loftier significance","a does not alter the situation at all. Even without this phrase the big rural factory owners, particularly in England, have long ago realised that the building of workers' dwellings is not only a necessity, a part of the factory equipment itself, but also that it pays very well. In England whole villages have grown up in this way, and some of them have later developed into towns. The workers, however, instead of being thankful to the philanthropic capitalists, have always raised very considerable objections to this "COTTAGE SYSTEM". Not only are they compelled to pay monopoly prices for these houses because the factory owner has no competitors, but immediately a strike breaks out they are homeless because the factory owner throws them out of his houses without any more ado and thus renders any resistance very difficult. Details can be studied in my Condition of the Working-Class in England, pp. 224 and 228.\textsuperscript{b} Herr Sax, however, thinks that these

\textsuperscript{a} V. A. Huber, \textit{Sociale Fragen. IV. Die latente Association}, Nordhausen, 1866.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} See present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 471-72, 477.—\textit{Ed.}
objections "hardly deserve refutation" (page 111). But does he not want to make the worker the owner of his little house? Certainly, but as

"the employers must always be in a position to dispose of the dwelling in order that when they dismiss a worker they may have room for the one who replaces him", well then, there is nothing for it but "to make provision for such cases by agreeing that the ownership shall be revocable." (Page 113.)*

This time we have stepped down with unexpected suddenness. First it was said the worker must own his own little house. Then we were informed that this was impossible in the towns and could be carried out only in the country. And now we are told that ownership even in the country is to be "revocable by agreement"! With this new sort of property for the workers discovered by Herr Sax, with this transformation of the workers into capitalists "revocable by agreement", we have safely arrived again on level ground, and have here to examine what the capitalists and other philanthropists have actually done to solve the housing question.

II

If we are to believe our Dr. Sax, much has already been done by these gentlemen, the capitalists, to remedy the housing shortage, and the proof has been provided that the housing problem can be solved on the basis of the capitalist mode of production.

First of all, Herr Sax cites to us the example of—Bonapartist France! As is known, Louis Bonaparte appointed a commission at the time of the Paris World Exhibition ostensibly to report upon the situation of the working classes in France, but in reality to describe their situation as blissful in the extreme, to the greater glory of the Empire. And it is to the report of this commission,

* In this respect too the English capitalists have long ago not only fulfilled but far exceeded all the cherished wishes of Herr Sax. On Monday, October 14, 1872, the court in Morpeth for the establishment of the lists of parliamentary electors had to adjudicate a petition on behalf of 2,000 miners to have their names enrolled on the list of parliamentary voters. It transpired that the greater number of these men, according to the regulations of the mine at which they were employed, were not to be regarded as lessees of the dwellings in which they lived but as occupying these dwellings on sufferance, and could be thrown out of them at any moment without notice. (The mine-owner and house-owner were naturally one and the same person.) The judge decided that these men were not lessees but servants, and as such not entitled to be included in the list of voters. ("The Miners' Right to Vote",] The Daily News, [No. 8258,] October 15, 1872.)
composed of the corruptest tools of Bonapartism, that Herr Sax refers, particularly because the results of its work are, "according to the authorised committee's own statement, fairly complete for France". And what are these results? Of eighty-nine big industrialists or joint-stock companies which gave information, thirty-one had built no workers' dwellings at all. According to Sax's own estimate the dwellings that were built house at the most from 50,000 to 60,000 people and consist almost exclusively of no more than two rooms for each family!

It is obvious that every capitalist who is tied down to a particular rural locality by the conditions of his industry—water power, the location of coal mines, iron-ore deposits and other mines, etc.—must build dwellings for his workers if none are available. To see in this a proof of "latent association", "an eloquent testimony to a growing understanding of the question and its wide import", a "very promising beginning" (page 115), requires a highly developed habit of self-deception. For the rest, the industrialists of the various countries differ from each other in this respect also, according to their national character. For instance, Herr Sax informs us (page 117):

"In England only quite recently has increased activity on the part of employers in this direction been observable. This refers in particular to the out-of-the-way hamlets in the rural areas... The circumstance that otherwise the workers often have to walk a long way from the nearest village to the factory and arrive there so exhausted that they do not perform enough work is the employers' main motive for building dwellings for their workers. However, the number of those who have a deeper understanding of conditions and who combine with the cause of housing reform more or less all the other elements of latent association is also increasing, and it is these people to whom credit is due for the establishment of those flourishing colonies... The names of Ashton in Hyde, Ashworth in Turton, Grant in Bury, Greg in Bollington, Marshall in Leeds, Strutt in Belper, Salt in Saltaire, Ackroyd in Copley, and others are well known on this account throughout the United Kingdom."

Blessed simplicity, and still more blessed ignorance! The English rural factory owners have only "quite recently" been building workers' dwellings! No, my dear Herr Sax, the English capitalists are really big industrialists, not only as regards their purses but also as regards their brains. Long before Germany possessed a really large-scale industry they had realised that for factory production in the rural districts expenditure on workers' dwellings was a necessary part of the total investment of capital, and a very profitable one, both directly and indirectly. Long before the

---

a L'Enquête du dixième groupe, Paris, 1867.—Ed.
struggle between Bismarck and the German bourgeoisie had given the German workers freedom of association, the English factory, mine and foundry owners had had practical experience of the pressure they can exert on striking workers if they are at the same time the landlords of those workers. "The flourishing colonies" of a Greg, an Ashton and an Ashworth are so "recent" that even forty years ago they were hailed by the bourgeoisie as models, as I myself wrote twenty-eight years ago. (The Condition of the Working-Class in England. Note on pp. 228-30.) The colonies of Marshall and Akroyd (that is how the man spells his name) are about as old, and the colony of Strutt is even much older, its beginnings reaching back into the last century. Since in England the average duration of a worker's dwelling is reckoned as forty years, Herr Sax can calculate on his fingers the dilapidated condition in which these "flourishing colonies" are today. In addition, the majority of these colonies are now no longer in the countryside. The colossal expansion of industry has surrounded most of them with factories and houses to such an extent that they are now situated in the middle of dirty, smoky towns with 20,000, 30,000 and more inhabitants. But all this does not prevent German bourgeois science, as represented by Herr Sax, from devoutly repeating today the old English paens of praise of 1840, which no longer have any application.

And to give us old Akroyd as an example! This worthy was certainly a philanthropist of the first water. He loved his workers, and in particular his female employees, to such an extent that his less philanthropic competitors in Yorkshire used to say of him that he ran his factories exclusively with his own children! True, Herr Sax contends that "illegitimate children are becoming more and more rare" in these flourishing colonies (page 118). Yes, illegitimate children born out of wedlock, for in the English industrial districts the pretty girls marry very young.

In England the establishment of workers' dwellings close to each big rural factory and simultaneously with the factory has been the rule for sixty years and more. As already mentioned, many of these factory villages have become the nucleus around which later on a whole factory town has grown up with all the evils which a factory town brings with it. These colonies have therefore not

---

\[a\] See present edition, Vol. 4, p. 477.—*Ed.*

\[b\] Engels changed this sentence in the 1887 edition; earlier it read as follows: "And to give us old A. as an example—I do not wish to name him since he is long dead and buried."—*Ed.*
solved the housing question; on the contrary, they first really created it in their localities.

On the other hand, in countries which in the sphere of large-scale industry have only limped along behind England, and which really got to know what large-scale industry is only after 1848, in France and particularly in Germany, the situation is quite different. Here it was only colossal foundries and factories which decided after much hesitation to build a certain number of workers' dwellings—for instance, the Schneider works in Creusot and the Krupp works in Essen. The great majority of the rural industrialists let their workers trudge miles through the heat, snow and rain every morning to the factories, and back again every evening to their homes. This is particularly the case in mountainous districts, in the French and Alsatian Vosges districts, in the valleys of the Wupper, Sieg, Agger, Lenne and other Rhineland-Westphalian rivers. In the Erzgebirge the situation is probably no better. The same petty niggardliness occurs among both Germans and French.

Herr Sax knows very well that the very promising beginning as well as the flourishing colonies mean less than nothing. Therefore, he tries now to prove to the capitalists that they can obtain magnificent rents by building workers' dwellings. In other words, he seeks to show them a new way of cheating the workers.

First of all, he holds up to them the example of a number of London building societies, partly philanthropic and partly speculative, which have shown a net profit of from four to six per cent and more. It is not at all necessary for Herr Sax to prove to us that capital invested in workers' houses yields a good profit. The reason why the capitalists do not invest still more than they do in workers' dwellings is that more expensive dwellings bring in still greater profits for their owners. Herr Sax's exhortation to the capitalists, therefore, amounts once again to nothing but a moral sermon.

Now, as far as these London building societies are concerned, whose brilliant successes Herr Sax so loudly trumpets forth, they have, according to his own figures—and every sort of building speculation is included here—provided housing for a total of 2,132 families and 706 single men, that is, for less than 15,000 persons! And is it presumed seriously to present in Germany this sort of childishness as a great success, although in the East End of London alone a million workers live under the

---

a The word was added by Engels in the 1887 edition.—Ed.
most miserable housing conditions? The whole of these philanthropic efforts are in fact so miserably futile that the English parliamentary reports dealing with the condition of the workers never even mention them.

We will not speak here of the ludicrous ignorance of London displayed throughout this whole section. Just one point, however. Herr Sax is of the opinion that the Lodging House for Single Men in Soho went out of business because there "was no hope of obtaining a large clientele" in this neighbourhood. Herr Sax imagines that the whole of the West End of London is one big luxury town, and does not know that right behind the most elegant streets the dirtiest workers' quarters are to be found, of which, for example, Soho is one. The model lodging house in Soho, which he mentions and which I already knew twenty-three years ago, was much frequented in the beginning, but closed down because no one could stand it there, and yet it was one of the best.

But the workers' town of Mulhouse in Alsace—that is surely a success, is it not?

The Workers' City in Mulhouse is the great show-piece of the continental bourgeois, just as the one-time flourishing colonies of Ashton, Ashworth, Greg and Co. are of the English bourgeois. Unfortunately, the Mulhouse example is not a product of "latent" association but of the open association between the Second French Empire and the capitalists of Alsace. It was one of Louis Bonaparte's socialist experiments, for which the state advanced one-third of the capital. In fourteen years (up to 1867) it built 800 small houses according to a defective system, an impossible one in England where they understand these things better, and these houses are handed over to the workers to become their own property after thirteen to fifteen years of monthly payments of an increased rental. It was not necessary for the Bonapartists of Alsace to invent this mode of acquiring property; as we shall see, it had been introduced by the English co-operative building societies long before. Compared with that in England, the extra rent paid for the purchase of these houses is rather high. For instance, after having paid 4,500 francs in instalments during fifteen years, the worker receives a house which was worth 3,300 francs fifteen years before. If the worker wants to go away or if he is in arrears with only a single monthly instalment (in which case he can be evicted), six and two-thirds per cent of the original value of the house is charged as the annual rent (for instance, 17 francs a month for a house worth 3,000 francs) and the rest is paid out to him, but without a penny of
interest. It is quite clear that under such circumstances the society is able to grow fat, quite apart from "state assistance". It is just as clear that the houses provided under these circumstances are better than the old tenement houses in the town itself, if only because they are built outside the town in a semi-rural neighbourhood.

We need not say a word about the few miserable experiments which have been made in Germany; even Herr Sax, on page 157, admits their woefulness.

What, then, exactly do all these examples prove? Simply that the building of workers' dwellings is profitable from the capitalist point of view, even when not all the laws of hygiene are trodden underfoot. But that has never been denied; we all knew that long ago. Any investment of capital which satisfies an existing need is profitable if conducted rationally. The question, however, is precisely, why the housing shortage continues to exist all the same, why the capitalists all the same do not provide sufficient healthy dwellings for the workers. And here Herr Sax has again nothing but exhortations to make to capital and fails to provide us with an answer. The real answer to this question we have already given above.

Capital does not want to abolish the housing shortage even if it could; this has now been finally established. There remain, therefore, only two other expedients: self-help on the part of the workers, and state assistance.

Herr Sax, an enthusiastic worshipper of self-help, is able to report miraculous things about it also in regard to the housing question. Unfortunately he is compelled to admit right at the beginning that self-help can only effect anything where the cottage system either already exists or where it is feasible, that is, once again only in the rural areas. In the big cities, even in England, it can be effective only in a very limited measure. Herr Sax then sighs:

"Reform in this way" (by self-help) "can be effected only in a roundabout way and therefore always only imperfectly, namely, only in so far as the principle of private ownership is so strengthened as to react on the quality of the dwelling." [Page 170.]

This too could be doubted; in any case, "the principle of private ownership" has not exercised any reforming influence on the "quality" of the author's style. Despite all this, self-help in England has achieved such wonders

"that thereby everything done there along other lines to solve the housing problem has been far exceeded".
Herr Sax is referring to the English building societies and he deals with them at great length particularly because

"very inadequate or erroneous ideas are current about their character and activities in general. The English building societies are by no means ... associations for building houses or building co-operatives; they can be described ... in German rather as something like 'Hauswerbvereine' [associations for the acquisition of houses]. They are associations whose object is to accumulate funds from the periodical contributions of their members in order then, out of these funds and according to their size, to grant loans to their members for the purchase of a house.... The building society is thus a savings bank for one section of its members, and a loan bank for the other section. The building societies are, therefore, mortgage credit institutions designed to meet the requirements of the workers which, in the main ... use the savings of the workers ... to assist persons of the same social standing as the depositors to purchase or build a house. As may be supposed, such loans are granted by mortgaging the real estate in question, and on condition that they must be paid back at short intervals in instalments which combine both interest and amortisation.... The interest is not paid out to the depositors but always placed to their credit and compounded.... The members can demand the return of the sums they have paid in, plus interest ... at any time by giving a month's notice." (Pages 170 to 172.) “There are over 2,000 such societies in England; ... the total capital they have accumulated amounts to about £15,000,000. In this way about 100,000 working-class families have already obtained possession of their own hearth and home—a social achievement which it would certainly be difficult to parallel.” (Page 174.)

Unfortunately here too the "but" comes limping along immediately after:

“But a perfect solution of the problem has by no means been achieved in this way, for the reason, if for no other, that the acquisition of a house is something only the better situated workers ... can afford.... In particular, sanitary conditions are often not sufficiently taken into consideration.” (Page 176.)

On the Continent “such associations ... find only little scope for development”. They presuppose the existence of the cottage system, which here exists only in the countryside; and in the countryside the workers are not yet sufficiently developed for self-help. On the other hand, in the towns where real building co-operatives could be formed they are faced with “very considerable and serious difficulties of all sorts”. (Page 179.) They could build only cottages and that will not do in the big cities. In short, “this form of co-operative self-help” cannot “in the present circumstances—and hardly in the near future either—play the chief role in the solution of the problem before us”. These building societies, you see, are still “in their initial, undeveloped stage”. “This is true even of England.” (Page 181.)

Hence, the capitalists will not and the workers cannot. And with this we could close this section if it were not absolutely necessary
to provide a little information about the English building societies, which the bourgeois of the Schulze-Delitzsch type always hold up to our workers as models.249

These building societies are not workers' societies, nor is it their main aim to provide workers with their own houses. On the contrary, we shall see that this happens only very exceptionally. The building societies are essentially of a speculative nature, the small ones, which were the original societies, not less so than their big imitators. In a public house, usually at the instigation of the proprietor, on whose premises the weekly meetings then take place, a number of regular customers and their friends, shopkeepers, office clerks, commercial travellers, master artisans and other petty bourgeois—with here and there perhaps a mechanic or some other worker belonging to the aristocracy of his class—get together and found a building co-operative. The immediate occasion is usually that the proprietor has discovered a comparatively cheap plot of land in the neighbourhood or somewhere else. Most of the members are not bound by their occupations to any particular locality. Even many of the shopkeepers and craftsmen have only business premises in the town but no living quarters. Everyone in a position to do so prefers to live in the suburbs rather than in the centre of the smoky town. The building plot is purchased and as many cottages as possible erected on it. The credit of the more substantial members makes the purchase possible, and the weekly contributions together with a few small loans cover the weekly costs of building. Those members who aim at getting a house of their own receive cottages by lot as they are completed, and the appropriate extra rent serves for the amortisation of the purchase price. The remaining cottages are then either let or sold. The building society, however, if it does good business, accumulates a more or less considerable sum. This remains the property of the members, provided they keep up their contributions, and is distributed among them from time to time, or when the society is dissolved. Such is the life history of nine out of ten of the English building societies. The others are bigger associations, sometimes formed under political or philanthropic pretexts, but in the end their chief aim is always to provide a more profitable mortgage investment for the savings of the petty bourgeoisie, at a good rate of interest and the prospect of dividends from speculation in real estate.

The sort of clients these societies speculate on can be seen from the prospectus of one of the largest, if not the largest, of them. The Birkbeck Building Society, 29 and 30, Southampton Buildings,
CHANCEY LANE, LONDON, whose gross receipts since its foundation total over £10,500,000 (70,000,000 thalers), which has over £416,000 in the bank or invested in government securities, and which at present has 21,441 members and depositors, introduces itself to the public in the following fashion:

"Most people are acquainted with the so-called three-year system of the piano manufacturers, under which anyone renting a piano for three years becomes the owner of the piano after the expiration of that period. Prior to the introduction of this system it was almost as difficult for people of limited income to acquire a good piano as it was for them to acquire their own house. Year after year such people had paid the rent for the piano and spent two or three times the money the piano was worth. What applies to a piano applies also to a house... However, as a house costs more than a piano, ... it takes longer to pay off the purchase price in rent. In consequence the directors have entered into an arrangement with house-owners in various parts of London and its suburbs which enables them to offer the members of the BIRKBECK BUILDING SOCIETY and others a great selection of houses in the most diverse parts of the town. The system which the Board of Directors intends to put into operation is as follows: it will let these houses for twelve and a half years and at the end of this period, providing that the rent has been paid regularly, the tenant will become the absolute owner of the house without any further payment of any kind... The tenant can also contract for a shorter space of time with a higher rental, or for a longer space of time with a lower rental... People of limited income, clerks, shop assistants, and others can make themselves independent of landlords immediately by becoming members of the BIRKBECK BUILDING SOCIETY."

That is clear enough. There is no mention of workers, but there is of people of limited income, clerks and shop assistants, etc., and in addition it is assumed that, as a rule, the applicants already possess a piano. In fact we do not have to do here with workers at all but with petty bourgeois and those who would like and are able to become such; people whose incomes gradually rise as a rule, even if within certain limits, such as clerks and similar employees. The income of the worker, on the contrary, at best remains the same in amount, and in reality falls in proportion to the increase of his family and its growing needs. In fact only a few workers can, by way of exception, belong to such societies. On the one hand their income is too low, and on the other hand it is of too uncertain a character for them to be able to undertake responsibilities for twelve and a half years in advance. The few exceptions where this is not valid are either the best-paid workers or foremen.*

* We add here a little contribution on the way in which these building associations, and in particular the London building associations, are managed. As is known, almost the whole of the land on which London is built belongs to about a dozen aristocrats, including the most eminent, the Duke of Westminster, the Duke of Bedford, the Duke of Portland, etc. They originally leased out the separate building sites for a period of ninety-nine years, and at the end of that period took
For the rest, it is clear to everyone that the Bonapartists of the workers' town of Mulhouse are nothing more than miserable apers of these petty-bourgeois English building societies. The sole difference is that the former, in spite of the state assistance granted to them, swindle their clients far more than the building societies do. On the whole their terms are less liberal than the average existing in England, and while in England interest and compound interest are calculated on each deposit and can be withdrawn at a month's notice, the factory owners of Mulhouse put both interest and compound interest into their own pockets and repay no more than the amount paid in by the workers in hard five-franc pieces. And no one will be more astonished at this difference than Herr Sax who has it all in his book without knowing it.

Thus, workers' self-help is also no good. There remains state assistance. What can Herr Sax offer us in this regard? Three things:

"First of all, the state must take care that in its legislation and administration all those things which in any way result in accentuating the housing shortage among the working classes are abolished or appropriately remedied." (Page 187.)

Consequently, revision of building legislation and freedom for the building trades in order that building shall be cheaper. But in England building legislation is reduced to a minimum, the building trades are as free as the birds in the air; nevertheless, the housing shortage exists. In addition building is now done so cheaply in England that the houses shake when a cart goes by and every day some of them collapse. Only yesterday (October 25, 1872) six of them collapsed simultaneously in Manchester and possession of the land with everything on it. They then let the houses on shorter leases, thirty-nine years for example, on a so-called repairing lease, according to which the leaseholder must put the house in good repair and maintain it in such condition. As soon as the contract has progressed thus far, the landlord sends his architect and the district surveyor to inspect the house and determine the repairs necessary. These repairs are often very considerable and may include the renewal of the whole frontage, or of the roof, etc. The leaseholder now deposits his lease as security with a building association and receives from this society a loan of the necessary money—up to £1,000 and more in the case of an annual rental of from £130 to £150—for the building repairs to be made at his expense. These building associations have thus become an important intermediate link in a system which aims at securing the continual renewal and maintenance in habitable condition of London's houses belonging to the landed aristocracy without any trouble to the latter and at the cost of the public. And this is supposed to be a solution of the housing question for the workers! [Note by Engels to the 1887 edition.]
seriously injured six workers. Therefore, that is also no remedy.

"Secondly, the state power must prevent individuals in their narrow-minded individualism from spreading the evil or calling it forth anew." [Page 187.]

Consequently, sanitary and building-police inspection of workers’ dwellings; transference to the authorities of power to forbid the occupancy of dilapidated and unhygienic houses, as has been the case in England since 1857. But how did it come about there? The first law, that of 1855 (the Nuisances Removal Act), was "a dead letter", as Herr Sax admits himself, as was the second, the law of 1858 (the Local Government Act) (page 197). On the other hand Herr Sax believes that the third law, the Artisans' Dwellings Act, which applies only to towns with a population of over 10,000, "certainly offers favourable testimony of the great understanding of the British Parliament in social matters" (page 199). But as a matter of fact this assertion does no more than "offer favourable testimony" of the utter ignorance of Herr Sax in English "matters". That England in general is far in advance of the Continent "in social matters" is a matter of course. England is the motherland of modern large-scale industry; the capitalist mode of production has developed there most freely and extensively of all, its consequences show themselves there most glaringly of all and therefore it is likewise there that they first produced a reaction in the sphere of legislation. The best proof of this is factory legislation. If however Herr Sax thinks that an Act of Parliament only requires to become legally effective in order to be carried immediately into practice as well, he is grievously mistaken. And this is true of the Local Government Act more than of any other act (with the exception, of course, of the Workshops Act). The administration of this law was entrusted to the urban authorities, which almost everywhere in England are recognised centres of corruption of every kind, of nepotism and jobbery.* The agents of

* Jobbery is the use of a public office to the private advantage of the official or his family. If, for instance, the director of the state telegraph of a country becomes a silent partner in a paper factory, provides this factory with timber from his forests and then gives the factory orders for supplying paper for the telegraph offices, that is, true, a fairly small but still quite a pretty "job", inasmuch as it demonstrates a complete understanding of the principles of jobbery; such as, by the way, in the days of Bismarck was a matter of course and to be expected.

---

a "Fall of Six Houses in Manchester", The Daily News, No. 8268, October 26, 1872. — Ed.
b The rest of the sentence was added by Engels in the 1887 edition.— Ed.
these urban authorities, who owe their positions to all sorts of family considerations, are either incapable of carrying into effect such social laws or disinclined to do so. On the other hand it is precisely in England that the state officials entrusted with the preparation and execution of social legislation are usually distinguished by a strict sense of duty—although in a lesser degree today than twenty or thirty years ago. In the town councils the owners of unsound and dilapidated dwellings are almost everywhere strongly represented either directly or indirectly. The system of electing these town councils by small wards makes the elected members dependent on the pettiest local interests and influences; no town councillor who desires to be re-elected dare vote for the application of this law in his constituency. It is comprehensible, therefore, with what aversion this law was received almost everywhere by the local authorities, and that up to the present it has been applied only in the most scandalous cases—and even then, as a general rule, only as the result of the outbreak of some epidemic, such as in the case of the small-pox epidemic last year in Manchester and Salford. Appeals to the Home Secretary have up to the present been effective only in such cases, for it is the principle of every Liberal government in England to propose social reform laws only when compelled to do so and, if at all possible, to avoid carrying into effect those already existing. The law in question, like many others in England, is of importance only because in the hands of a government dominated by or under the pressure of the workers, a government which would at last really administer it, it will be a powerful weapon for making a breach in the existing social state of things.

"Thirdly," the state power ought, according to Herr Sax, "to make the most extensive use possible of all the positive means at its disposal to allay the existing housing shortage." [Page 187.]

That is to say, it should build barracks, "truly model buildings", for its "subordinate officials and servants" (but then these are not workers!), and "grant loans ... to municipalities, societies and also to private persons for the purpose of improving the housing conditions of the working classes" (page 203), as is done in England under the Public Works Loan Act, and as Louis Bonaparte has done in Paris and Mulhouse. But the Public Works Loan Act also exists only on paper. The government places at the disposal of the commissioners a maximum sum of £50,000, that is, sufficient to build at the utmost 400 cottages, or in forty years a total of 16,000 cottages or dwellings for at the most 80,000
persons—a drop in the bucket! Even if we assume that after twenty years the funds at the disposal of the commission were to double as a result of repayments, that therefore during the past twenty years dwellings for a further 40,000 persons have been built, it still is only a drop in the bucket. And as the cottages last on the average only forty years, after forty years the liquid assets of £50,000 or £100,000 must be used every year to replace the most dilapidated, the oldest of the cottages. This, Herr Sax declares on page 203, is carrying the principle into practice correctly "and to an unlimited extent"! And with this confession that even in England the state, "to an unlimited extent", has achieved next to nothing, Herr Sax concludes his book, but not without having first delivered another homily to all concerned.*

It is perfectly clear that the state as it exists today is neither able nor willing to do anything to remedy the housing calamity. The state is nothing but the organised collective power of the possessing classes, the landowners and the capitalists, as against the exploited classes, the peasants and the workers. What the individual capitalists (and it is here only a question of these because in this matter the landowner, who is concerned, also acts primarily in his capacity as a capitalist) do not want, their state also does not want. If therefore the individual capitalists deplore the housing shortage, but can hardly be moved to palliate even superficially its most terrifying consequences, the collective capitalist, the state, will not do much more. At most it will see to it that that measure of superficial palliation which has become customary is carried into execution everywhere uniformly. And we have seen that this is the case.

But, one might object, in Germany the bourgeois do not rule as yet; in Germany the state is still to a certain extent a power hovering independently over society, which for that very reason

* In recent English Acts of Parliament giving the London building authorities the right of expropriation for the purpose of new street construction, a certain amount of consideration is given to the workers thus turned out of their homes. A provision has been inserted that the new buildings to be erected must be suitable for housing those classes of the population previously living there. Big five or six storey tenement houses are therefore erected for the workers on the least valuable sites and in this way the letter of the law is complied with. It remains to be seen how this arrangement will work, for the workers are quite unaccustomed to it and in the midst of the old conditions in London these buildings represent a completely foreign development. At best, however, they will provide new dwellings for hardly a quarter of the workers actually evicted by the building operations. [Note by Engels to the 1887 edition.]
represents the collective interests of society and not those of a single class. Such a state can certainly do much that a bourgeois state cannot do, and one ought to expect from it something quite different in the social field also.

That is the language of reactionaries. In reality however the state as it exists in Germany is likewise the necessary product of the social basis out of which it has developed. In Prussia—and Prussia is now decisive—there exists side by side with a landowning aristocracy, which is still powerful, a comparatively young and extremely cowardly bourgeoisie, which up to the present has not won either direct political domination, as in France, or more or less indirect domination as in England. Side by side with these two classes, however, there exists a rapidly increasing proletariat which is intellectually highly developed and which is becoming more and more organised every day. We therefore find here, alongside of the basic condition of the old absolute monarchy—an equilibrium between the landed aristocracy and the bourgeoisie—the basic condition of modern Bonapartism—an equilibrium between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

But both in the old absolute monarchy and in the modern Bonapartist monarchy the real governmental authority lies in the hands of a special caste of army officers and state officials. In Prussia this caste is replenished partly from its own ranks, partly from the lesser primogenitary aristocracy, more rarely from the higher aristocracy, and least of all from the bourgeoisie. The independence of this caste, which appears to occupy a position outside and, so to speak, above society, gives the state the semblance of independence in relation to society.

The form of state which has developed with the necessary consistency in Prussia (and, following the Prussian example, in the new Imperial constitution of Germany) out of these contradictory social conditions is pseudo-constitutionalism, a form which is at once both the present-day form of the dissolution of the old absolute monarchy and the form of existence of the Bonapartist monarchy. In Prussia pseudo-constitutionalism from 1848 to 1866 only concealed and facilitated the slow decay of the absolute monarchy. However, since 1866, and still more since 1870, the upheaval in social conditions, and with it the dissolution of the old state, has proceeded in the sight of all and on a tremendously increasing scale. The rapid development of industry, and in particular of stock-exchange swindling, has dragged all the ruling classes into the whirlpool of speculation. The wholesale corruption imported from France in 1870 is developing at an unprece-
dented rate. Strousberg and Péreire take off their hats to each other. Ministers, generals, princes and counts gamble in stocks in competition with the most cunning stock-exchange wolves, and the state recognises their equality by conferring baronetcies wholesale on these stock-exchange wolves. The rural nobility, who have been industrialists for a long time as manufacturers of beet sugar and distillers of brandy, have long left the old respectable days behind and their names now swell the lists of directors of all sorts of sound and unsound joint-stock companies. The bureaucracy is beginning more and more to despise embezzlement as the sole means of improving its income; it is turning its back on the state and beginning to hunt after the far more lucrative posts on the administration of industrial enterprises. Those who still remain in office follow the example of their superiors and speculate in stocks, or “acquire interests” in railways, etc. One is even justified in assuming that the lieutenants also have their hands in certain speculations. In short, the decomposition of all the elements of the old state and the transition from the absolute monarchy to the Bonapartist monarchy is in full swing. With the next big business and industrial crisis not only will the present swindle collapse, but the old Prussian state as well.*

And this state, in which the non-bourgeois elements are becoming more bourgeois every day, is it to solve “the social question”, or even only the housing question? On the contrary. In all economic questions the Prussian state increasingly comes under the control of the bourgeoisie. And if legislation in the economic field since 1866 has not been adapted even more to the interests of the bourgeoisie than has actually been the case, whose fault is that? The bourgeoisie itself is chiefly responsible, first because it is too cowardly to press its own demands energetically, and secondly because it resists every concession if the latter simultaneously provides the menacing proletariat with new weapons. And if the political power, that is, Bismarck, is attempting to organise the proletariat for its own needs to keep the political activity of the bourgeoisie in check, what else is that if not a necessary and quite familiar Bonapartist recipe which pledges the state to nothing more, as far as the workers are concerned, than a few benevolent phrases and at the utmost to a minimum of state assistance for building societies à la Louis Bonaparte?

* Even today, in 1886, the only thing that holds together the old Prussian state and its basis, the alliance of big landownership and industrial capital sealed by the protective tariffs, is fear of the proletariat, which has grown tremendously in numbers and class-consciousness since 1872. [Note by Engels to the 1887 edition.]
The best proof of what the workers have to expect from the Prussian state lies in the utilisation of the French milliards which have given a new, short reprieve to the independence of the Prussian state machine in regard to society. Has even a single thaler of all these milliards been used to provide shelter for those Berlin working-class families which have been thrown on to the streets? On the contrary. As autumn approached, the state caused to be pulled down even those few miserable hovels which had given them a temporary roof over their heads during the summer. The five milliards are going rapidly enough the way of all flesh: for fortresses, cannon and soldiers; and despite Wagner's asinities, and despite Stieber's conferences with Austria, less will be allotted to the German workers out of those milliards than was allotted to the French workers out of the millions which Louis Bonaparte stole from France.

III

In reality the bourgeoisie has only one method of settling the housing question after its fashion—that is to say, of settling it in such a way that the solution continually poses the question anew. This method is called "Haussmann".

By the term "Haussmann" I do not mean merely the specifically Bonapartist manner of the Parisian Haussmann—breaking long, straight and broad streets right through the closely-built workers' quarters and lining them on both sides with big luxurious buildings, the intention having been, apart from the strategic aim of making barricade fighting more difficult, to develop a specifically Bonapartist building trades' proletariat dependent on the government and to turn the city into a luxury city pure and simple. By "Haussmann" I mean the practice, which has now become general, of making breaches in the working-class quarters of our big cities, particularly in those which are centrally situated, irrespective of whether this practice is occasioned by considerations of public health and beautification or by the demand for big centrally located business premises or by traffic requirements, such as the laying down of railways, streets, etc. No matter how different the reasons may be, the result is everywhere the same: the most scandalous alleys and lanes disappear to the accompaniment of lavish self-glorification by the bourgeoisie on account of this tremendous success, but—they appear again at once somewhere else, and often in the immediate neighbourhood.
In *The Condition of the Working-Class in England* I gave a picture of Manchester as it looked in 1843 and 1844. Since then the construction of railways through the centre of the city, the laying out of new streets and the erection of great public and private buildings have broken through, laid bare and improved some of the worst districts described there, others have been abolished altogether; although, apart from the fact that sanitary-police inspection has since become stricter, many of them are still in the same state or in an even worse state of dilapidation than they were then. On the other hand, thanks to the enormous extension of the town, whose population has since increased by more than a half, districts which were at that time still airy and clean are now just as overbuilt, just as dirty and congested as the most ill-famed parts of the town formerly were. Here is but one example: On page 80 et seq. of my book I described a group of houses situated in the valley bottom of the Medlock River, which under the name of Little Ireland was for years the disgrace of Manchester. Little Ireland has long ago disappeared and on its site there now stands a railway station built on a high foundation. The bourgeoisie pointed with pride to the happy and final abolition of Little Ireland as to a great triumph. Now last summer a great inundation took place, as in general the rivers embanked in our big cities cause more and more extensive floods year after year for reasons that can be easily explained. And it was then revealed that Little Ireland had not been abolished at all, but had simply been shifted from the south side of Oxford Road to the north side, and that it still continues to flourish. Let us hear what *The Manchester Weekly Times*, the organ of the radical bourgeoisie of Manchester, has to say in its issue of July 20, 1872:

"The one good result which we may hope to obtain from the calamity which befell the inhabitants of the property built on the low lying ground near the banks of the Medlock on Saturday last, is that public attention will be concentrated on the palpable violation of sanitary laws which has been permitted so long to exist under the noses of the Corporation officers and the sanitary committee of the City Council. A correspondent in yesterday's paper, in a pithy letter, indicated only too feebly the shameful condition of some of the cellar dwelling houses in the neighbourhood of Charles-street and Brook-street, which were inundated by the flood. A minute investigation of one of the courts named in our correspondent's letter, which was made yesterday by our reporter, enables us fully to confirm all his statements, and to endorse his opinion that the cellar dwellings contained in it ought to have been closed long ago, or rather that their habitation ought never to

---

\[a\] See present edition, Vol. 4, p. 347 et seq.—*Ed.*

\[b\] Ibid., p. 361.—*Ed.*
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have been allowed. Squire’s Court consists of a group of seven or eight dwelling houses at the junction of Charles-street and Brook-street, over which the passenger, who reached the lowest step in the dip of Brook-street under the railway arches, may pass daily, unconscious of the knowledge that human beings burrow in the depths beneath him. It is hidden from public view, and is only accessible to those whom misery compels to seek a shelter in its grave-like seclusion. Even when the ordinary sluggish weir-pent waters of the Medlock are at their ordinary height, the floors of these dwellings can only be a few inches above their level, and are liable after any heavy shower to have their ‘soughs’ or drainpipes surcharged with filthy water and their dwellings poisoned by the pestiferous vapours which flood water invariably leaves as its souvenir... Squire’s Court lies at even a lower level than these cellars ... 20 feet below the level of the street, and the foul water forced up the ‘soughs’ by the rising flood in the river on Saturday reached to the roofs. Knowing so much as this, we had expected on our visit yesterday to find the court deserted, or occupied only by the officers of the health committee, engaged in flushing the foetid walls and distributing disinfectants. The only thing we did observe, ... was a labouring man engaged, under the superintendence of a tenant (who had been so far fortunate that he possessed an upper storey to his cellar dwelling, in which he officiates as a barber, and carries on a miscellaneous business), in digging into a heap of mud and putrid matter collected in a corner, from which he was filling a wheelbarrow... The barber’s cellar had been pretty well set to rights, but he directed us to a lower depth, where were a series of dwellings, regarding which he said if he were a scholar he should write to the newspapers, insisting that they should be shut up. Guided at last to Squire’s Court proper, we found a buxom and healthy-looking Irishwoman busily engaged in her washtub. With her husband, a night watchman, she had lived in the court for six years, and had brought up a large family... Inside the house the water-mark had risen to within a few inches of the roof, the windows had been broken in, the furniture remaining in the house was a confused heap of broken and sodden timber... The tenant said that he had kept the place sweet by whitewashing its damp walls once in two months... This discovery made, our reporter on entering found three houses standing back to back, with those in the outer square. Two of these were occupied. The smell arising from them was so sickening that a few minutes’ stay within their foetid portals was sufficient to upset the stomach of a healthy man ... this dismal dwelling place was occupied by a family of seven in all, everyone of whom had slept in the house on Thursday night” (the day of the beginning of the flood). “The woman who gave our reporter this information instantly corrected herself. Neither she nor her husband had slept at all. They had lain on the bare boards, but the smell of the place was so offensive that they had been vomiting during a great part of the night... On Saturday she ... had been obliged to wade breast-high through the flood, bearing two children in her arms... She agreed that the place was not fit for a pig to live in, but had been induced against her will to accept it, because of the cheapness of the rent (only 1s. 6d.” (15 groschen) “a week), and because her husband, a labourer, had of late been much out of work through illness. The reflections raised in one’s mind by the contemplation of this wretched court, and the poor creatures whom poverty has forced into it as into a premature grave, is one of almost utter hopelessness... In the public interest, however, we are forced to say a word. Observation during the past few days assures us that Squire’s Court is a type, though perhaps an extreme one, of many other places in the neighbourhood which it is a reflection upon the health committee to have permitted so long to exist; if their further occupation under existing circumstances be allowed, the committee will incur a responsibility
and the neighbourhood a danger of infectious visitation the seriousness of which we have no desire to prognosticate."

This is a striking example of how the bourgeoisie settles the housing question in practice. The breeding places of disease, the infamous holes and cellars in which the capitalist mode of production confines our workers night after night, are not abolished; they are merely shifted elsewhere! The same economic necessity which produced them in the first place produces them in the next place also. As long as the capitalist mode of production continues to exist it is folly to hope for an isolated settlement of the housing question or of any other social question affecting the lot of the workers. The solution lies in the abolition of the capitalist mode of production and the appropriation of all the means of subsistence and instruments of labour by the working class itself.

Part III
SUPPLEMENT ON PROUDHON
AND THE HOUSING QUESTION

I

In No. 86 of the Volksstaat, A. Mülberger\(^a\) reveals himself as the author of the articles criticised by me in No. 51 and subsequent numbers of the paper.\(^b\) In his answer he overwhelms me with such a series of reproaches, and at the same time confuses all the issues to such an extent that willy-nilly I am compelled to reply to him. I shall attempt to give my reply, which to my regret must be made to a large extent in the field of personal polemics enjoined upon me by Mülberger himself, a general interest by presenting the chief points once again and if possible more clearly than before, even at the risk of being told once more by Mülberger that all this "contains nothing essentially new either for him or for the other readers of the Volksstaat".

Mülberger complains of the form and content of my criticism. As far as the form is concerned it will be sufficient to reply that at the time I did not even know who had written the articles in question. There can, therefore, be no question of any personal "prejudice" against their author; against the solution of the

\(^a\) A. Mülberger, “Zur Wohnungsfrage”, Der Volksstaat, No. 86, October 26, 1872.—*Ed*.

\(^b\) See this volume, pp. 317-37.—*Ed*. 
housing problem put forward in the articles I was of course in so far “prejudiced” as I was long ago acquainted with it from Proudhon and my opinion on it was firmly fixed.

I am not going to quarrel with friend Mülberger about the “tone” of my criticism. When one has been so long in the movement as I have, one develops a fairly thick skin against attacks, and therefore one easily presumes the existence of the same in others. In order to compensate Mülberger I shall endeavour this time to bring my “tone” into the right relation to the sensitiveness of his epidermis (outer layer of the skin).

Mülberger complains with particular bitterness that I said he was a Proudhonist, and he protests that he is not. Naturally I must believe him, but I shall adduce proof that the articles in question—and I had to do with them alone—contain nothing but undiluted Proudhonism.

But according to Mülberger I have also criticised Proudhon “frivolously” and have done him a serious injustice.

“The doctrine of the petty bourgeois Proudhon has become an accepted dogma in Germany, which is even proclaimed by many who have never read a line of him.”

When I express regret that for twenty years the workers speaking Romance languages have had no other mental pabulum than the works of Proudhon, Mülberger answers that as far as the Latin workers are concerned, “the principles formulated by Proudhon are almost everywhere the driving spirit of the movement”. This I must deny. First of all, the “driving spirit” of the working-class movement nowhere lies in “principles”, but everywhere in the development of large-scale industry and its effects, the accumulation and concentration of capital, on the one hand, and of the proletariat, on the other. Secondly, it is not correct to say that in the Latin countries Proudhon’s so-called “principles” play the decisive role ascribed to them by Mülberger; that “the principles of anarchism, of the Organisation des forces économiques, of the liquidation sociale, etc., have there ... become the true bearers of the revolutionary movement”. Not to speak of Spain and Italy, where the Proudhonist panacea has gained some influence only in the still more botched form presented by Bakunin, it is a notorious fact for anyone who knows the international working-class movement that in France the Proudhonists form a numerically rather insignificant sect, while the mass of the French workers refuses to have anything to do with the social reform plan drawn up by Proudhon under the
titles of *Liquidation sociale* and *Organisation des forces économiques*. This was shown, among other things, in the Commune. Although the Proudhonists were strongly represented in the Commune, not the slightest attempt was made to liquidate the old society or to organise the economic forces according to Proudhon’s proposals. On the contrary, it does the Commune the greatest honour that in all its economic measures the “driving spirit” was not any set of “principles”, but simple, practical needs. And therefore these measures—abolition of night work in the bakeries, prohibition of monetary fines in the factories, confiscation of shut-down factories and workshops and handing them over to workers’ associations—were not at all in accordance with the spirit of Proudhonism, but certainly in accordance with the spirit of German scientific socialism. The only social measure which the Proudhonists put through was the decision *not* to confiscate the Bank of France, and this was partly responsible for the downfall of the Commune. In the same way, when the so-called Blanquists made an attempt to transform themselves from mere political revolutionists into a socialist workers’ faction with a definite programme—as was done by the Blanquist fugitives in London in their manifesto, *Internationale et révolution*—they did not proclaim the “principles” of the Proudhonist plan for the salvation of society, but adopted, and almost literally at that, the views of German scientific socialism on the necessity of political action by the proletariat and of its dictatorship as the transition to the abolition of classes and, with them, of the state—views such as had already been expressed in the *Communist Manifesto* and since then on innumerable occasions. And if Mülberger even draws the conclusion from the Germans’ disdain of Proudhon that there has been a lack of understanding of the movement in the Latin countries “down to the Paris Commune”, let him as proof of this lack tell us what work from the Latin side has understood and described the Commune even approximately as correctly as has the *Address of the General Council of the International on the Civil War in France*, written by the German Marx.

The only country where the working-class movement is directly under the influence of Proudhon “principles” is Belgium, and precisely as a result of this the Belgian movement comes, as Hegel would say, “from nothing through nothing to nothing”.

---

b See present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 504-06.—*Ed.*
When I consider it a misfortune that for twenty years the workers of the Latin countries fed intellectually, directly or indirectly, exclusively on Proudhon, I do not mean that thoroughly mythical dominance of Proudhon’s reform recipe—termed by Mülberger the “principles”—but the fact that their economic criticism of existing society was contaminated with absolutely false Proudhonist phrases and that their political actions were bungled by Proudhonist influence. Whether thus the “Proudhonised workers of the Latin countries” “stand more in the revolution” than the German workers, who in any case understand the meaning of scientific German socialism infinitely better than the Latins understand their Proudhon, we shall be able to answer only after we have learnt what “to stand in the revolution” really means. We have heard talk of people who “stand in Christianity, in the true faith, in the grace of God”, etc. But “standing” in the revolution, in the most violent of all movements? Is, then, “the revolution” a dogmatic religion in which one must believe?

Mülberger further reproaches me with having asserted, in defiance of the express wording of his articles, that he had declared the housing question to be an exclusively working-class question.

This time Mülberger is really right. I overlooked the passage in question. It was irresponsible of me to overlook it, for it is one most characteristic of the whole tendency of his disquisition. Mülberger actually writes in plain words:

“As we have been so frequently and largely exposed to the absurd charge of pursuing a class policy, of striving for class domination, and such like, we wish to stress first of all and expressly that the housing question is by no means a question which affects the proletariat exclusively, but that, on the contrary, it interests to a quite prominent extent the middle classes proper, the small tradesmen, the petty bourgeoisie, the whole bureaucracy... The housing question is precisely that point of social reform which more than any other seems appropriate to reveal the absolute inner identity of the interests of the proletariat, on the one hand, and the interests of the middle classes proper of society, on the other. The middle classes suffer just as much as, and perhaps even more than, the proletariat under the oppressive fetters of the rented dwelling... Today the middle classes proper of society are faced with the question of whether they... can summon sufficient strength... to participate in the process of the transformation of society in alliance with the youthful, vigorous and energetic workers’ party, a transformation whose blessings will be enjoyed above all by them.”

Friend Mülberger thus makes the following points here:

1. “We” do not pursue any “class policy” and do not strive for

---

“class domination”. But the German Social-Democratic Workers’ Party, just because it is a workers’ party, necessarily pursues a “class policy”, the policy of the working class. Since each political party sets out to establish its rule in the state, so the German Social-Democratic Workers’ Party is necessarily striving to establish its rule, the rule of the working class, hence “class domination”. Moreover, every real proletarian party, from the English Chartists onward, has put forward a class policy, the organisation of the proletariat as an independent political party, as the primary condition of its struggle, and the dictatorship of the proletariat as the immediate aim of the struggle. By declaring this to be “absurd”, Mülberger puts himself outside the proletarian movement and inside the camp of petty-bourgeois socialism.

2. The housing question has the advantage that it is not an exclusively working-class question, but a question which “interests to a quite prominent extent” the petty bourgeoisie, in that “the middle classes proper” suffer from it “just as much as, and perhaps even more than”, the proletariat. If anyone declares that the petty bourgeoisie suffers, even if in one respect only, “perhaps even more than the proletariat”, he can hardly complain if one counts him among the petty-bourgeois socialists. Has Mülberger therefore any grounds for complaint when I say:

“It is largely with just such sufferings as these, which the working class endures in common with other classes, and particularly the petty bourgeoisie, that petty-bourgeois socialism, to which Proudhon belongs, prefers to occupy itself. And thus it is not at all accidental that our German Proudhonist seizes chiefly upon the housing question, which, as we have seen, is by no means exclusively a working-class question.”

3. There is an “absolute inner identity” between the interests of the “middle classes proper of society” and the interests of the proletariat, and it is not the proletariat, but these middle classes proper which will “enjoy above all” the “blessings” of the coming process of transformation of society.

The workers, therefore, are going to make the coming social revolution “above all” in the interests of the petty bourgeoisie. And furthermore, there is an absolute inner identity of the interests of the petty bourgeoisie and those of the proletariat. If the interests of the petty bourgeoisie have an inner identity with those of the workers, then those of the workers have an inner identity with those of the petty bourgeoisie. The petty-bourgeois

---

a See this volume, p. 319.—Ed.
standpoint has thus as much right to exist in the movement as the proletarian standpoint, and it is precisely the assertion of this equality of right that is called petty-bourgeois socialism.

It is therefore perfectly consistent when, on page 25 of the separate reprint, Mülberger extols “petty industry” as the “actual buttress of society”, “because in accordance with its very nature it combines within itself the three factors: labour—acquisition—possession, and because in the combination of these three factors it places no bounds to the capacity for development of the individual”; and when he reproaches modern industry in particular with destroying this nursery for the production of normal human beings and “making out of a virile class continually reproducing itself an unconscious heap of humans who do not know whither to direct their anxious gaze”. The petty bourgeoisie is thus Mülberger’s model human being and petty industry is Mülberger’s model mode of production. Did I defame him, therefore, when I classed him among the petty-bourgeois socialists?

As Mülberger rejects all responsibility for Proudhon, it would be superfluous to discuss here any further how Proudhon’s reform plans aim at transforming all members of society into petty bourgeois and small peasants. It will be just as unnecessary to deal with the alleged identity of interests of the petty bourgeoisie and the workers. What is necessary is to be found already in the Communist Manifesto. (Leipzig edition, 1872, pp. 12 and 21.)

The result of our examination is, therefore, that side by side with the “myth of the petty bourgeois Proudhon” appears the reality of the petty bourgeois Mülberger.

II

We now come to one of the main points. I accused Mülberger’s articles of falsifying economic relationships after the manner of Proudhon by translating them into legal terminology. As an example of this, I picked the following statement by Mülberger:

“The house, once it has been built, serves as a perpetual legal title to a definite fraction of social labour although the real value of the house has been paid to the owner long ago more than adequately in the form of rent. Thus it comes about that a house which, for instance, was built fifty years ago, during this period covers the original cost price two, three, five, ten and more times over in its rent yield.”

---

a See present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 494 and 509-10.—Ed.
b See this volume, pp. 320-21.—Ed.
Mülberger now complains as follows:

"This simple, sober statement of fact causes Engels to enlighten me to the effect that I should have explained how the house became a 'legal title'—something which was quite beyond the scope of my task.... A description is one thing, an explanation another. When I say with Proudhon that the economic life of society should be pervaded by a conception of right, I am describing present-day society as one in which, true, not every conception of right is absent, but in which the conception of right of the revolution is absent, a fact which Engels himself will admit."a

Let us keep for the moment to the house which has been built. The house, once it has been let, yields its builder ground rent, repairing costs, and interest on the building capital invested, including as well the profit made thereon in the form of rent;b and, according to the circumstances, the rent, paid gradually, can amount to twice, thrice, five times or ten times as much as the original cost price. This, friend Mülberger, is the "simple, sober statement" of "fact", an economic fact; and if we want to know "how it comes" that it exists, we must conduct our examination in the economic field. Let us therefore look a little closer at this fact so that not even a child may misunderstand it any longer. As is known, the sale of a commodity consists in the fact that its owner relinquishes its use-value and pockets its exchange-value. The use-values of commodities differ from one another among other things in the different periods of time required for their consumption. A loaf of bread is consumed in a day, a pair of trousers will be worn out in a year, and a house, if you like, in a hundred years. Hence, in the case of durable commodities, the possibility arises of selling their use-value piecemeal and each time for a definite period, that is to say, to let it. The piecemeal sale therefore realises the exchange-value only gradually. As a compensation for his renouncing the immediate repayment of the capital advanced and the profit accrued on it, the seller receives an increased price, interest, whose rate is determined by the laws of political economy and not by any means in an arbitrary fashion. At the end of the hundred years the house is used up, worn out and no longer habitable. If we then deduct from the total rent paid for the house the following: 1) the ground rent together with any increase it may have experienced during the period in question, and 2) the sums expended for current repairs, we shall find that the

---
a A. Mülberger, "Zur Wohnungsfrage", Der Volksstaat, No. 86, October 26, 1872.—Ed.
b In Der Volksstaat this part of the sentence reads as follows: "The house, once it has been let, yields its builder ground rent, repairing costs, and profit on the building capital invested in the form of rent".—Ed.
remainder is composed on an average as follows: 1) the building capital originally invested in the house, 2) the profit on this, and 3) the interest on the gradually maturing capital and profit. Now it is true that at the end of this period the tenant has no house, but neither has the house-owner. The latter has only the lot (provided that it belongs to him) and the building material on it, which, however, is no longer a house. And although in the meantime the house may have brought in a sum "which covers the original cost price five or ten times over", we shall see that this is solely due to an increase of the ground rent. This is no secret to anyone in such cities as London where the landowner and the house-owner are in most cases two different persons. Such tremendous rent increases occur in rapidly growing towns, but not in a farming village, where the ground rent for building sites remains practically unchanged. It is indeed a notorious fact that, apart from increases in the ground rent, house rents produce on an average no more than seven per cent per annum on the invested capital (including profit) for the house-owner, and out of this sum repair costs, etc., must be paid. In short, a rent agreement is quite an ordinary commodity transaction which theoretically is of no greater and no lesser interest to the worker than any other commodity transaction, with the exception of that which concerns the buying and selling of labour power, while practically the worker faces the rent agreement as one of the thousand forms of bourgeois cheating, which I dealt with on page 4 of the separate reprint. But, as I proved there, this form is also subject to economic regulation.

Mülberger, on the other hand, regards the rent agreement as nothing but pure "arbitrariness" (page 19 of the separate reprint) and when I prove the contrary to him he complains that I am telling him "solely things which to his regret he already knew himself".

But all the economic investigations into house rent will not enable us to turn the abolition of the rented dwelling into "one of the most fruitful and magnificent aspirations which have ever sprung from the womb of the revolutionary idea". In order to accomplish this we must translate the simple fact from sober economics into the really far more ideological sphere of jurispru-
ence. "The house serves as a perpetual legal title" to house rent, and "thus it comes" that the value of a house can be paid back in rent two, three, five or ten times. The "legal title" does not help us a jot to discover how it really "does come", and therefore I said that Mülberger would have been able to find out how it really "does come" only by inquiring how the house becomes a legal title. We discover this only after we have examined, as I did, the economic nature of house rent, instead of quarrelling with the legal expression under which the ruling class sanctions it.—Anyone who proposes the taking of economic steps to abolish rent surely ought to know a little more about house rent than that it "represents the tribute which the tenant pays to the perpetual title of capital". To this Mülberger answers, "A description is one thing, an explanation another."

We have thus converted the house, although it is by no means everlasting, into a perpetual legal title to house rent. We find, no matter how "it comes", that by virtue of this legal title, the house brings in its original value several times over in the form of rent. By the translation into legal phraseology we are happily so far removed from economics that we now can see no more than the phenomenon that a house can gradually get paid for in gross rent several times over. As we are thinking and talking in legal terms, we apply to this phenomenon the measuring stick of right, of justice, and find that it is unjust, that it is not in accordance with the "conception of right of the revolution", whatever that may be, and that therefore the legal title is no good. We find further that the same holds good for interest-bearing capital and leased agricultural land, and we now have the excuse for separating these classes of property from the others and subjecting them to exceptional treatment. This consists in the demands: 1) to deprive the owner of the right to give notice to quit, the right to demand the return of his property; 2) to give the lessee, borrower or tenant the gratuitous use of the object transferred to him but not belonging to him; and 3) to pay off the owner in instalments over a long period without interest. And with this we have exhausted the Proudhonist "principles" from this angle. This is Proudhon's "social liquidation".

Incidentally, it is obvious that this whole reform plan is to benefit almost exclusively the petty bourgeois and the small peasants, in that it consolidates them in their position as petty bourgeois and small peasants. Thus "the petty bourgeois

---

a Cf. this volume, p. 327.— *Ed.*
Proudhon”, who, according to Mülberger, is a mythical figure, suddenly takes on here a very tangible historical existence.

Mülberger continues:

“When I say with Proudhon that the economic life of society should be pervaded by a conception of right, I am describing present-day society as one in which, true, not every conception of right is absent, but in which the conception of right of the revolution is absent, a fact which Engels himself will admit.”

Unfortunately I am not in a position to do Mülberger this favour. Mülberger demands that society should be pervaded by a conception of right and calls that a description. If a court sends a bailiff to me with a summons demanding the payment of a debt, then, according to Mülberger, it does no more than describe me as a man who does not pay his debts! A description is one thing, and a presumptuous demand is another. And precisely herein lies the essential difference between German scientific socialism and Proudhon. We describe—and despite Mülberger every real description of a thing is at the same time an explanation of it—economic relationships as they are and as they are developing, and we provide the proof, strictly economically, that their development is at the same time the development of the elements of a social revolution: the development, on the one hand, of a class whose conditions of life necessarily drive it to social revolution, the proletariat, and, on the other hand, of productive forces which, having grown beyond the framework of capitalist society, must necessarily burst that framework, and which at the same time offer the means of abolishing class distinctions once and for all in the interest of social progress itself. Proudhon, on the contrary, demands of present-day society that it shall transform itself not according to the laws of its own economic development, but according to the precepts of justice (the “conception of right” does not belong to him, but to Mülberger). Where we prove, Proudhon, and with him Mülberger, preaches and laments.

What kind of thing “the conception of right of the revolution” is I am absolutely unable to guess. Proudhon, it is true, makes a sort of goddess out of “the Revolution”, the bearer and executrix of his “Justice”, in doing which he then falls into the peculiar error of mixing up the bourgeois revolution of 1789-94 with the coming proletarian revolution. He does this in almost all his works, particularly since 1848; I shall quote only one as an example, namely, the *Idée générale de la révolution*, pages 39 and 40

---

a Here and below Engels quotes from: A. Mülberger, “Zur Wohnungsfrage”, *Der Volksstaat*, No. 86, October 26, 1872.—Ed.
of the 1868 edition. As, however, Mülberger rejects all and every responsibility for Proudhon, I am not allowed to explain "the conception of right of the revolution" from Proudhon and remain therefore in Egyptian darkness.

Mülberger says further:

"But neither Proudhon nor I appeal to an 'eternal justice' in order thereby to explain the existing unjust conditions, or even expect, as Engels imputes to me, the improvement of these conditions from an appeal to this justice."

Mülberger must be banking on the idea that "in Germany Proudhon is, in general, as good as unknown". In all his works Proudhon measures all social, legal, political and religious propositions\(^a\) with the rod of "justice", and rejects or recognises them according to whether they conform or do not conform to what he calls "justice". In the *Contradictions économiques*\(^b\) this justice is still called "eternal justice", *justice éternelle*. Later on, nothing more is said about eternity, but the idea remains in essence. For instance, in *De la justice dans la révolution et dans l'église*, 1858 edition, the following passage is the text of the whole three-volume sermon (Vol. 1, page 42):

> "What is the basic principle, the organic, regulating, sovereign principle of societies, the principle which subordinates all others to itself, which rules, protects, represses, punishes, and in case of need even suppresses all rebellious elements? Is it religion, the ideal or interest? ... In my opinion this principle is justice.—What is justice? *It is the very essence of humanity.* What has it been since the beginning of the world? Nothing.—What ought it to be? Everything."

Justice which is the very essence of humanity, what is that if not *eternal* justice? Justice which is the organic, regulating, sovereign basic principle of societies, which has nevertheless been nothing up to present, but which ought to be everything—what is that if not the stick with which to measure all human affairs, if not the final arbiter to be appealed to in all conflicts? And did I assert anything else but that Proudhon cloaks his economic ignorance and helplessness by judging all economic relations not according to economic laws, but according to whether they conform or do not conform to his conception of this eternal justice? And what is the difference between Mülberger and Proudhon if Mülberger demands that "all these exchanges in the life of modern society" should be "pervaded by a *conception of right*, that is to say", should

---

\(^a\) *Der Volksstaat* has "all social, legal, and political conditions, all theoretical, philosophical, and religious propositions".— *Ed.*

\(^b\) This refers to P. J. Proudhon, *Système des contradictions économiques, ou Philosophie de la misère*.— *Ed.*
“everywhere be carried out according to the strict demands of justice”? Is it that I can’t read, or that Mülberger can’t write? Mülberger says further:

“Proudhon knows as well as Marx and Engels that the actual driving spirit in human society is the economic and not the juridical relations; he also knows that the given conceptions of right among a people are only the expression, the imprint, the product of the economic relations—and in particular the relations of production... In a word, for Proudhon right is a historically evolved economic product.”

If Proudhon knows all this (I am prepared to let the unclear expressions used by Mülberger pass and take his good intentions for the deed), if Proudhon knows it all “as well as Marx and Engels”, what is there left to quarrel about? The trouble is that the situation with regard to Proudhon’s knowledge is somewhat different. The economic relations of a given society present themselves in the first place as interests. Now, in the passage which has just been quoted from his opus Proudhon says in so many words that the “regulating, organic, sovereign basic principle of societies, the principle which subordinates all others to itself”, is not interest but justice. And he repeats the same thing in all the decisive passages of all his works, which does not prevent Mülberger from continuing:

“...The idea of economic right, as it was developed by Proudhon most profoundly of all in La guerre et la paix, completely coincides with the basic ideas of Lassalle so excellently expressed by him in his foreword to the System der erworbenen Rechte.”

La guerre et la paix is perhaps the most schoolboyish of all the many schoolboyish works of Proudhon, but I could not have expected it to be put forward as proof of Proudhon’s alleged understanding of the German materialist conception of history, which explains all historical events and ideas, all politics, philosophy and religion, from the material, economic conditions of life of the historical period in question. The book is so little materialistic that it cannot even construct its conception of war without calling in the help of the creator:

“However, the creator, who chose this form of life for us, had his own purposes.” (Vol. II, page 100, 1869 edition.)

On what historical knowledge the book is based can be judged from the fact that it believes in the historical existence of the Golden Age:

a Cf. this volume, p. 322.—Ed.
“In the beginning, when the human race was still sparsely spread over the earth’s surface, nature supplied its needs without difficulty. It was the Golden Age, the age of peace and plenty.” (Ibid., page 102.)

Its economic standpoint is that of the crassest Malthusianism:

“When production is doubled, the population will soon be doubled also” (page 106).252

In what does the materialism of this book consist, then? In that it declares the cause of war to have always been and still to be: “pauperism” (for instance, page 143). Uncle Bräsig was just such an accomplished materialist when in his 1848 speech he placidly uttered these grand words: “The cause of the great poverty is the great pauvreté”

Lassalle’s System der erworbenen Rechte bears the imprint of the illusions of not only the jurist, but also the Old Hegelian. On page VII, Lassalle declares expressly that also “in economics the conception of acquired right is the driving force of all further development”, and he seeks to prove (page XI) that “right is a rational organism developing out of itself” (and not, therefore, out of economic prerequisites). For Lassalle it is a question of deriving right not from economic relations, but from

“the concept of the will itself, of which the philosophy of law [right—Rechtsphilosophie] is only the development and exposition” (page XII).

So, where does this book come in here? The only difference between Proudhon and Lassalle is that the latter was a real jurist and Hegelian, while in both jurisprudence and philosophy, as in all other matters, Proudhon was merely a dilettante.

I know perfectly well that this man Proudhon, who notoriously continually contradicts himself, occasionally makes an utterance which looks as though he explained ideas on the basis of facts. But such utterances are devoid of any significance when contrasted with the basic tendency of his thought, and where they do occur they are, besides, extremely confused and inherently inconsistent.

At a certain, very primitive stage of the development of society, the need arises to bring under a common rule the daily recurring acts of production, distribution and exchange of products to see to it that the individual subordinates himself to the common conditions of production and exchange. This rule, which at first is custom, soon becomes law. With law, organs necessarily arise which are entrusted with its maintenance—public authority, the state. With further social development, law develops into a more or less comprehensive legal system. The more intricate this legal
system becomes, the more is its mode of expression removed from that in which the usual economic conditions of the life of society are expressed. It appears as an independent element which derives the justification for its existence and the substantiation of its further development not from the economic relations but from its own inner foundations or, if you like, from "the concept of the will". People forget that their right derives from their economic conditions of life, just as they have forgotten that they themselves derive from the animal world. With the development of the legal system into an intricate, comprehensive whole a new social division of labour becomes necessary; an order of professional jurists develops and with these legal science comes into being. In its further development this science compares the legal systems of various peoples and various times not as a reflection of the given economic relationships, but as systems which find their substantiations in themselves. The comparison presupposes points in common, and these are found by the jurists compiling what is more or less common to all these legal systems and calling it natural right. And the stick used to measure what is natural right and what is not is the most abstract expression of right itself, namely, justice. Henceforth, therefore, the development of right for the jurists, and for those who take their word for everything, is nothing more than a striving to bring human conditions, so far as they are expressed in legal terms, ever closer to the ideal of justice, eternal justice. And always this justice is but the ideologised, idealised expression of the existing economic relations, now from their conservative, and now from their revolutionary angle. The justice of the Greeks and Romans held slavery to be just; the justice of the bourgeois of 1789 demanded the abolition of feudalism on the ground that it was unjust. For the Prussian Junker even the miserable district regulations are a violation of eternal justice.253 The conception of eternal justice, therefore, varies not only with time and place, but also with the persons concerned, and belongs among those things of which Mülberger correctly says, "everyone understands something different". While in everyday life, in view of the simplicity of the relations discussed, expressions like right, wrong, justice, and sense of right are accepted without misunderstanding even with reference to social matters, they create, as we have seen, the same hopeless confusion in any scientific investigation of economic relations as would be created, for instance, in modern chemistry if the terminology of the phlogiston theory were to be retained. The confusion becomes still worse if one, like Proudhon, believes in this social phlogiston,
“justice”, or if one, like Mülberger, avers that the phlogiston theory is as correct as the oxygen theory.*

III

Mülberger further complains that I called his “emphatic” utterance,

“that there is no more terrible mockery of the whole culture of our lauded century than the fact that in the big cities 90 per cent and more of the population have no place that they can call their own”\(^a\)

— a reactionary jeremiad. To be sure. If Mülberger had confined himself, as he pretends, to describing “the horrors of the present time” I should certainly not have said one ill word about “him and his modest words”. In fact, however, he does something quite different. He describes these “horrors” as the result of the fact that the workers “have no place that they can call their own”. Whether one laments “the horrors of the present time” for the reason that the ownership of houses by the workers has been abolished or, as the Junkers do, for the reason that feudalism and the guilds have been abolished, in either case nothing can come of it but a reactionary jeremiad, a song of sorrow at the coming of the inevitable, of the historically necessary. Its reactionary character lies precisely in the fact that Mülberger wishes to re-establish individual house ownership for the workers—a matter which history has long ago put an end to; that he can conceive of the emancipation of the workers in no other way than by making everyone once again the owner of his own house.

And further:

“I declare most emphatically, the real struggle is to be waged against the capitalist mode of production; only from its transformation is an improvement of housing conditions to be hoped for. Engels sees nothing of all this ... I presuppose

* Before the discovery of oxygen chemists explained the burning of substances in atmospheric air by assuming the existence of a special igneous substance, phlogiston, which escaped during the process of combustion. Since they found that simple substances on combustion weighed more after having been burned than they did before, they declared that phlogiston had a negative weight so that a substance without its phlogiston weighed more than one with it. In this way all the main properties of oxygen were gradually ascribed to phlogiston, but all in an inverted form. The discovery that combustion consists in a combination of the burning substance with another substance, oxygen, and the discovery of this oxygen disposed of the original assumption, but only after long resistance on the part of the older chemists.

\(^a\) See this volume, p. 323.— Ed.
the complete settlement of the social question in order to be able to proceed to the
abolition of the rented dwelling." \(^a\)

Unfortunately, I still see nothing of all this even now. It surely is
impossible for me to know what someone whose name I never
heard presupposes in the secret recesses of his mind. All I could
do was to stick to the printed articles of Mülberger. And there I
find even today (pages 15 and 16 of the reprint) that Mülberger,
in order to be able to proceed to the abolition of the rented
dwelling, presupposes nothing except—the rented dwelling. Only
on page 17 he takes "the productivity of capital by the horns", to
which we shall come back later. Even in his answer he confirms
this when he says:

"It was rather a question of showing how, from existing conditions, a complete
transformation in the housing question could be achieved."

From existing conditions, and from the transformation (read: abolion)
of the capitalist mode of production, are surely
diametrically opposite things.

No wonder Mülberger complains when I regard the philan-
thropic efforts of M. Dollfus and other manufacturers to assist
the workers to obtain houses of their own as the only possible
practical realisation of his Proudhonist projects. If he were to
realise that Proudhon's plan for the salvation of society is a fantasy
resting completely on the basis of bourgeois society, he would
naturally not believe in it. I have never at any time called his good
intentions in question. But why then does he praise Dr. Reschauer \(^b\)
for proposing to the Vienna City Council that it should imitate
Dollfus' projects?

Mülberger further declares:

"As far as the antithesis between town and country is particularly concerned, it
is utopian to want to abolish it. This antithesis is a natural one, or more correctly,
one that has arisen historically.... The question is not one of abolishing this
antithesis, but of finding political and social forms in which it would be harmless,
indeed even fruitful. In this way it would be possible to expect a peaceful adjustment, a
gradual balancing of interests."

So the abolition of the antithesis between town and country is utopian, because this antithesis is a natural one, or more correctly, one
that has arisen historically. Let us apply this same logic to other
contrasts in modern society and see where we land. For instance:

\(^a\) Here and below Engels quotes from: A. Mülberger, "Zur Wohnungsfrage", Der Volksstaat, No. 86, October 26, 1872.—Ed.

\(^b\) H. Reschauer, Die Wohnungsnoth und ihr schädlicher Einfluß auf die Kleingewerbetreibenden und Lohnarbeiter, Vienna, 1871.—Ed.
“As far as the antithesis between” the capitalists and the wage-workers “is particularly concerned, it is utopian to want to abolish it. This antithesis is a natural one, or more correctly, one that has arisen historically. The question is not one of abolishing this antithesis, but of finding political and social forms in which it would be harmless, indeed even fruitful. In this way it would be possible to expect a peaceful adjustment, a gradual balancing of interests.”

And with this we have once again arrived at Schulze-Delitzsch.

The abolition of the antithesis between town and country is no more and no less utopian than the abolition of the antithesis between capitalists and wage-workers. From day to day it is becoming more and more a practical demand of both industrial and agricultural production. No one has demanded this more energetically than Liebig in his writings on the chemistry of agriculture, in which his first demand has always been that man shall give back to the land what he receives from it, and in which he proves that only the existence of the towns, and in particular the big towns, prevents this. When one observes how here in London alone a greater quantity of manure than is produced by the whole kingdom of Saxony is poured away every day into the sea with an expenditure of enormous sums, and what colossal structures are necessary in order to prevent this manure from poisoning the whole of London, then the utopia of abolishing the antithesis between town and country is given a remarkably practical basis. And even comparatively unimportant Berlin has been suffocating in the malodours of its own filth for at least thirty years. On the other hand, it is completely utopian to want, like Proudhon, to upheave present-day bourgeois society while maintaining the peasant as such. Only as uniform a distribution as possible of the population over the whole country, only an intimate connection between industrial and agricultural production together with the extension of the means of communication made necessary thereby—granted the abolition of the capitalist mode of production—will be able to deliver the rural population from the isolation and stupor in which it has vegetated almost unchanged for thousands of years. To be utopian does not mean to maintain that the emancipation of humanity from the chains which its historic past has forged will be complete only when the antithesis between town and country has been abolished; the utopia begins

---

a Justus von Liebig, *Die Chemie in ihrer Anwendung auf Agricultur und Physiologie*, Part 1, Brunswick, 1862, pp. 128-29 et seq.—Ed.
only when one ventures, “from existing conditions”, to prescribe the form in which this or any other antithesis of present-day society is to be resolved. And this is what Mülberger does by adopting the Proudhonist formula for the settlement of the housing question.

Mülberger then complains that I have made him to a certain extent co-responsible for “Proudhon’s monstrous views on capital and interest”, and declares:

“I presuppose the alteration of the relations of production as an accomplished fact, and the transitional law regulating the rate of interest does not deal with relations of production but with the social turnover, the relations of circulation... The alteration of the relations of production, or, as the German school says more accurately, the abolition of the capitalist mode of production, certainly does not result, as Engels tries to make me say, from a transitional law abolishing interest, but from the actual seizure of all the instruments of labour, from the seizure of industry as a whole by the working people. Whether the working people will in that event worship” (!) “redemption sooner than immediate expropriation is not for either Engels or me to decide.”

I rub my eyes in astonishment. I am reading Mülberger’s disquisition through once again from beginning to end in order to find the passage where he says his redemption of the rented dwelling presupposes as an accomplished fact “the actual seizure of all the instruments of labour, the seizure of industry as a whole by the working people”, but I am unable to find any such passage. It does not exist. There is nowhere mention of “actual seizure”, etc., but there is the following on page 17:

“Let us now assume that the productivity of capital is really taken by the horns, as it must be sooner or later, for instance, by a transitional law which fixes the interest on all capitals at one per cent, but mark you, with the tendency to make even this rate of interest approximate more and more to the zero point... Like all other products, houses and dwellings are naturally also included within the purview of this law... We see, therefore, from this angle that the redemption of the rented dwelling is a necessary consequence of the abolition of the productivity of capital in general.”

Thus it is said here in plain words, quite contrary to Mülberger’s latest about-face, that the productivity of capital, by which confused phrase he admittedly means the capitalist mode of production is really “taken by the horns” by a law abolishing interest, and that precisely as a result of such a law “the redemption of the rented dwelling is a necessary consequence of the abolition of the productivity of capital in general”. Not at all, says Mülberger now. That transitional law “does not deal with relations of production but with relations of circulation”. In view of

---

a A. Mülberger, Die Wohnungsfrage (see this volume, p. 331).— Ed.
this crass contradiction, "equally mysterious for wise men as for fools", as Goethe would say, all that is left for me to do is to assume that I am dealing with two separate and distinct Mülbergers, one of whom rightly complains that I "tried to make him say" what the other caused to be printed.

It is certainly true that the working people will ask neither me nor Mülberger whether in the actual seizure they will "worship redemption sooner than immediate expropriation". In all probability they will prefer not to "worship" at all. However, there never was any question of the actual seizure of all the instruments of labour by the working people, but only of Mülberger’s assertion (page 17) that "the whole content of the solution of the housing question is comprised in the word redemption". If he now declares this redemption to be extremely doubtful, what was the sense in giving the two of us and our readers all this unnecessary trouble? Moreover, it must be pointed out that the "actual seizure" of all the instruments of labour, the taking possession of industry as a whole by the working people, is the exact opposite of the Proudhonist "redemption". In the latter case the individual worker becomes the owner of dwelling, the peasant farm, the instruments of labour; in the former case, the "working people" remain the collective owner of the houses, factories and instruments of labour, and will hardly permit their use, at least during a transitional period, by individuals or associations without compensation for the cost. In the same way, the abolition of property in land is not the abolition of ground rent but its transfer, if in a modified form, to society. The actual seizure of all the instruments of labour by the working people, therefore, does not at all preclude the retention of rent relations.

In general, the question is not whether the proletariat when it comes to power will simply seize by force the instruments of production, the raw materials and means of subsistence, whether it will pay immediate compensation for them or whether it will redeem the property therein by small instalment payments. To attempt to answer such a question in advance and for all cases would be utopia-making, and that I leave to others.

IV

There was need to consume so much ink and paper in order to bore a way through Mülberger’s diverse twists and turns to the

\[\text{\textsuperscript{a} Cf. Goethe, } Faust, \text{ Part I, Scene 6 ("Hexenküche").— Ed.}\]
real point at issue, a point which Mülberger carefully evades in his answer.

What were Mülberger’s positive statements in his article?

First: that “the difference between the original cost price of a house, building site, etc., and its present value” belongs by right to society.\(^a\) In the language of economics, this difference is called ground rent. Proudhon too wants to appropriate this for society, as one may read in his *Idée générale de la révolution*, page 219 of the 1868 edition.

Secondly: that the solution of the housing problem consists in everyone becoming the owner instead of the tenant of his dwelling.

Thirdly: that this solution shall be put into effect by passing a law turning rent payments into instalment payments on the purchase price of the dwelling.—Points 2 and 3 are both borrowed from Proudhon, as anyone can see in the *Idée générale de la révolution*, page 199 et seq., where on page 203 a project of the law in question is to be found already drafted.

Fourthly: that the productivity of capital is taken by the horns by a transitional law reducing the rate of interest provisionally to one per cent, subject to further reduction later on. This point has also been taken from Proudhon, as may be read in detail on pages 182 to 186 of the *Idée générale*.

With regard to each of these points I have cited the passage in Proudhon where the original of the Mülberger copy is to be found, and I ask now whether I was justified in calling the author of an article containing completely Proudhonist and nothing but Proudhonist views a Proudhonist or not? Nevertheless, Mülberger complains about nothing more bitterly than that I call him a Proudhonist because I “came upon a few expressions that are peculiar to Proudhon”! On the contrary. The “expressions” all belong to Mülberger, their content belongs to Proudhon. And when I then supplement this Proudhonist disquisition with Proudhon, Mülberger complains that I am ascribing to him the “monstrous views” of Proudhon!

What did I reply to this Proudhonist plan?

First: that the transfer of ground rent to the state is tantamount to the abolition of individual property in land.

Secondly: that the redemption of the rented dwelling and the transfer of property in the dwelling to the party who was the tenant hitherto does not at all affect the capitalist mode of production.

\(^a\) A. Mülberger, *Die Wohnungsfrage*, p. 8.—*Ed.*
Thirdly: that with the present development of large-scale industry and towns this proposal is as absurd as it is reactionary, and that the reintroduction of the individual ownership of his dwelling by each individual would be a step backward.

Fourthly: that the compulsory reduction of the rate of interest on capital would by no means attack the capitalist mode of production; and that, on the contrary, as the usury laws prove, it is as old as it is impossible.

Fifthly: that the abolition of interest on capital by no means abolishes the payment of rent for houses.

Mülberger has now admitted points 2 and 4. To the other points he makes no reply whatever. And yet these are just the points around which the whole debate centres. Mülberger's answer, however, is not a refutation: it carefully avoids dealing with all economic points, which after all are the decisive ones. It is a personal complaint, nothing more. For instance, he complains when I anticipate his announced solution of other questions, for example, state debts, private debts and credit, and say that his solution will everywhere be the same, namely, that, as in the housing question, the abolition of interest, the conversion of interest payments into instalment payments on the capital sum, and free credit. Nevertheless, I am still ready to bet that if these articles of Mülberger see the light of day, their essential content will coincide with Proudhon's *Idée générale*: credit, page 182; state debts, page 186; private debts, page 196—just as much as his articles on the housing question coincided with the passages I quoted from the same book.

Mülberger takes this opportunity to inform me that questions such as taxation, state debts, private debts and credit, to which is now added the question of communal autonomy, are of the greatest importance to the peasant and for propaganda in the countryside. To a great extent I agree, but 1) up to the moment there has been no discussion of the peasant, and 2) the Proudhonian "solutions" of all these problems are just as absurd economically and just as essentially bourgeois as his solution of the housing problem. I need hardly defend myself against Mülberger's suggestion that I fail to appreciate the necessity of drawing the peasants into the movement. However, I certainly consider it folly to recommend the Proudhonian quackery to them for this purpose. There is still very much big landed property in Germany. According to Proudhon's theory all this ought to be

---

a *Der Volksstaat* has "capitalist production".—*Ed.*
divided up into small peasant farms, which, in the present state of
scientific agriculture and after the experience with small land
allotments in France and Western Germany, would be positively
reactionary. The big landed estates which still exist will rather
afford us a welcome basis for the carrying on of agriculture on a
large scale—the only system of farming which can utilise all
modern facilities, machinery, etc.—by associated workers, and thus
demonstrating to the small peasants the advantages of large-scale
operation by means of association. The Danish socialists, who in
this respect are ahead of all others, saw this long ago.a

It is equally unnecessary for me to defend myself against the
 suggestion that I regard the existing infamous housing conditions
of the workers as “an insignificant detail”. As far as I know, I was
the first to describe in German these conditions in their classical
form as they exist in England; not, as Mülberger opines, because
they “violated my sense of justice”—anyone who insisted on writing
books about all the facts which violated his sense of justice would
have a lot to do—but, as can be read in the Preface to my book,b
in order to provide a factual basis, by describing the social
conditions created by modern large-scale industry, for German
socialism, which was then arising and expending itself in empty
phrases. However, it never entered my head to try to settle the
so-called housing question any more than to occupy myself with the
details of the still more important food question. I am satisfied if I
can prove that the production of our modern society is sufficient
to provide all its members with enough to eat, and that there are
houses enough in existence to provide the working masses for the
time being with roomy and healthy living accommodation. To
speculate on how a future society might organise the distribution
of food and dwellings leads directly to utopia. The utmost we can
do is to state from our understanding of the basic conditions of all
modes of production up to now that with the downfall of the
capitalist mode of production certain forms of appropriation
which existed in society hitherto will become impossible. Even the
transitional measures will everywhere have to be in accordance
with the relations existing at the moment. In countries of small
landed property they will be substantially different from those in
countries where big landed property prevails, etc. Mülberger
himself shows us better than anyone else where one arrives at if

---

a F. Engels, “The Position of the Danish Members of the International on the
Agrarian Question” (see this volume, pp. 57-58).—Ed.
b F. Engels, The Condition of the Working-Class in England (see present edition,
Vol. 4, pp. 302-04).—Ed.
one attempts to find separate solutions for so-called practical problems like the housing question, etc. He first took 28 pages to explain* that “the whole content of the solution of the housing question is comprised in the word redemption”, and then, when hard pressed, begins to stammer in embarrassment that it is really very doubtful whether, on actually taking possession of the houses, “the working people will worship redemption” sooner than some other form of expropriation.\textsuperscript{b}

Mülberger demands that we should become \textit{practical}, that we should not “come forward merely with dead and abstract formulas” when “faced with real practical relations”, that we should “proceed beyond abstract socialism and come close to the definite concrete relations of society”. If Mülberger had done this he might perhaps have rendered great service to the movement. The first step in coming close to the definite concrete relations of society is surely that one should learn what they are, that one should examine them according to their existing economic interconnections. But what do we find in Mülberger’s articles? Two whole sentences, namely:

1. “The tenant is in the same position in relation to the house-owner as the wage-worker in relation to the capitalist.” [Page 13.]

I have proved on page 6 of the reprint that this is totally wrong,\textsuperscript{c} and Mülberger has not a word to say in reply.

2. “However, the bull which” (in the social reform) “must be taken by the horns is the productivity of capital, as the liberal school of political economy calls it, a thing which in reality does not exist, but which in its seeming existence serves as a cloak for all the inequality which burdens present-day society.”\textsuperscript{d}

Thus, the bull which has to be taken by the horns “\textit{in reality does not}” exist, and therefore also has no “horns”. Not the bull itself is the evil, but his \textit{seeming existence}. Despite this, “the so-called productivity” (of capital) “is able to conjure up houses and towns” whose existence is anything but “seeming”. (Page 12.) And a man who, although Marx’s \textit{Capital} “is familiar also to him”, jabbers in this hopelessly confused fashion about the relation of capital and labour, undertakes to show the German workers a new and better path, and presents himself as the “master builder” who is

“clear about the architectural structure of the future society, at least in its main outlines”! [Page 13.]

\textsuperscript{a} \textit{Der Volksstaat} has “to explain in detail”.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} See this volume, p. 385.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{c} Ib\textit{id.}, p. 320.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{d} A. Mülberger, \textit{Die Wohnungsfrage}, p. 7 (cf. this volume, p. 331).—\textit{Ed.}
The Housing Question.—III

No one has come closer “to the definite concrete relations of society” than Marx in Capital. He spent twenty-five years investigating them from all angles, and the results of his criticism contain throughout also the germs of so-called solutions, in so far as they are possible at all today. But that is not enough for friend Mülberger. That is all abstract socialism, dead and abstract formulas. Instead of studying the “definite concrete relations of society”, friend Mülberger contents himself with reading through a few volumes of Proudhon which, although they offer him next to nothing concerning the definite concrete relations of society, offer him, on the contrary, very definite concrete miraculous remedies for all social evils. He then presents this ready-made plan for social salvation, this Proudhonian system, to the German workers under the pretext that he wants “to say good-bye to the systems”, while I “choose the opposite path”! In order to grasp this I must assume that I am blind and Mülberger deaf so that any understanding between us is utterly impossible.

But enough. If this polemic serves for nothing else it has in any case the value of having given proof of what there really is to the practice of these self-styled “practical” socialists. These practical proposals for the abolition of all social evils, these universal social panaceas, have always and everywhere been the work of founders of sects who appeared at a time when the proletarian movement was still in its infancy. Proudhon too belongs to them. The development of the proletariat soon casts aside these swaddling-clothes and engenders in the working class itself the realisation that nothing is less practical than these “practical solutions”, concocted in advance and universally applicable, and that practical socialism consists rather in a correct knowledge of the capitalist mode of production from its various aspects. A working class which knows what’s what in this regard will never be in doubt in any case as to which social institutions should be the objects of its main attacks, and in what manner these attacks should be executed.

Written in May 1872-January 1873
First published in Der Volksstaat, Nos. 51, 52, 53, 103 and 104, June 26 and 29, July 3, December 25 and 28, 1872; Nos. 2, 3, 12, 13, 15 and 16, January 4 and 8, February 8, 12, 19 and 22, 1873; and in three separate reprints in Leipzig in 1872-73
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