

**KARL  
MARX  
FREDERICK  
ENGELS**

---

**Collected  
Works**



**Volume 20  
Marx and Engels  
1864 -1868**

## Contents

Preface .....	XV
---------------	----

### KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

#### WORKS

September 1864-July 1868

1. <i>K. Marx</i> . Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association .....	5
2. <i>K. Marx</i> . Provisional Rules of the Association .....	14
3. <i>K. Marx</i> . Resolutions on the Composition of the Provisional Central Council .....	17
4. <i>K. Marx</i> . Resolutions on the Terms of the Admission of Workers' Organisations to the International Working Men's Association .....	18
5. <i>K. Marx</i> . To Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America .....	19
6. <i>K. Marx</i> . To the Editor of the <i>Beobachter</i> .....	22
7. <i>K. Marx</i> . To the Editor of the Stuttgart <i>Beobachter</i> .....	23
8. <i>K. Marx</i> . On Proudhon [Letter to J. B. Schweitzer] .....	26
9. <i>F. Engels</i> . Herr Tidmann. Old Danish Folk Song .....	34
10. <i>K. Marx and F. Engels</i> . To the Editor of the <i>Social-Demokrat</i> .....	36
11. <i>F. Engels</i> . The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party .....	37
I. ....	42
II. ....	56
III. ....	67
12. <i>K. Marx and F. Engels</i> . To the Editor of the <i>Social-Demokrat</i> .....	80
13. <i>F. Engels</i> . Notice Concerning <i>The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party</i> .....	81

14. <i>K. Marx</i> . Resolutions of the Central Council on the Conflict in the Paris Section .....	82
15. <i>K. Marx</i> . Synopsis of Engels' Pamphlet <i>The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party</i> .....	84
16. <i>K. Marx</i> . Review of Engels' Pamphlet <i>The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party</i> .....	85
17. <i>K. Marx</i> . Statement Regarding the Causes of the Breach with the <i>Social-Demokrat</i> .....	87
18. <i>K. Marx</i> . To the Editor of the <i>Berliner Reform</i> .....	91
19. <i>K. Marx</i> . The "President of Mankind" .....	92
20. <i>K. Marx</i> . A Correction .....	97
21. <i>K. Marx</i> . Address from the Working Men's International Association to President Johnson .....	99
22. <i>K. Marx</i> . Value, Price and Profit .....	101
Preliminary .....	103
1) Production and Wages .....	103
2) Production, Wages, Profits .....	105
3) Wages and Currency .....	113
4) Supply and Demand .....	116
5) Wages and Prices .....	118
6) Value and Labour .....	120
7) Labouring Power .....	127
8) Production of Surplus-Value .....	130
9) Value of Labour .....	132
10) Profit is Made by Selling a Commodity at Its Value .....	133
11) The Different Parts into Which Surplus-Value is Decomposed .....	134
12) General Relation of Profits, Wages and Prices .....	137
13) Main Cases of Attempts at Raising Wages or Resisting Their Fall .....	138
14) The Struggle Between Capital and Labour and Its Results .....	144
23. <i>K. Marx</i> . Resolution on the Convocation of a General Congress of the International in 1866 .....	150
24. <i>K. Marx</i> . Resolution on the Procedure of Discussing the Programme of the Congress .....	151
25. <i>F. Engels</i> . What Have the Working Classes to Do with Poland? .....	152
I. To the Editor of <i>The Commonwealth</i> .....	152
II. To the Editor of <i>The Commonwealth</i> .....	155
III. The Doctrine of Nationality Applied to Poland .....	158

26. <i>K. Marx</i> . A Warning .....	162
27. <i>F. Engels</i> . Notes on the War in Germany .....	164
No. I .....	164
No. II .....	168
No. III .....	172
No. IV .....	176
No. V .....	179
28. <i>K. Marx</i> . Proposals of the Standing Committee on the Programme of the Geneva Congress .....	183
29. <i>K. Marx</i> . Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council. The Different Questions .....	185
1.—Organisation of the International Association .....	185
2.—International Combination of Efforts, by the Agency of the Association, in the Struggle Between Labour and Capital .....	186
3.—Limitation of the Working Day .....	187
4.—Juvenile and Children's Labour (Both Sexes) .....	188
5.—Co-operative Labour .....	190
6.—Trades' Unions. Their Past, Present and Future .....	191
7.—Direct and Indirect Taxation .....	192
8.—International Credit .....	193
9.—Polish Question .....	193
10.—Armies .....	193
11.—Religious Question .....	194
30. <i>K. Marx</i> . Resolution of Gratitude to the Delegates of the Central (General) Council to the Geneva Congress .....	195
31. <i>K. Marx</i> . Speech at the Polish Meeting in London. <i>January 22, 1867</i> .....	196
32. <i>K. Marx</i> . A Correction .....	202
33. <i>K. Marx</i> . Resolutions Concerning the Agenda of the Lausanne Congress .....	203
34. <i>K. Marx</i> . Resolution on the Attitude of the International Working Men's Association to the Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom .....	204

## ARTICLES AND REVIEWS

WRITTEN IN CONNECTION WITH THE PUBLICATION  
OF VOLUME ONE OF *CAPITAL*

(October 1867-July 1868)

35. <i>F. Engels</i> . Review of Volume One of <i>Capital</i> for the <i>Zukunft</i> .....	207
36. <i>F. Engels</i> . Review of Volume One of <i>Capital</i> for the <i>Rheinische Zeitung</i> .....	210

37. <i>F. Engels</i> . Review of Volume One of <i>Capital</i> for the <i>Elberfelder Zeitung</i> .....	214
38. <i>F. Engels</i> . Review of Volume One of <i>Capital</i> for the <i>Düsseldorfer Zeitung</i> .....	216
39. <i>K. Marx</i> . Plagiarism .....	219
40. <i>F. Engels</i> . Review of Volume One of <i>Capital</i> for the <i>Beobachter</i> .....	224
41. <i>F. Engels</i> . Review of Volume One of <i>Capital</i> for the <i>Staats-Anzeiger für Württemberg</i> .....	227
42. <i>F. Engels</i> . Review of Volume One of <i>Capital</i> for the <i>Neue Badische Landeszeitung</i> .....	229
43. <i>F. Engels</i> . Review of Volume One of <i>Capital</i> for the <i>Demokratisches Wochenblatt</i> .....	231
44. <i>F. Engels</i> . Review of Volume One of <i>Capital</i> for <i>The Fortnightly Review</i> .....	238
45. <i>K. Marx</i> . My Plagiarism of F. Bastiat .....	260
46. <i>F. Engels</i> . Synopsis of Volume One of <i>Capital</i> by Karl Marx .....	263
Chapter I — Commodities and Money .....	265
1. Commodities as Such .....	265
2. The Process of Commodity Exchange .....	267
3. Money, or the Circulation of Commodities ...	268
Chapter II — The Transformation of Money into Capital .....	275
1. The General Formula for Capital .....	275
2. Contradictions in the General Formula .....	277
3. The Buying and Selling of Labour-Power ....	280
Chapter III — The Production of Absolute Surplus-Value .....	282
1. The Labour Process and the Process of Producing Surplus-Value .....	282
2. Constant and Variable Capital .....	284
3. The Rate of Surplus-Value .....	286
4. The Working Day .....	286
5. Rate and Mass of Surplus-Value .....	289
Chapter IV — Production of Relative Surplus-Value .....	292
1. The Concept of Relative Surplus-Value .....	292
2. Co-operation .....	293
3. Division of Labour and Manufacture .....	297
4. Machinery and Large-Scale Industry .....	300

#### FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS

1. <i>K. Marx</i> . Draft for a Speech on France's Attitude to Poland (Polemics against Peter Fox)	311
--	-----

1. The So-called Polish Succession War .....	312
2. The Seven Years' War (1756-1763) .....	313
3. First Partition of Poland .....	316
4. French Republic .....	318
5. Consulate .....	322
6. Empire .....	323
2. <i>K. Marx</i> . Draft for a Report to the Central Council .....	328
3. <i>K. Marx</i> . Notes Concerning the Conflict in the Paris Section .....	329
4. <i>K. Marx</i> . Original Draft Resolution on the Conflict in the Paris Section .....	330
5. <i>K. Marx</i> . Memorandum to Hermann Jung About the Conflict in the Paris Section .....	331
6. <i>K. Marx</i> . Note to Hermann Jung About Ernest Jones' Letter to the Central Council Meeting. <i>March 21, 1865</i> .....	337
7. <i>K. Marx</i> . Notes for the Report on Value, Price and Profit .....	338
8. <i>K. Marx</i> . Record of the Central Council Meeting. <i>January 16, 1866</i> .....	339
9. <i>F. Engels</i> . Sweden and Denmark. Travel Notes .....	343

## APPENDICES

1. From the Minute Book of the General Council. Central Council Meetings (October-November 1864) .....	351
2. From the Minute Book of the General Council. Central Council Meetings (November-December 1864) .....	353
3. From the Minute Book of the General Council. Central Council Meetings (January-February 1865) .....	356
4. Report of a Speech by Karl Marx at the Anniversary Celebration of the German Workers' Educational Society in London .....	360
5. Agreement Between Mr. Karl Marx and Mr. Otto Meissner, Publisher and Bookseller .....	361
6. From the Minute Book of the General Council. Central Council Meetings (March-early July 1865) .....	363
7. A Card Issued to Societies Forming the Association .....	369
8. Report of the Sub-Committee on the Questions of a Congress and Conference as Amended and Passed by the Central Council at a Summoned Meeting on the 25th of July, 1865 .....	375
9. To the Working Men of Great Britain and Ireland .....	378
10. The Industrial Newspaper Company (Limited) .....	380
11. From the Minute Book of the General Council. Central Council Meetings (September 1865) .....	384

12. From the Minutes of the London Conference of the International Working Men's Association .....	385
13. From the Minute Book of the General Council. Central Council Meetings (October 1865-January 1866) .....	387
14. From a Letter by Jenny Marx to Johann Philipp Becker. <i>January 29, 1866</i> .....	390
15. To the Editor of <i>L'Echo de Verviers</i> .....	392
16. Record of Marx's Speech on Mazzini's Attitude to the International Working Men's Association .....	401
17. Manchester Schiller Institute Circular .....	402
18. From the Minute Book of the General Council. Central Council Meetings (May 1866) .....	405
19. <i>P. Lafargue</i> . Survey of the Progress of the International Working Men's Association .....	406
20. From the Minute Book of the General Council. Central (General) Council Meetings (June-December 1866) .....	411
21. Report of a Speech by Karl Marx at the Anniversary Celebration of the German Workers' Educational Society in London. <i>February 28, 1867</i> .....	415
22. From the Minute Book of the General Council. General Council Meetings (April 1867) .....	416
23. Manchester Schiller Institute Circular .....	417
24. The General Council of the International Working Men's Association on the Lausanne Congress .....	421
25. Record of Marx's Speech on the Statistics in the New Blue Book .....	424
26. Record of Marx's Speech on the Attitude of the International Working Men's Association to the Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom .....	426
27. Third Annual Report of the International Working Men's Association .....	428
28. From the Minute Book of the General Council. General Council Meetings (September 24-October 22, 1867) .....	438
29. From a Letter by Jenny Marx to Johann Philipp Becker. <i>On about October 5, 1867</i> .....	439
30. Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association .....	441

## NOTES AND INDEXES

<i>Notes</i> .....	447
<i>Name Index</i> .....	517
<i>Index of Quoted and Mentioned Literature</i> .....	544

<i>Index of Periodicals</i> .....	554
<i>Subject Index</i> .....	559
<i>Glossary of Geographical Names</i> .....	581

## ILLUSTRATIONS

Title page of the first edition of the Inaugural Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association .....	3
Title page of the first edition of <i>The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party</i> by Engels .....	39
The Austro-Prussian War, 1866 (map) .....	182-83
The last page of Marx's memorandum to Jung about the conflict in the Paris Section .....	333
Minutes of the Central Council Meeting of January 16, 1866 recorded by Marx .....	341
Plan of the Swedish fortress of Karlsborg. <i>Drawing by Engels</i> .....	345
Central Council's Address to working men's societies .....	372-73





## TRANSLATORS:

CYNTHIA CARLILE: Appendix 24

JANE DGEBUADZE: Appendices 14, 29

GLENYS ANN KOZLOV: Appendices 17, 23

RODNEY LIVINGSTONE: Article 15, Appendices  
4, 5, 19

LEONARD E. MINS: Article 46

BARBARA RUHEMANN: Articles 32, 35, 36-42

VICTOR SCHNITTKE: Article 9, From the Preparatory  
Materials 3, 9, Appendix 21

BARRIE SELMAN: Articles 6, 7, 10, 12, 17-19

CNRISTOPHER UPWARD: Articles 11, 13, 16

JOAN and TREVOR WALMSLEY: Article 45



## Preface

Volume 20 of the *Collected Works* of Marx and Engels contains works written between September 1864 and July 1868. It is the first in a group of volumes that reflect the activity of Marx and Engels as the leaders of the International Working Men's Association (the First International). The volume includes documents of the International drawn up by them, reports, pamphlets, articles, statements, records of speeches, drafts, etc., written up to November 1867, the period of the setting up of the international proletarian organisation and the beginning of the struggle to establish socialist principles in its programme. Extending slightly beyond this chronological framework are the notes and reviews written by Marx and Engels in connection with the publication of the first volume of *Capital* in September 1867, and also Engels' synopsis of this volume, which are published in a special section.

The founding of the Association, the first mass international organisation of the proletariat, heralded a new stage in the development of the working-class movement and in the history of Marxism. It marked the beginning of the international proletarian movement and created new conditions and opportunities for the broad dissemination of the ideas of scientific communism. "It is unforgettable, it will remain for ever in the history of the workers' struggle for their emancipation," Lenin wrote of the First International (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, Moscow, 1980, p. 240).

The International was set up when the working-class movement began to gain momentum in the late 1850s. The world economic crisis of 1857 and the growing strike movement that followed it

were awakening in the workers' consciousness an understanding of the importance of their fraternal solidarity in the struggle against capital. The activity of the working class was also stimulated by the revolutionary events of the time: the struggle for the unification of Italy, the Civil War in the United States of America, the Polish national liberation uprising of 1863-64, and others. All this drew broad masses of workers into political life and strengthened the desire for concerted action by the proletariat of the different countries.

However, the spontaneous urge to establish international connections was not in itself enough for the creation of an independent international working-class organisation. Of decisive importance for its formation and activity was the participation of Marx and his supporters, including former members of the Communist League. It was the influence of Marx and the proletarian revolutionaries who managed to express the vital interests of the workers of all countries, that ensured the development of the International Working Men's Association as a truly proletarian association, and made it possible to overcome such obstacles to this as the ideological dependence of many workers on bourgeois democracy, the widespread nationalistic prejudices among them, and the reformist and sectarian dogmas of petty-bourgeois socialism.

The works published in this and the three subsequent volumes, and the relevant correspondence volumes, illustrate clearly the leading role which Marx played in the International Working Men's Association. He was the author of all its programmatic documents and most of its addresses and statements. Personally or through his colleagues he guided the work of the congresses and conferences of the International Association and drafted their most important resolutions. He was in fact the head of the Central (General) Council of the International, the headquarters of the international proletarian organisation, and directed the activity of its executive body, the Standing Committee or Sub-Committee. On behalf of the General Council Marx drew up the political programme of the International, thereby outlining the strategy and tactics of the whole international working-class movement.

Marx was greatly assisted by Engels in the guidance of the International. Until his move from Manchester to London in the autumn of 1870 Engels could not participate directly in the work of the General Council, but even before then he assisted with all its main undertakings, explaining in the press and in letters to active members of the working-class movement, particularly in

Germany, the position of the International Working Men's Association on many theoretical and tactical questions.

In guiding the International Marx had to take into account the differing conditions for the struggle of the proletariat and the varying degrees of its organisation and ideological level in the individual countries. He saw the prime task of the international organisation as being to unite the different streams of the proletarian movement, and to single out the proletariat from the general democratic camp and to ensure its class independence. Marx sought step by step to bring the workers to accept a common theoretical programme and general tactical principles, thus promoting the combination of scientific communism and the mass working-class movement. "In uniting the labour movement of various countries, striving to channel into joint activity the various forms of non-proletarian, pre-Marxist socialism (Mazzini, Proudhon, Bakunin, liberal trade-unionism in Britain, Lassallean vacillations to the right in Germany, etc.), and in combating the theories of all these sects and schools, Marx hammered out a uniform tactic for the proletarian struggle of the working class in the various countries" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, Moscow, 1977, p. 49).

Marx's consistently revolutionary and at the same time flexible line as leader of the International manifested itself already in the drafting of the organisation's first programme documents—the "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association" and the "Provisional Rules of the Association", with which the present volume opens. Here Marx succeeded in resisting attempts to impose on the Association a declaration of principles written in a bourgeois-democratic spirit and Mazzini's rules for Italian working-men's mutual aid societies that were full of sectarian-conspiratorial tendencies. Thanks to his efforts the International Working Men's Association based its programme and rules according to the theoretical and organisational principles of scientific socialism.

Working on the Inaugural Address and Rules Marx sought to reflect in them the sum total of social development since the Revolution of 1848 and the further development of revolutionary theory, particularly his economic teaching. In this respect the inaugural documents of the International are a step forward from the first programmatic work—the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. On the other hand, not all the propositions of the *Communist Manifesto* could be reproduced in the new documents, and Marx

had to expound some of its ideas in a form comprehensible to the members of the proletarian movement of his day. International unification of the various detachments of the working class, and ensurance of the mass nature of the organisation being set up, were possible at that time only on a platform which, without making any concessions to reformist and sectarian trends, did not simultaneously close the door on British trade-unionists, French, Belgian and Swiss Proudhonists, and German Lassalleans. "It was very difficult to frame the thing so that our view should appear in a form which would make it acceptable to the present outlook of the workers' movement," Marx wrote to Engels in this connection on November 4, 1864. "It will take time before the revival of the movement allows the old boldness of language to be used. We must be *fortiter in re, suaviter in modo* [forcible in deed, gentle in manner]." Marx believed that as the influence of reformist and sectarian trends was overcome and the working class accumulated practical experience, the programme of the International would be extended and, first and foremost, supplemented by propositions concretising the socialist aims of the working-class movement and ways of achieving them.

The first programmatic documents of the International stressed that the contradictions between labour and capital would inevitably deepen as capitalism developed. Hence the conclusion that the radical transformation of society was the only way to free the proletariat and all working people from oppression. The abolition of all class rule was proclaimed as the aim of the working-class movement. "The emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves" (this volume, p. 14). These opening words of the preamble to the Provisional Rules express the idea that the political and ideological independence of the working-class movement is the most important condition for the successful outcome of the proletariat's struggle against capitalism.

In the Inaugural Address Marx noted two great victories won by the working class: the passing of the Ten-Hours' Bill in Britain and the development of the co-operative movement. However, he pointed out that neither legislative restriction of the working day nor experiments with the creation of workers' cooperatives could lead to a transformation of the economic foundations of bourgeois society under capitalism. An insuperable obstacle to this is the exploiting classes'—the magnates of land and the magnates of capital—monopoly of political power. "To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the working classes" (this

volume, p. 12). Pointing out that the workers possessed one of the elements of success—numbers—Marx emphasised that “numbers weigh only in the balance, if united by combination and led by knowledge” (*ibid.*). This idea helped members of the working-class movement to understand the importance of creating a proletarian party armed with revolutionary theory.

The principles of proletarian internationalism were profoundly substantiated in the first documents of the International. “Past experience has shown,” wrote Marx in the Inaugural Address, “how disregard of that bond of brotherhood which ought to exist between the workmen of different countries, and incite them to stand firmly by each other in all their struggles for emancipation, will be chastised by the common discomfiture of their incoherent efforts” (this volume, p. 12). The summons “Proletarians of all countries, Unite!” put forward by Marx and Engels on the founding of the Communist League, became the new organisation’s watchword. As one of the International’s main tasks the Inaugural Address put forward the struggle against the aggressive foreign policy of the ruling classes, calling on workers “to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations” (this volume, p. 13).

In working out the organisational structure of the International Marx also took account of the historically developed forms of the working-class movement. The International Working Men’s Association did not oppose existing workers’ organisations, but sought to base itself on them and lead their activity to a common goal. The Rules provided for both individual membership of the Association and collective membership by craft, trade, co-operative, educational and other societies and unions. The truly democratic structure of the organisation, recognition of congresses as the supreme bodies, in the intervals between which leadership was concentrated in the hands of the Central Council, the elective nature of all posts, accountability, collective decision-taking, the granting of extensive rights to local sections with observance of a certain degree of centralisation necessary for unity of action—all these propositions in the Rules were in keeping with the truly emancipatory nature of the struggle of the working class and with the task of drawing the broad proletarian masses into this struggle.

The resolutions on the composition of the Provisional Central Council, the records of a number of speeches delivered by Marx at meetings of the Council, and also of proposals made by his



colleagues on his initiative, the English text of the General Rules and Administrative Regulations passed at the Geneva Congress in 1866 and prepared for publication with Marx's assistance, and other documents, testify to the attention which he devoted to perfecting the structure and organisational forms of the activity of the International Working Men's Association.

The new organisation became the centre of the international mutual assistance of the proletariat in the struggle for its economic interests. "It is one of the great purposes of the Association," Marx stated, "to make the workmen of different countries not only *feel* but *act* as brethren and comrades in the army of emancipation" (this volume, p. 186). Already in the early years of the Association's existence its support enabled the workers of a number of countries to hold successful strikes. The leaders of the Association frequently succeeded in thwarting factory owners' plans to use foreign workers as strike-breakers. A characteristic document in this respect is the Central Council's appeal, written by Marx, entitled "A Warning". Addressing German tailors whom employers were trying to recruit for work in Scotland so as to break strikes, Marx urged them not to become the "*obedient mercenaries of capital*" (this volume, p. 163).

Marx devoted a special paper to the theoretical substantiation of the importance of the economic struggle. He considered it essential to refute mistaken views on this subject, including those of the Lassalleans and Proudhonists who denied the role of strikes and trade unions. In the Central Council itself the Owenist John Weston tried to argue the futility of the workers' struggle for higher wages. In reply to this attempt Marx presented a report on June 20 and 27, 1865 to the Central Council, which is published in this volume under the title of *Value, Price and Profit* (also known under the title of *Wages, Price and Profit*). In this report Marx demonstrated most convincingly the invalidity of Weston's arguments. The tendency of capital, Marx explained, to make the working day as long as possible and reduce wages to a minimum, that is, to the cost of the means of subsistence physically necessary for the worker and his family to stay alive, is by no means a kind of fatal, "iron" law. The cost of labour power, he noted, is variable, and depends not only on physical, but also on social factors, the standard of living in this or that country, the different phases of the economic cycle and, in particular, the degree of resistance offered by the workers to the capitalists. Without this resistance, which stimulates the workers to organise themselves for struggle, "they would be degraded to one level mass of broken

wretches past salvation" (this volume, p. 148). However, the proletariat cannot be content with mere improvements in the conditions for selling labour power, Marx stressed, and also attacked the British trade-unionists' attempts to limit the working-class movement to achieving economic concessions. The daily "guerilla war" against the consequences and not the causes of the exploitation of the workers must, he taught, be subordinated to the final aim of the working class—to overthrow the exploitative system, destroy the system of wage labour itself (ibid., p. 149).

Marx's report did not contain only his polemic with Weston and those who supported his views. In it, two years before the publication of the first volume of *Capital*, Marx set out in popular form some of the main propositions of his economic teaching, revealing, first and foremost, how surplus value, the source of all types of unearned income, is formed and thereby explaining the true nature of the relations between capitalists and wage workers. *Value, Price and Profit* is one of the most important works of Marxist political economy.

A splendid example of how revolutionary theory can be used to define the practical tasks of the working-class movement is the document entitled "Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council. The Different Questions", drawn up by Marx, which served as the basis for the work and resolutions of the Geneva Congress of the International Working Men's Association in 1866. Developing and expanding the first programmatic documents of the International, the Instructions concretised the broad programme of its activity.

The Instructions orientated members of the working-class movement to all-round international mutual assistance in the economic struggle. Marx endeavoured to give the highly important task of strengthening international proletarian solidarity a concrete content, by searching at each stage of the activity of the International for new ways of uniting the proletariat of different countries. In order to put the struggle for the workers' economic interests on a scientific basis, Marx advanced the idea of a statistical inquiry into the condition of the working class and outlined a general scheme for such an inquiry. The Instructions attached special importance to the restriction of the working day. Having substantiated the demand for an eight-hour working day, Marx turned this demand into a common slogan for the proletariat of the whole capitalist world.

Outlining measures against the capitalist exploitation of female and child labour, Marx at the same time showed the progressive

nature of drawing women and adolescents into material production. He advanced a number of propositions concerning the education and upbringing of the younger generation which served as a point of departure for the development of the theory and practice of socialist education. The main thing here was the idea of polytechnical training, the combining of the mental and physical education of children and adolescents with a study of the main principles of production, and the initiation in productive labour. Marx saw this as a means of raising the intellectual level of the working class and, in future socialist society, as a way for ensuring the formation of the harmoniously developed individual.

In the section of the Instructions on co-operative labour, Marx, unlike the Proudhonists and other petty-bourgeois reformers, showed that the co-operative movement in itself could not transform the capitalist social system. Radical changes in the social system could never "be realised save by the transfer of the organised forces of society, viz., the state power, from capitalists and landlords to the producers themselves" (this volume, p. 190).

Of particular importance is the section on trades' unions. Here thoughts concerning the place and role of the trade-union movement in the revolutionary emancipatory process expressed by Marx at different times, and his ideas on the need to combine the economic and political struggle of the working class, were systematised and developed. Lenin subsequently remarked that, after the Geneva Congress adopted the resolution on trade unions reproducing the corresponding propositions in the Instructions, "the conviction that the class struggle must necessarily combine the political and the economic struggle into one integral whole has entered into the flesh and blood of international Social-Democracy" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, Moscow, 1977, p. 177). Outlining the ways of turning the trade unions into schools of revolutionary education for the proletarian masses and training them for decisive battles with capital, Marx pointed out that professional organisations should not limit themselves to the narrow everyday requirements of their members, and that they were obliged to take part in any social and political movement aimed at the emancipation of the working class.

A considerable number of works and documents included in this volume reflect the position of the International, led by Marx, on the most important political questions of the day. Marx believed that the consistent carrying out of urgent bourgeois-democratic transformations would facilitate the task of organising the forces of the proletariat and be a step towards its emancipation.

Therefore, unlike the supporters of Proudhon and other petty-bourgeois utopians who maintained that intervention in politics distracts the workers from the solution of social problems, Marx sought to turn the International Working Men's Association into an influential political force, a vanguard fighter for democracy, peace between peoples and the liberation of oppressed nations.

In the congratulatory address of the Central Council to Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America, on the occasion of his re-election to this post in autumn 1864, drafted by Marx, the International expressed its solidarity with the struggle of the revolutionary-democratic forces of the United States against the Southern slave-holders (see this volume, pp. 19-21). Marx was also the author of the address of the International Working Men's Association to President Andrew Johnson in May 1865 in connection with the murder of Lincoln by an agent of the slave-holders (*ibid.*, pp. 99-100). Marx orientated his supporters in Germany towards unification of the country by democratic, revolutionary means. He regarded the struggle against the Bonapartist regime as the most important task of the International in France. In reply to the obstacles which the French authorities raised to the activity of the International Working Men's Association, Marx suggested intensifying the denunciatory campaign against the Bonapartist regime (see his speech on this question at the meeting of the General Council on November 27, 1866, this volume, p. 414).

The note to Hermann Jung about Ernest Jones' letter, and the brief records of speeches at meetings of the Central Council, in particular, those of January 24, February 14 and 28 and April 25, 1865, testify to the efforts which Marx was making to induce the leading body of the International to assume the role of organiser of a mass movement for democratic parliamentary reform in Britain and to exert an influence on the activity of the Reform League, founded in spring 1865, as a centre of this movement. Under the influence of Marx and the Central Council, the League advanced the demand for universal male suffrage. The movement for reform did not live up to Marx's expectations, however. The trade-union leaders, who were members of the Council of the League and inclined to compromise, renounced the platform which the Central Council of the International had outlined for the League. Taking advantage of the League's weakness, the government passed a moderate reform in 1867, leaving most of the workers without the right to vote.

Already in the early years of the activity of the International Working Men's Association Marx and Engels devoted considerable attention to substantiating the internationalist position of the working class in relation to the national liberation movement. In this period they spoke out with particular frequency on the Polish question. Marx and Engels regarded support of the fighters for the freedom of the Polish people and other oppressed nations as a most important task of the proletarian organisation, proceeding from the conviction that the solution of urgent national problems in a revolutionary-democratic manner was a condition of the successful development of the working-class movement. This idea runs through the Central Council's "Correction", written by Marx in April 1865, in connection with the silence of the British liberal press concerning the position of the International on the Polish question, and Marx's speech at a meeting in London on January 22, 1867 to mark the anniversary of the Polish insurrection of 1863-64 (see this volume, pp. 97-98, 196-201).

Marx was compelled to defend the internationalist line with respect to Poland in a struggle against the Proudhonists, who had inherited from their teacher a nihilistic attitude to the national liberation movements and denied their progressive nature. He also had to contend with the misunderstanding about the real ways of liberating Poland, with the allegation made by the right wing of the Polish emigration, that the policy of the ruling classes of the Western powers, in particular bourgeois France, was in keeping with the national aspirations of the Poles. On the Central Council the English democrat Peter Fox sought to defend this point of view. It was refuted in a number of speeches by Marx at meetings of the Standing Committee and Central Council in December 1864-January 1865 (see this volume, pp. 311-27, 354-56). On the matter of liberating Poland Marx took the view that one should look not to the so-called "help" of the Western powers, but to internal revolutionary-democratic forces, a union of the popular masses of Poland and Russia (he had already expressed this idea in letters to Engels during the Polish insurrection of 1863-64) and support from the European proletariat.

Engels also criticised Proudhonist views on the Polish question. In a series of articles entitled *What Have the Working Classes to Do with Poland?* he showed that in the interests of its own emancipation the working class should irreconcilably oppose the policy of national oppression and be at the forefront of the struggle for the national independence of enslaved peoples. At the same time Engels warned of the danger of reactionary forces

making use of national movements, especially those of small peoples, an example of which was the speculation of ruling circles in the Bonapartist Second Empire on the "principle of nationalities".

Marx regarded the international solidarity of the proletariat as a powerful means of combating militarism, the unleashing of bloody wars by the ruling classes. He stressed that "the union of the working classes of the different countries must ultimately make international wars impossible" (this volume, p. 426). At the same time Marx sought to teach the working-class movement to combine the struggle for peace with the class approach to war, with an ability to analyse the nature of this or that military conflict. This aspect of Marx's activity was seen during the discussion in the Central Council on the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, an analysis of which from the military strategic point of view was provided by Engels in the series of articles entitled *Notes on the War in Germany*. In spite of their laconic nature, the notes in the Council Minute Book give an idea of the active part which Marx took in this discussion. The resolution passed by the Council under his influence shows his deep understanding of the contradictory nature of the war in which objectively progressive aims—the unification of Germany—were intertwined with the dynastic and territorial claims of the ruling classes of the belligerent states. The International recommended workers to adopt a neutral stand, and at the same time placed responsibility for the military conflict on the governments of the belligerent parties (*ibid.*, p. 411).

In the Resolution on the Attitude of the International Working Men's Association to the Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom and the speech on this subject at the meeting of the General Council on August 13, 1867, Marx formulated a number of propositions concerning joint action by workers and members of the bourgeois pacifist movement (see this volume, pp. 204, 426-27). While supporting in principle collaboration with all progressive forces in the struggle against the growing military danger, Marx stressed that this collaboration should take forms which did not threaten the working class with the loss of its own independent, class line and with ideological submission to bourgeois democracy. The proletarian organisation could not assume responsibility for all the weaknesses and illusions of the pacifist movement, which, although it really did reflect the anti-military mood of the broad masses, was characterised by an abstract approach to war, a reluctance to see the capitalist system as its source, and a tendency

to replace real struggle for peace by high-flown declarations.

The materials and documents published in the volume reflect the intense activity of Marx and Engels to create and strengthen local organisations of the International and to draw into its ranks the workers of Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland and the USA.

In Britain Marx sought to make such mass working-class organisations as the trade unions a bulwark for the International. To this end he drafted the resolutions on terms for the admission of workers' organisations to membership of the International Working Men's Association and the Address of the Central Council to working men's societies, based on these resolutions (see this volume, pp. 18, 372-73). The Minute Book of the General Council contains a report of a speech by Marx on July 23, 1867, from which it is clear that he played an active part in defending trade unions against attacks by reactionary forces trying to ban or restrict their activity (see this volume, pp. 424-25).

In seeking to use the organisational experience and influence among the masses of trade-union leaders of the day in the interests of strengthening the position of the International, Marx did not overlook their characteristic reformist interpretation of the aims of the working-class movement, their respect for bourgeois authorities, their uncritical acceptance of pacifist rhetoric, and their compliance with respect to bourgeois radicals. Marx considered it his duty to combat the manifestation of such tendencies. Thus, on his initiative, the General Council dissociated itself from the panegyric of Bismarck made by George Odger, an eminent trade unionist (see this volume, p. 416).

The Central Council's resolutions on the conflict in the Paris section and a number of preparatory materials for this document (see present volume, pp. 82-83, 329-36) throw light on Marx's endeavours to strengthen the International's sections in France. Rejecting in these resolutions the claims of bourgeois democrats to a leading role in the French sections of the International Working Men's Association and denying their ill-founded accusations levelled at members of the Paris Administration (Proudhonist workers), Marx at the same time sought to complement it with revolutionary-proletarian elements. He hoped to induce the Administration to turn from propagating utopian Proudhonist projects of social reform to organisational work among the proletarian masses.

Marx showed constant concern for the creation of a massive base for the International in Germany. This task could be solved

by the affiliation to the International Working Men's Association of the General Association of German Workers, the foundation of which in 1863 was an important step towards emancipating German workers from the political tutelage of the liberal bourgeoisie. However, the General Association's programme, drawn up by its first president Ferdinand Lassalle, contained utopian dogmas (in particular, on solving the social question by setting up producer associations with state help) diametrically opposed to the principles of the International. Lassalle oriented the Association towards support of the Prussian government's policy of uniting Germany under the aegis of Prussia in return for the promise of universal suffrage.

By drawing the General Association of German Workers into the ranks of the International Marx hoped to influence the former and bring about a revision of its reformist programme and a change in its tactics. Not possessing at that time any means for the wide propagation of their own ideas and for their criticism of Lassalle's views in Germany, Marx and Engels agreed to collaborate on the *Social-Demokrat*, a newspaper founded by one of the leaders of the General Association of German Workers Johann Baptist von Schweitzer. The newspaper published the authorised translation of the "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association", and also the German text of the Association's Provisional Rules.

In connection with the death of Proudhon in January 1865, Marx wrote an article about him for the *Social-Demokrat*. He paid tribute to Proudhon's services—his attack on capitalist property, his critique of religion and the church, and his courageous defence of the June insurgents in 1848. At the same time he exposed the petty-bourgeois essence of Proudhon's views, the contradictory, utopian nature of the projects for social transformations advanced by him. In Proudhon's writings and ideas Marx detected features characteristic also of other reformist and sectarian trends of petty-bourgeois socialism, including Lassalleanism—superficial playing with philosophical and economic categories instead of the scientific analysis of reality, apriori formulae for solving social questions, which were dogmatically presented as universal panaceas for social ills (see this volume, p. 29). Without mentioning Lassalle's name, he suggested that, like Proudhon's proposals, Lassalle's recipes were also the result of indulging in hare-brained social schemes. Marx's sharp criticism in this article of Proudhon's attempts to justify the coup d'état of 1851 and the Bonapartist regime in France contain a direct



condemnation of the flirting by Lassalle and his supporters with Bismarck.

Publishing in the *Social-Demokrat* a translation of the old Danish folk song "Herr Tidmann" with a commentary (see this volume, pp. 34-35), Engels stressed the importance of the revolutionary traditions of the peasant movement, unlike the Lassalleans who regarded peasantry as "one reactionary mass".

The collaboration on the *Social-Demokrat* did not last for long. The paper's content soon convinced Marx and Engels that Schweitzer and Lassalle's other successors had no intention of renouncing Lassallean doctrines and tactics of accommodation to the Bismarck regime. It became clear to Marx and Engels that the Lassallean leaders were preventing the German workers from joining the International. This induced Marx and Engels not only to break off relations with the *Social-Demokrat*, but also to make the breach public. In their statement of February 23, 1865, to the editors, contained in this volume, they strongly criticised the tenor that the Lassalleans had given the newspaper, and characterised Lassalleanism itself as "royal Prussian governmental socialism" (this volume, p. 80). A number of other letters by Marx to the press published in this volume (his "Statement regarding the causes of the breach with the *Social-Demokrat*", "To the Editor of the *Berliner Reform*", and "The 'President of Mankind'") also denounced the paper's editor, Schweitzer, and other Lassallean leaders.

Engels' pamphlet *The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party* which substantiates the tactics of the German proletariat on the major questions of political life in Germany, was also full of criticism of Lassalleanism. The pamphlet analysed the alignment of class forces in the constitutional conflict that had arisen between the Prussian government and the liberal bourgeoisie in connection with the government's proposals for reorganising the army. In the prevailing circumstances, the pamphlet's author made it clear, the need to create an independent workers' party in Germany was most acute. Outlining its tactical line, Engels, unlike the Lassalleans, argued the need not only to criticise the inconsistency and cowardice of the bourgeois Party of Progress, but also to wage an unrelenting battle against the military-bureaucratic monarchy and its social bulwark—the reactionary class of Junker landowners.

In the struggle against Junker-monarchistic forces, the workers' party, Engels stressed, must be able to expose the social demagoguery of the head of the Prussian state, Bismarck, his feigned willingness

to grant concessions to the working class, which concealed his intention to use it to put pressure on the bourgeois opposition. Comparing Bismarck's actions with the political methods of the bourgeois ruling circles in the Second Empire in France, Engels reveals the reactionary nature of Bonapartism, pointing out such characteristic features of it as manoeuvring between classes with the aim of suppressing all resistance to the reactionary regime, savage repression of the workers' movement under the pretence of protecting the workers, the transformation of a democratic institution, universal suffrage, into a means of deceiving the masses, and consolidating the military-police dictatorship (*ibid.*, pp. 72-73). In so doing Engels warned German workers against the Lassallean idealisation of universal suffrage, showing that its real value for the working class was determined by the social and political conditions under which it took effect.

The writings of Marx and Engels promoted the disillusionment of the German workers with Lassallean dogmas and the tactics of the leaders of the General Association of German Workers. Opposition to the Lassallean leaders grew within the organisation itself. The workers became increasingly drawn to the International, to creating its sections in Germany. Marx followed these changes in the German working-class movement closely. At the meeting of the General Council on October 8, 1867 he reported as a great victory for the German working class the election to the North German Imperial Diet of Wilhelm Liebknecht who, together with August Bebel, supported the policies of the International (see this volume, p. 438). On October 22, 1867, Marx considered it necessary to acquaint members of the Council with extracts from Liebknecht's speech in the Imperial Diet, in which he criticised Bismarck's foreign policy (*ibid.*).

In September 1867 a great event took place in the history of social thought and the international working-class movement: the publication of Volume One of Marx's main work, *Capital*. "As long as there have been capitalists and workers on earth," Engels wrote, "no book has appeared which is of as much importance for the workers as the one before us. The relation between capital and labour, the axis on which our entire present system of society turns, is here treated scientifically for the first time" (this volume, p. 231). By revealing in *Capital* the laws of development of the capitalist mode of production, Marx made a revolution in economic science. His work was a tremendous step forward in the

development of other component parts of Marxist teaching also—dialectical and historical materialism and the theory of scientific communism. *Capital* was a theoretical weapon for the working class in its struggle against capitalist slavery.

Marx's book played an exceptionally important role in the activity of the International. In *Capital* the international proletarian organisation acquired an ideological source for elucidating the revolutionary aims of its struggle, and an indispensable guide for determining its position on many questions of vital importance for the working-class movement. The propaganda of the ideas contained in *Capital*, in which eminent members of the International Association joined, accelerated the development of the class consciousness of participants in the working-class movement and their liberation from the influence of petty-bourgeois utopians, helping the proletarian masses to master revolutionary socialist teaching and turn to scientific communism. For Marx and his colleagues this process helped to solve the task which they had set at this stage of the International's activity, namely, that of bringing the workers in its ranks to a clear understanding of the need for socialist revolution and the communist transformation of society and inserting corresponding propositions in the programme of the international proletarian organisation.

The works by Marx and Engels, published in a special section of this volume and dealing with the publication of Volume One of *Capital*, reflect the initial stage of the popularisation of this work and also the ideological struggle around it, when bourgeois ideologists abandoned their tactics of silence and sought to belittle its importance and distort its content.

A great role was played by Engels in breaking the "conspiracy of silence" with which official academic circles and the bourgeois press met the appearance of *Capital*. He wrote a number of reviews for liberal and democratic newspapers as if considering the book from the viewpoint of a bourgeois scholar sufficiently objective, however, to assess its scientific merits. "The studies made in this book are of the greatest scientific subtlety," Engels wrote in a review for the *Zukunft* newspaper (this volume, p. 208). "... it is a most scholarly work which has a claim to be regarded as most strictly scientific," he remarked in a review for the *Elberfelder Zeitung* (ibid., pp. 214-215). One of the devices that Engels used in his reviews was to compare the theoretical level of Marx's work with the academic level of bourgeois, particularly German, economists, in order under the guise of lamenting the deplorable state of official economic thought in Germany to show the

superiority of Marxist political economy to bourgeois political economy.

Addressing himself in the above-mentioned reviews primarily to a bourgeois audience, Engels sought to dispel the idea widespread among it that Marx's teaching was a type of utopian socialism. He emphasised that by his economic theory Marx had provided "the scientific basis for socialist aspirations which neither Fourier nor Proudhon nor even Lassalle had been able to do" (*ibid.*, p. 215). In a review for the *Beobachter* Engels described the basic difference between the Marxist and the Lassallean approach to the major questions of the day as follows: "If Lassalle had big ideas about Bismarck's fitness to introduce the socialist Millennium, Herr Marx refutes his wayward pupil loudly enough" (*ibid.*, p. 225).

Engels frequently drew attention to Marx's application of the dialectical method, and his consistent historical approach to events, hailing this as a great scientific achievement of the author of *Capital*. "We must confess," he wrote, "that we are much impressed by the sense of history which pervades the whole book and forbids the author to take the laws of economics for eternal truths, for anything but the formulations of the conditions of existence of certain transitory states of society" (this volume, p. 208). Thus Engels led the reader to the conclusion that from the scientific point of view the capitalist system was just as historically transient as the feudal and slave-owning systems before it, and that it would inevitably be succeeded by a different, higher organisation of society. In his review for the liberal *Rheinische Zeitung* Engels states unambiguously in this connection that the representatives of revolutionary Social-Democracy should see Marx's work as "their *theoretical bible*, as the armoury from which they will take their most telling arguments" (*ibid.*, p. 210). It was evidently no accident that the editors of this newspaper refused to publish it. Engels' long article for the British journal *The Fortnightly Review* was not published either (*ibid.*, pp. 238-59).

Engels' review for the workers' newspaper *Demokratisches Wochenblatt* was of a different nature. Here he could express openly his solidarity with the author's views. In his exposition of the fundamentals of Marx's economic teaching he laid emphasis on the pinpointing of the exploitative nature of the relations between capitalists and workers, the mechanism of extracting surplus value by entrepreneurs, the inevitable aggravation of the class antagonisms inherent in bourgeois society and the growing struggle between labour and capital. Engels expounded clearly

Marx's idea that the very development of capitalism creates the material prerequisites for the revolutionary transition to a communist system. "Capitalist production is the first to create the wealth and the productive forces necessary for this, but at the same time it also creates, in the numerous and oppressed workers, the social class which is compelled more and more to claim the utilisation of this wealth and these productive forces for the whole of society—instead of their being utilised, as they are today, for a monopolist class" (this volume, p. 237).

The synopsis of Volume One of Marx's *Capital* which Engels may have written as an outline for a special pamphlet, covers the content of almost four of the six chapters in the first edition of the book (see this volume, pp. 263-308). This work is a fine example of the popular exposition of the complex economic problems examined in Marx's work.

The volume also contains Marx's article "Plagiarism" and the manuscript outline of his article "My Plagiarism of F. Bastiat". The first of these works criticises the misuse and crude distortion by Lassallean leaders and publicists of individual propositions of *Capital* (see this volume, pp. 219-23). In this article Marx warns against the danger of debasing Marxist political economy. In the second work, having refuted the assertion by bourgeois reviewers of *Capital* that he had borrowed his theory of value from Bastiat, one of the French vulgar economists (*ibid.*, pp. 260-62). Marx refuted attempts by his opponents to belittle the scientific value of his economic teaching by false references to its alleged lack of originality.

The section "From the Preparatory Materials" contains drafts and notes by Marx that show his preparations for various speeches in the Central Council of the International Working Men's Association and other aspects of his activity as a leader of the Council, and Marx's minutes of the Central Council meeting on January 16, 1866. It also contains notes made by Engels during his travels round Sweden and Denmark in July 1867.

The Appendices contain records of Marx's speeches published according to the Minute Book of the General Council or newspaper reports, and also extracts from the Minute Book that throw light on the discussion of various matters in the Council in which Marx took part. Here too are extracts from the minutes of the London Conference of the International in 1865 which was held under Marx's leadership, and also documents of the Central (later General) Council drawn up with his assistance, including the

Council Report to the Lausanne Congress of the International. The Appendices also include some contributions by Marx's associates edited by him and letters from Jenny Marx to Johann Philipp Becker with information that came from Marx and was intended for publication. Also published here are circulars from the Schiller Institute in Manchester, of which Engels was Chairman at the time.

\* \* \*

This volume contains 55 works by Marx and Engels, of which 21 are published in English for the first time, among them the statement by Marx and Engels to the *Social-Demokrat* of February 6, 1865, a number of other statements and letters from Marx to the editors of German newspapers, and also his articles "The 'President of Mankind'", "Plagiarism" and "My Plagiarism of F. Bastiat". Of Engels' works the pamphlet *The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party* and most of the reviews of Volume One of *Capital* are published in English for the first time. Of the documents contained in the Appendices nine are appearing in English for the first time.

In cases where documents of the International written by Marx or with his participation have survived in more or less authentic versions in several languages, the English version—manuscript or printed—is reproduced in this volume. Significant differences in reading with versions in other languages are indicated in the footnotes.

All the texts have been translated from the German except where otherwise stated. Headings supplied by the editors where none existed in the original are given in square brackets. The asterisks indicate footnotes by the author; the editors' footnotes are indicated by index letters.

Misprints in quotations, proper and geographical names, figures, dates, and so on, have been corrected with reference to the sources used by Marx and Engels. The known literary and documental sources are referred to in footnotes and in the index of quoted and mentioned literature. Words written in English in the original are given in small caps.

The compilation of the volume, its preface and notes, the index of quoted and mentioned literature and the glossary of geographical names, are the work of Tatyana Vasilyeva, under the editorship of Lev Golman (CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism). The name index and the index of periodicals were prepared by Yeli-

zaveta Ovsyannikova (CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism).

The translations were made by Rodney Livingstone, Leonard E. Mins, Barrie Selman, Barbara Ruhemann, Christopher Upward and Joan and Trevor Walmsley (Lawrence and Wishart), Cynthia Carlile, Jane Dgebuadze, Glenys Ann Kozlov and Victor Schnittke (Progress Publishers) and edited by Nicholas Jacobs (Lawrence and Wishart), Natalia Karmanova and Margarita Lopukhina (Progress Publishers) and scientific editor Vladimir Mosolov (CC CPSU Institute of Marxism-Leninism).

The volume was prepared for the press by the editors Natalia Karmanova, Margarita Lopukhina and Alla Varavitskaya.

KARL MARX  
and  
FREDERICK ENGELS

WORKS

September 1864-July 1868





**ADDRESS**  
**AND**  
**PROVISIONAL RULES**  
**OF THE**  
**WORKING MEN'S**  
**INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION,**

**ESTABLISHED SEPTEMBER 28, 1864,**

**AT A PUBLIC MEETING HELD AT ST. MARTIN'S**  
**HALL, LONG ACRE, LONDON.**

---

**PRICE ONE PENNY.**

---

**PRINTED AT THE "BEE-HIVE" NEWSPAPER OFFICE,**  
**10, BOLT COURT, FLEET STREET.**

---

**1864.**

Title page of the first edition  
of the Inaugural Address and Provisional Rules  
of the Working Men's International Association



## Karl Marx

### INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE WORKING MEN'S INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION

ESTABLISHED SEPTEMBER 28, 1864  
AT A PUBLIC MEETING HELD  
AT ST. MARTIN'S HALL, LONG ACRE, LONDON<sup>1</sup>

#### Working Men,<sup>a</sup>

It is a great fact that the misery of the working masses has not diminished from 1848 to 1864, and yet this period is unrivalled for the development of its industry and the growth of its commerce. In 1850, a moderate organ of the British middle class, of more than average information, predicted that if the exports and imports of England were to rise 50 per cent, English pauperism would sink to zero.<sup>2</sup> Alas! on April 7th, 1864, the Chancellor of the Exchequer<sup>b</sup> delighted his Parliamentary audience by the statement that the total import and export trade of England had grown in 1863

"to £443,955,000! that astonishing sum [...] about three times the trade of the [...] comparatively recent epoch of 1843!"

With all that, he was eloquent upon "poverty".

"Think," he exclaimed, "of those who are on the border of that region", upon "wages ... not increased"; upon "human life ... in nine cases out of ten but a struggle for existence!"

He did not speak of the people of Ireland, gradually replaced by machinery in the north, and by sheep-walks in the south, though even the sheep in that unhappy country are decreasing, it is true, not at so rapid a rate as the men. He did not repeat what then had been just betrayed by the highest representatives of the upper ten thousand in a sudden fit of terror. When the garotte<sup>3</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The pamphlet published in London in 1866 has "Fellow Working Men".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> William Gladstone's speech in the House of Commons on April 7, 1864, *The Times*, No. 24841, April 8, 1864.—*Ed.*

panic had reached a certain height, the House of Lords caused an inquiry to be made into, and a report to be published upon, transportation and penal servitude. Out came the murder in the bulky Blue Book<sup>4</sup> of 1863,<sup>a</sup> and proved it was, by official facts and figures, that the worst of the convicted criminals, the penal serfs of England and Scotland, toiled much less and fared far better than the agricultural labourers of England and Scotland. But this was not all. When, consequent upon the Civil War in America, the operatives of Lancashire and Cheshire were thrown upon the streets,<sup>5</sup> the same House of Lords sent to the manufacturing districts a physician commissioned to investigate into the smallest possible amount of carbon and nitrogen, to be administered in the cheapest and plainest form, which on an average might just suffice to “avert starvation diseases”. Dr. Smith, the medical deputy, ascertained that 28,000 grains of carbon, and 1,330 grains of nitrogen were the weekly allowance that would keep an average adult ... just over the level of starvation diseases, and he found furthermore that quantity pretty nearly to agree with the scanty nourishment to which the pressure of extreme distress had actually reduced the cotton operatives.\* But now mark! The same learned Doctor was later on again deputed by the medical officer of the Privy Council to inquire into the nourishment of the poorer labouring classes. The results of his researches are embodied in the “Sixth Report on Public Health”, published by order of Parliament in the course of the present year.<sup>b</sup> What did the Doctor discover? That the silk weavers, the needle women, the kid glovers, the stocking weavers, and so forth, received,<sup>c</sup> on an average, not even the distress pittance of the cotton operatives, not even the amount of carbon and nitrogen “just sufficient to avert starvation diseases”.

“Moreover,” we quote from the report, “as regards the examined families of the agricultural population, it appeared that more than a fifth were with less than the

\* We need hardly remind the reader that, apart from the elements of water and certain inorganic substances, carbon and nitrogen form the raw materials of human food. However, to nourish the human system, those simple chemical constituents must be supplied in the form of vegetable or animal substances. Potatoes, for instance, contain mainly carbon, while wheaten bread contains carbonaceous and nitrogenous substances in a due proportion.

<sup>a</sup> The reference is to the *Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the operation of the acts (16 & 17 Vict. c. 99 and 20 & 21 Vict. c. 3) relating to transportation and penal servitude*, vols. I-II, London, 1863.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *Public Health. Sixth Report of the Medical Officer of the Privy Council with Appendix*. 1863, London, 1864.—Below Marx quotes this report, pp. 13-15.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> In the German text the words “year after year” have been added.—Ed.

estimated sufficiency of carbonaceous food, that more than one-third were with less than the estimated sufficiency of nitrogenous food, and that in three counties (Berkshire, Oxfordshire, and Somersetshire) insufficiency of nitrogenous food was the average local diet." "It must be remembered," adds the official report, "that privation of food is very reluctantly borne, and that, as a rule, great poorness of diet will only come when other privations have preceded it... Even cleanliness will have been found costly or difficult, and if there still be self-respectful endeavours to maintain it, every such endeavour will represent additional pangs of hunger." "These are painful reflections, especially when it is remembered that the poverty to which they advert is not the deserved poverty of idleness; in all cases it is the poverty of working populations. Indeed, [...] the work which obtains the scanty pittance of food is for the most part excessively prolonged."

The report brings out the strange, and rather unexpected fact, "That of the divisions of the United Kingdom", England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, "the agricultural population of England", the richest division, "is considerably the worst fed"; but that even the agricultural labourers of Berkshire, Oxfordshire, and Somersetshire, fare better than great numbers of skilled indoor operatives of the East of London.

Such are the official statements published by order of Parliament in 1864, during the millennium of free trade, at a time when the Chancellor of the Exchequer told the House of Commons that:

"The average condition of the British labourer has [...] improved [...] in a degree [...] we know to be extraordinary and [...] unexampled [...] in the history of any country or any age."<sup>a</sup>

Upon these official congratulations jars the dry remark of the official Public Health Report:

"The public health of a country means the health of its masses, and the masses will scarcely be healthy unless, to their very base, they be at least moderately prosperous."

Dazzled by the "Progress of the Nation" statistics dancing before his eyes, the Chancellor of the Exchequer exclaims in wild ecstasy:

"From 1842 to 1852 the taxable income of the country [...] increased by 6 per cent; [...] in the eight years from 1853 to 1861, it has increased from the basis taken in 1853 20 per cent! the fact is so astonishing to be almost incredible!... This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power," adds Mr. Gladstone, "is entirely confined to classes of property!"<sup>6</sup>

If you want to know under what conditions of broken health, tainted morals, and mental ruin, that "intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power entirely confined to classes of property" was,

---

<sup>a</sup> Here and below Marx quotes Gladstone's speech in the House of Commons on April 16, 1863.—*Ed.*

and is being, produced by the classes of labour, look to the picture hung up in the last "Public Health Report" of the workshops of tailors, printers, and dressmakers!<sup>a</sup> Compare the "Report of the Children's Employment Commission" of 1863, where it is stated, for instance, that:

"The potters as a class, both men and women, [...] represent a much degenerated population, both physically and mentally", that "the unhealthy child is an unhealthy parent in his turn", that "a progressive deterioration of the race must go on", and that "the degenerescence of the population of Staffordshire would be even greater were it not for the constant recruiting from the adjacent country, and the intermarriages with more healthy races."<sup>b</sup>

Glance at Mr. Tremenheere's Blue Book on the "Grievances complained of by the Journeymen Bakers"<sup>c</sup>! And who has not shuddered at the paradoxical statement made by the inspectors of factories, and illustrated by the Registrar General, that the Lancashire operatives, while put upon the distress pittance of food, were actually improving in health, because of their temporary exclusion by the cotton famine from the cotton factory, and that the mortality of the children was decreasing, because their mothers were now at last allowed to give them, instead of Godfrey's cordial, their own breasts.

Again reverse the medal! The Income and Property Tax Returns laid before the House of Commons on July 20, 1864, teach us that the persons with yearly incomes, valued by the tax-gatherer at £50,000 and upwards, had, from April 5th, 1862, to April 5th, 1863, been joined by a dozen and one, their number having increased in that single year from 67 to 80. The same returns disclose the fact that about 3,000 persons divide amongst themselves a yearly income of about £25,000,000 sterling, rather more than the total revenue doled out annually to the whole mass of the agricultural labourers of England and Wales. Open the census of 1861, and you will find that the number of the male landed proprietors of England and Wales had decreased from 16,934 in 1851, to 15,066 in 1861, so that the concentration of land had grown in 10 years 11 per cent. If the concentration of the soil of the country in a few hands proceeds at the same rate, the land question will become singularly simplified, as it has

<sup>a</sup> The reference is to the above quoted *Sixth Report*, pp. 25-27.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *Children's Employment Commission (1862). First Report of the Commissioners*, London, 1863, p. 24.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> *Report addressed to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, relative to the Grievances complained of by the Journeymen Bakers*, London, 1862.—Ed.

become in the Roman Empire, when Nero grinned at the discovery that half the Province of Africa was owned by six gentlemen.

We have dwelt so long upon these "facts so astonishing to be almost incredible", because England heads the Europe of commerce and industry.<sup>a</sup> It will be remembered that some months ago one of the refugee sons of Louis Philippe publicly congratulated the English agricultural labourer on the superiority of his lot over that of his less florid comrade on the other side of the Channel. Indeed, with local colours changed, and on a scale somewhat contracted, the English facts reproduce themselves in all the industrious and progressive countries of the Continent. In all of them there has taken place, since 1848, an unheard-of development of industry, and an undreamed-of expansion of imports and exports. In all of them "the augmentation of wealth and power entirely confined to classes of property" was truly "intoxicating". In all of them, as in England, a minority of the working classes got their real wages<sup>b</sup> somewhat advanced; while in most cases the monetary rise of wages denoted no more a real access of comforts than the inmate of the metropolitan poor-house or orphan asylum, for instance, was in the least benefited by his first necessaries costing £9 15s. 8d. in 1861 against £7 7s. 4d. in 1852. Everywhere the great mass of the working classes were sinking down to a lower depth, at the same rate, at least, that those above them were rising in the social scale. In all countries of Europe it has now become a truth demonstrable to every unprejudiced mind, and only denied by those, whose interest it is to hedge other people in a fool's paradise, that no improvement of machinery,<sup>c</sup> no appliance of science to production, no contrivances of communication, no new colonies, no emigration, no opening of markets, no free trade, nor all these things put together, will do away with the miseries of the industrious masses; but that, on the present false base, every fresh development of the productive powers of labour must tend to deepen social contrasts and point social antagonisms. Death of starvation rose almost to the rank of an institution, during this "intoxicating" epoch of economical progress, in the metropolis of the British Empire. That epoch is

---

<sup>a</sup> In the German text the following words have been added: "and in fact represents it on the world market".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the German text the following words been added: "i.e. the foodstuffs bought with money wages".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> In the German text the following words have been added: "no chemical discoveries".—*Ed.*



marked in the annals of the world by the quickened return, the widening compass, and the deadlier effects of the social pest called a commercial and industrial crisis.

After the failure of the revolutions of 1848, all party organisations and party journals of the working classes were, on the Continent, crushed by the iron hand of force, the most advanced sons of labour fled in despair to the Transatlantic Republic, and the short-lived dreams of emancipation vanished before an epoch of industrial fever, moral marasme, and political reaction. The defeat of the continental working classes, partly owed to the diplomacy of the English Government, acting then as now in fraternal solidarity with the Cabinet of St. Petersburg, soon spread its contagious effects on this side of the Channel. While the rout of their continental brethren unmanned the English working classes, and broke their faith in their own cause, it restored to the landlord and the money-lord their somewhat shaken confidence. They insolently withdrew concessions already advertised. The discoveries of new goldlands led to an immense exodus, leaving an irreparable void in the ranks of the British proletariat. Others of its formerly active members were caught by the temporary bribe of greater work and wages, and turned into "political blacks". All the efforts made at keeping up, or remodelling, the Chartist Movement, failed signally; the press organs of the working class died one by one of the apathy of the masses, and, in point of fact, never before seemed the English working class so thoroughly reconciled to a state of political nullity. If, then, there had been no solidarity of action between the British and the continental working classes, there was, at all events, a solidarity of defeat.

And yet the period passed since the revolutions of 1848 has not been without its compensating features. We shall here only point to two great facts.

After a thirty years' struggle, fought with most admirable perseverance, the English working classes, improving a momentaneous split between the landlords and money-lords, succeeded in carrying the Ten Hours' Bill.<sup>7</sup> The immense physical, moral, and intellectual benefits hence accruing to the factory operatives, half-yearly chronicled in the reports of the inspectors of factories, are now acknowledged on all sides. Most of the continental governments had to accept the English Factory Act in more or less modified forms, and the English Parliament itself is every year compelled to enlarge its sphere of action. But besides its practical import, there was something else to exalt the marvellous success of this working men's measure. Through their most notorious organs

of science, such as Dr. Ure, Professor Senior, and other sages of that stamp, the middle class had predicted, and to their heart's content proved, that any legal restriction of the hours of labour must sound the death knell of British industry, which, vampire like, could but live by sucking blood, and children's blood, too. In olden times, child murder was a mysterious rite of the religion of Moloch, but it was practised on some very solemn occasions only, once a year perhaps, and then Moloch had no exclusive bias for the children of the poor. This struggle about the legal restriction of the hours of labour raged the more fiercely since, apart from frightened avarice, it told indeed upon the great contest between the blind rule of the supply and demand laws which form the political economy of the middle class, and social production controlled by social foresight, which forms the political economy of the working class. Hence the Ten Hours' Bill was not only a great practical success; it was the victory of a principle; it was the first time that in broad daylight the political economy of the middle class succumbed to the political economy of the working class.

But there was in store a still greater victory of the political economy of labour over the political economy of property.<sup>a</sup> We speak of the co-operative movement, especially the co-operative factories raised by the unassisted efforts of a few bold "hands". The value of these great social experiments cannot be over-rated. By deed, instead of by argument, they have shown that production on a large scale, and in accord with the behests of modern science, may be carried on without the existence of a class of masters employing a class of hands; that to bear fruit, the means of labour need not be monopolised as a means of dominion over, and of extortion against, the labouring man himself; and that, like slave labour, like serf labour, hired labour is but a transitory and inferior<sup>b</sup> form, destined to disappear before associated labour plying its toil with a willing hand, a ready mind, and a joyous heart. In England, the seeds of the co-operative system were sown by Robert Owen; the working men's experiments, tried on the Continent, were, in fact, the practical upshot of the theories, not invented, but loudly proclaimed, in 1848.

At the same time, the experience of the period from 1848 to 1864 has proved<sup>c</sup> beyond doubt that, however excellent in

<sup>a</sup> The German text reads: "the political economy of capital".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the German text the word "social" has been added.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> In the German text the following has been added: "what the most intelligent leaders of the working class asserted about the co-operative movement in England already in 1851 and 1852".<sup>8</sup>—*Ed.*

principle, and however useful in practice, co-operative labour, if kept within the narrow circle of the casual efforts of private workmen, will never be able to arrest the growth in geometrical progression of monopoly, to free the masses, nor even to perceptibly lighten the burden of their miseries. It is perhaps for this very reason that plausible noblemen, philanthropic middle-class spouters, and even keen political economists, have all at once turned nauseously complimentary to the very co-operative labour system they had vainly tried to nip in the bud by deriding it as the Utopia of the dreamer, or stigmatising it as the sacrilege of the Socialist. To save the industrious masses, co-operative labour ought to be developed to national dimensions, and, consequently, to be fostered by national means. Yet, 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. Remember the sneer with which, last session, Lord Palmerston put down the advocates of the Irish Tenants' Right Bill. The House of Commons, cried he, is a house of landed proprietors.<sup>a</sup>

To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the working classes. They seem to have comprehended this, for in England, Germany, Italy, and France there have taken place simultaneous revivals, and simultaneous efforts are being made at the political reorganisation of the working men's party.

One element of success they possess—numbers; but numbers weigh only in the balance, if united by combination and led by knowledge. Past experience has shown how disregard of that bond of brotherhood which ought to exist between the workmen of different countries, and incite them to stand firmly by each other in all their struggles for emancipation, will be chastised by the common discomfiture of their incoherent efforts. This thought prompted the working men of different countries assembled on September 28, 1864, in public meeting at St. Martin's Hall, to found the International Association.

Another conviction swayed that meeting.

If the emancipation of the working classes requires their fraternal concurrence,<sup>b</sup> how are they to fulfil that great mission with a foreign policy in pursuit of criminal designs, playing upon

<sup>a</sup> John Palmerston's speech in the House of Commons on June 23, 1863, *The Times*, No. 24593, June 24, 1863.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German text reads: "requires fraternal concurrence of different nations".—*Ed.*

national prejudices, and squandering in piratical wars the people's blood and treasure? It was not the wisdom of the ruling classes, but the heroic resistance to their criminal folly by the working classes of England that saved the West of Europe from plunging headlong into an infamous crusade for the perpetuation and propagation of slavery on the other side of the Atlantic.<sup>10</sup> The shameless approval, mock sympathy, or idiotic indifference, with which the upper classes of Europe have witnessed the mountain fortress of the Caucasus falling a prey to, and heroic Poland being assassinated by, Russia; the immense and unresisted encroachments of that barbarous power, whose head is at St. Petersburg, and whose hands are in every Cabinet of Europe, have taught the working classes the duty to master themselves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective Governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power; when unable to prevent, to combine in simultaneous denunciations, and to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations.

The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes.

Proletarians of all countries, Unite!

Written between October 21 and 27, 1864

First published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 160, November 5, 1864 and in the pamphlet *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association...*, London, November 1864. Author's translation into German was published in *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nos. 2 and 3, December 21 and 30, 1864

Reproduced from the text of the pamphlet checked with that in *Der Social-Demokrat*

Karl Marx

PROVISIONAL RULES OF THE ASSOCIATION<sup>11</sup>

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 monopoliser 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 labour 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 the immediate combination of the still disconnected movements;

For these reasons—

The undersigned members of the committee, holding its powers by resolution of the public meeting held on Sept. 28, 1864, at St. Martin's Hall, London, have taken the steps necessary for founding the Working Men's International Association;

They declare that this International Association and 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;

They hold it the duty of a man to claim the rights of a man and a citizen, not only for himself, but for every man who does his duty. No rights without duties, no duties without rights<sup>12</sup>;

And in this spirit they have drawn up the following Provisional Rules of the International Association:—

1. This Association is established to afford a central medium of communication and co-operation 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 Working Men's International Association".

3. In 1865 there shall meet in Belgium a General Working Men's Congress, consisting of representatives of such working men's societies as may have joined the International Association. The Congress will have to proclaim before Europe the common aspirations of the working classes, decide on the definitive rules of the International Association, consider the means required for its successful working, and appoint the Central Council of the Association.<sup>13</sup> The General Congress is to meet once a year.

4. The Central Council shall sit in London, and consist of working men belonging to the different countries represented in the International Association. It shall from its own members elect the officers necessary for the transaction of business, such as a president, a treasurer, a general secretary, corresponding secretaries for the different countries, &c.

5. On its annual meetings, the General Congress shall receive a public account of the annual transactions of the Central Council. The Central Council, yearly appointed by the Congress, shall have power to add to the number of its members. In cases of urgency, it may convoke the General Congress before the regular yearly term.

6. The Central Council shall form an international agency between the different co-operating associations, 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 Central Council shall take the initiative of proposals to be laid before the different national or local societies.

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 Central 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 London Central Council.

8. Until the meeting of the first Congress, the committee chosen on September 28th, 1864, will act as a Provisional Central Council, try to connect the different national working men's associations, enlist members in the United Kingdom, take the steps preparatory to the convocation of the General Congress, and discuss with the national and local societies the main questions to be laid before that Congress.

9. 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.

10. While united in a perpetual bond of fraternal co-operation, the working men's societies, joining the International Association, will preserve their existent organisations intact.

Written between October 21 and 27,  
1864

Reproduced from the pamphlet

First published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 161, November 12, 1864 and in the pamphlet *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association...*, London, November 1864

## Karl Marx

### [RESOLUTIONS ON THE COMPOSITION OF THE PROVISIONAL CENTRAL COUNCIL<sup>14</sup>]

#### I

That persons residing in any part of England can join the Association, but that no member can be elected upon the General Committee who is unable to attend its meetings, and assist in its deliberations.<sup>a</sup>

#### II

That no one be elected on the Central Council who has not previously paid his annual subscription as a member of this Association.

#### III

That nominations for the Central Council shall be made at least a week previous to the election, such election to take place in the absence of the candidate, and that the person to be elected shall before his nomination have taken a card of membership.

Adopted by the Central Council on November 8 and 29, 1864 and January 24, 1865

Resolution I was first published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 161, November 12, 1864; resolutions II and III were first published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet Peruogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1961

Resolution I is reproduced from the newspaper, resolutions II and III from the Minute Book of the General Council

<sup>a</sup> As entered in the Minute Book of the General Council, see this volume, p. 353—Ed.



## Karl Marx

[RESOLUTIONS ON THE TERMS OF THE ADMISSION  
OF WORKERS' ORGANISATIONS  
TO THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION <sup>15]</sup>

## I

That organised bodies of working men be invited to join this Association in their co-operative capacity, the amount of their contributions to be left to their means and discretion.

## II

That societies joining this Association shall have the power to elect a representative to sit on the Central Council, the Council reserving to itself the power to accept or reject such delegates.<sup>a</sup>

Adopted by the Central Council on  
November 22, 1864

First published in *The Bee-Hive News-  
paper*, No. 163, November 26, 1864

Reproduced from the text in the  
Minute Book of the General  
Council checked with that in *The  
Bee-Hive Newspaper*

---

<sup>a</sup> In *The Bee-Hive Newspaper* (No. 163, November 26, 1864) report of this meeting, the Resolution II is formulated as follows: "It was also decided that societies in London who join the Association shall have the power to elect a representative to sit on the Central Council, the Council reserving to itself the power to receive or reject such representative. With regard to societies in the provinces who may join, it was decided that they should have the power to elect a corresponding member of the Association".—*Ed.*

# THE BEE-HIVE NEWSPAPER.

A JOURNAL OF GENERAL INTELLIGENCE, ADVOCATING INDUSTRIAL INTERESTS

Karl Marx

TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN,  
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES  
OF AMERICA<sup>16</sup>

Sir,

We congratulate the American people upon your re-election by a large majority.

If resistance to the Slave Power was the reserved watchword of your first election, the triumphant warcry of your re-election is, Death to Slavery.

From the commencement of the Titanic-American strife the working men of Europe felt instinctively that the star-spangled banner carried the destiny of their class. The contest for the territories which opened the dire epopee, was it not to decide whether the virgin soil of immense tracts should be wedded to the labour of the emigrant, or prostituted by the tramp of the slave-driver?

When an oligarchy of 300,000 slave-holders dared to inscribe, for the first time in the annals of the world, "slavery" on the banner of Armed Revolt; when on the very spots where hardly a century ago the idea of one great Democratic Republic had first sprung up, whence the first Declaration of the Rights of Man<sup>17</sup> was issued, and the first impulse given to the European revolution of the 18th century; when on those very spots counter-revolution, with systematic thoroughness, gloried in rescinding "the [...] ideas entertained [...] at the time of the formation of the old Constitution", and maintained "slavery to be a beneficent institution", indeed the only solution of the great problem of "the relation of labour to capital", and cynically proclaimed property in man "the corner-stone of the new edifice",<sup>a</sup> then the working

---

<sup>a</sup> From the speech of A. Stephens, a leading Southern slave-holder, made in Savannah on March 21, 1861. See report in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6215, March 27, 1861.—Ed.

classes of Europe understood at once, even before the fanatic partisans of the upper classes for the Confederate gentry had given its dismal warning, that the slave-holders' rebellion was to sound the tocsin for a general holy crusade of property against labour, and that for the men of labour, with their hopes for the future, even their past conquests were at stake in that tremendous conflict on the other side of the Atlantic. Everywhere they bore therefore patiently the hardships imposed upon them by the cotton crisis,<sup>18</sup> opposed enthusiastically the pro-slavery intervention, importunities of their betters—and, from most parts of Europe, contributed their quota of blood to the good cause.

While the working men, the true political power of the North, allowed slavery to defile their own republic; while before the Negro, mastered and sold without his concurrence, they boasted it the highest prerogative of the white-skinned labourer to sell himself and choose his own master; they were unable to attain the true freedom of labour or to support their European brethren in their struggle for emancipation, but this barrier to progress has been swept off by the red sea of civil war.

The working men of Europe feel sure that, as the American War of Independence initiated a new era of ascendancy for the middle class, so the American Anti-Slavery War will do for the working classes. They consider it an earnest of the epoch to come that it fell to the lot of Abraham Lincoln, the single-minded son of the working class, to lead his country through the matchless struggle for the rescue of an enchained race and the reconstruction of a social world.

Signed on behalf of the International Working Men's Association

The Central Council

*Le Lubez*, Corresponding Secretary for France, *F. Rybcziński* (Pole), *Emile Holtorp* (Pole), *J. B. Bocquet*, *H. Jung*, Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland; *Morisot*, *Georgy W. Wheeler*, *J. Denoual*, *P. Bordage*, *Leroux*, *Talandier*, *Jourdain*, *Dupont*, *R. Gray*, *D. Lama*, *Setacci*, *F. Solustri*, *P. Aldovrandi*, *D. G. Bagnagatti*, *G. P. Fontana*, Corresponding Secretary for Italy; *G. Lake*, *J. Buckley*, *G. Howell*, *J. Osborne*, *J. D. Stainsby*, *J. Grossmith*, *G. Eccarius*, *Friedrich Lessner*, *L. Wolff*, *K. Kaub*, *Henry Bolleter*, *Ludwig Otto*, *N. P. Hansen* (Dane), *Karl Pfänder*, *Georg Lochner*, *Peter Petersen*, *Karl Marx*, Corresponding Secretary for Germany, *A. Dick*, *J. Wolff*, *J. Whitlock*, *J. Carter*, *W. Morgan*, *William Dell*, *John Weston*, *Peter Fox*,

*Robert Shaw, John H. Longmaid, Robert Henry Side, William C. Worley, Blackmoor W., R. Hartwell, W. Pidgeon, B. Lucraft, J. Nieass,<sup>a</sup>*

*G. Odger, President of Council,  
William R. Cremer, Honorary General Secretary<sup>b</sup>*

Written between November 22 and 29,  
1864

Reproduced from the manuscript  
checked with the newspaper's text

First published in *The Daily News*,  
No. 5813, December 23, 1864

---

<sup>a</sup> *The Bee-Hive Newspaper* and *The Miner and Workman's Advocate* have here "Nusperli, Schantzenbach, Smales, Cornelius".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *The Bee-Hive Newspaper* has here: "18, Greek Street, Soho".—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE *BEOBACHTER*<sup>19</sup>]

November 28, 1864  
1, Modena Villas, Maitland Park,  
Haverstock Hill, London

Dear Sir,

I beg you to accept for publication the enclosed letter concerning Herr *Karl Blind*.

I have sent the same statement in the same form—as a letter to the Stuttgart *Beobachter*—to some Prussian newspapers for publication, and will also arrange for it to be reproduced in a *German newspaper here* so that responsibility for it rests solely with me.

Yours faithfully,  
K. Marx

First published in *Der Beobachter*,  
No. 282, December 3, 1864

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Published in English for the first  
time

Karl Marx  
TO THE EDITOR  
OF THE STUTTGART *BEOBACHTER*<sup>20</sup>

Sir,

Through his man-of-straw in Bradford, Dr. Bronner, *Herr Karl Blind* has sent you a long epistle by, for, and about *Herr Blind*, into which, among other curiosities, the following passage slips:

*"I do not wish in this connection to return to that old dispute"* in respect of the leaflet *"Zur Warnung"* against Vogt *"which was settled by statements from all concerned, and which the editorial office has brought up anew."*<sup>a</sup>

He "does not wish to return"! What magnanimity!

As evidence that the pompous vanity of Herr Karl Blind occasionally propels Herr Karl Blind beyond the bounds of pure comedy, you make mention of *my work* against Vogt. From Blind's reply you and your readers must draw the conclusion that the accusations made in that work against Herr Karl Blind have been settled by *"statements from all concerned"*. In actual fact since the appearance of my work, that is for four years, the otherwise so prolific Herr Karl Blind has *never once* dared to "return to the old dispute" with so much as a word, much less with "statements from all concerned".

On the contrary, *Herr Karl Blind* has been content to remain branded an *"infamous liar"* (see pp. 66, 67 of my work<sup>b</sup>). Herr Karl Blind has repeatedly declared in public that he did not *know* by whom the leaflet against Vogt had been cast into the world, that *"he had absolutely no part in the affair"*, etc. In addition, Herr Karl Blind published a statement by the printer *Fidelio Hollinger*, flanked by another statement by the compositor *Wiehe*, to the effect that the leaflet had neither been printed in Hollinger's printing-shop nor had it emanated from Herr Karl Blind. In my

<sup>a</sup> "Bradford, 25. Oct.", *Der Beobachter*, No. 268, November 17, 1864. Marx's italics.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 128-29.—*Ed.*

work against Vogt may be found the *affidavits* (statements made under oath) of the compositor Vögele and of *Wiehe* himself made before the *Bow Street Magistrates Court, London*, proving that the same Herr Karl Blind *wrote the manuscript* of the leaflet, *had it printed* by Hollinger, *personally corrected the proofs, fabricated a false certificate* to refute these facts, and *deviously obtained the signature of the compositor Wiehe* for this false certificate by proffering promises of money from Hollinger, and future gratitude on his own part, and finally sent this false document fabricated by himself, along with the signature he himself had dishonestly obtained, to the *Augsburg Allgemeine*<sup>a</sup> and other German newspapers as morally outraged evidence of my “*malicious invention*”.

Thus publicly pilloried, Herr *Karl Blind* kept silent. Why? Because (see p. 69 of my work<sup>b</sup>) he could only refute the *affidavits* by me by means of *counter-affidavits*, but he found himself “under the grave jurisdiction of England”, where “*felony is no joking matter*”.

In the aforementioned letter to your newspaper there are also some strange statements about Herr *Karl Blind*'s American industriousness. In order to clear up this point allow me to cite an extract from a letter from *J. Weydemeyer* that arrived here a few days ago. You will recall that *J. Weydemeyer* used to edit the *Neue Deutsche Zeitung* in Frankfurt along with O. Lüning, and was always one of the most stalwart champions of the German workers' party. Shortly after the outbreak of the American Civil War he entered the ranks of the Federals. Summoned by Frémont to St. Louis, he served initially as a captain in the Engineer Corps there, then as lieutenant-colonel in an artillery regiment, and when Missouri was again recently threatened with enemy invasion, he was suddenly given the task of organising the 41st Missouri Volunteer Regiment, which he now commands with the rank of colonel. *Weydemeyer* writes from St. Louis, the capital of Missouri, where his regiment is stationed, as follows<sup>c</sup>:

“You will find enclosed a cutting from a newspaper here, the *Westliche Post*, in which the literary pirate *Karl Blind* is again strutting and swaggering with all his might at the expense of the ‘German republicans’. Of course here it is rather irrelevant how he distorts *Lassalle*'s aspirations and agitations; anyone who has read the works of the latter knows what to think of *Blind*'s *harlequinades*; anyone who has not taken the trouble of becoming somewhat better acquainted with that

<sup>a</sup> This refers to Blind's *Allgemeine Zeitung* statements published in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Nos. 313 and 345. November 9 and December 11, 1859.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 130-31.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Joseph Weydemeyer to Engels, October 1864.—*Ed.*†

agitation, may gullibly admire the wisdom and 'staunchness of spirit' of the great man of Baden, conspirator *par excellence* and member of every secret society and future provisional government; such a judgment is of no consequence. *Also people have other things to do here at present than to concern themselves with Blind's protests.* But it would surely be appropriate to rap this *pompous ass* strongly over the knuckles at home, and so I am sending you the article, which is only a small specimen of similar earlier products."

The cutting from the *Westliche Post* sent by J. Weydemeyer is headed: "A *Republican Protest, London, September 17, 1864*", and is the *American edition* of the "*Republican Protest*" which the same unavoidable *Herr Karl Blind* simultaneously sent under the same title to the *Neue Frankfurter Zeitung*,<sup>a</sup> and then with his customary, assiduous ant-like industriousness forwarded to the London *Hermann*<sup>b</sup> as a reproduction from the *Neue Frankfurter Zeitung*.

A comparison of the two versions of Blind's clumsy handiwork would show how the same *Herr Karl Blind*, while protesting in Frankfurt and London with a respectable, republican, Cato-like woeful countenance, simultaneously gives free rein in far-off St. Louis to the most malicious idiocy and the vilest impudence. A comparison of the two versions of the "Protest", for which there is no space here, would also result in a new amusing contribution to the method of fabricating letters, circulars, leaflets, protests, provisos, defences, proclamations, appeals, and other similar headshakingly solemn *Blindian* political recipés, from which there is as little chance of escaping as from Mr. Holloway's pills or Mr. Hoff's malt extract.

Nothing could be further from my mind than to seek to explain a man such as *Lassalle* and the real tendency of his agitation to a grotesque *Mazzini-Scapin*<sup>c</sup> with nothing behind him but his own shadow. On the contrary, I am convinced that *Herr Karl Blind* is only fulfilling the calling imposed on him by nature and by *Aesop* in stepping behind the *dead lion*.<sup>d</sup>

*Karl Marx*

London, November 28, 1864      1, Modena Villas, Maitland Park

First published in the *Nordstern*, No. 287,  
December 10, 1864

Published in English for the first  
time

Printed according to the copy in  
Mrs. Marx's hand, corrected by  
the author and collated with the  
newspaper

<sup>a</sup> Published in the *Neue Frankfurter Zeitung*, No. 270, September 29, 1864.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Published in the *Hermann*, No. 2407, October 8, 1864.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The *Nordstern* has "a grotesque buffoon".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> An allusion to an ass in *Aesop's* fable "Leo senio confectus".—*Ed.*



Karl Marx

ON PROUDHON

[LETTER TO J. B. SCHWEITZER]<sup>21</sup>

[*Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 16, February 1, 1865]

London, January 24, 1865

Dear Sir,

Yesterday I received a letter in which you demand from me a detailed judgment of *Proudhon*. Lack of time prevents me from fulfilling your desire. Added to which I have *none* of his works to hand. However, in order to assure you of my good will I will quickly jot down a brief outline. You can then complete it, add to it or cut it—in short do anything you like with it.<sup>a</sup>

Proudhon's earliest efforts I no longer remember. His school work about the *Langue universelle*<sup>b</sup> shows how unceremoniously he tackled problems for the solution of which he still lacked the first elements of knowledge.

His first work, *Qu'est-ce que la propriété?*, is undoubtedly his best. It is epoch-making, if not because of the novelty of its content, at least because of the new and audacious way of expressing old ideas. In the works of the French socialists and communists he knew "*propriété*" had, of course, been not only criticised in various ways but also "*abolished*" in an utopian manner. In this book Proudhon stands in approximately the same relation to Saint-Simon and Fourier as Feuerbach stands to Hegel. Compared with Hegel, Feuerbach is certainly poor. Nevertheless he was epoch-making *after* Hegel because he laid *stress* on certain points which were disagreeable to the Christian consciousness but important for the progress of criticism, points which Hegel had left in mystic *clair-obscur*.<sup>c</sup>

In this book of Proudhon's there still prevails, if I may be

<sup>a</sup> The editors of *Der Social-Demokrat* supplied a footnote here: "We found it better to print the letter *without any changes*."—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The reference is to Proudhon's *Essai de grammaire générale*.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Semi-obscurity.—*Ed.*

allowed the expression, a strong muscular style. And its style is in my opinion its chief merit. It is evident that even where he is only reproducing old stuff, Proudhon discovers things in an independent way—that what he is saying is new to him and is treated as new. The provocative defiance, which lays hands on the economic “holy of holies”, the ingenious paradox which made a mock of the ordinary bourgeois understanding, the withering criticism, the bitter irony, and, revealed here and there, a deep and genuine feeling of indignation at the infamy of the existing order, a revolutionary earnestness—all these electrified the readers of *Qu'est-ce que la propriété?* and provided a strong stimulus on its first appearance. In a strictly scientific history of political economy the book would hardly be worth mentioning. But sensational works of this kind have their role to play in the sciences just as much as in the history of the novel. Take, for instance, Malthus's book on *Population*.<sup>3</sup> Its first edition was nothing but a “SENSATIONAL PAMPHLET” and *plagiarism* from beginning to end into the bargain. And yet what a stimulus was produced by this *lampoon on the human race!*

If I had Proudhon's book before me I could easily give a few examples to illustrate his *early style*. In the passages which he himself regarded as the most important he imitates Kant's treatment of the *antinomies*—Kant was at that time the only German philosopher whose works he had read, in translations—and he leaves one with a strong impression that to him, as to Kant, the resolution of the antinomies is something “*beyond*” human understanding, i.e., something that remains obscure to him himself.

But in spite of all his apparent iconoclasm one already finds in *Qu'est-ce que la propriété?* the contradiction that Proudhon is criticising society, on the one hand, from the standpoint and with the eyes of a French small-holding peasant (later *petit bourgeois*) and, on the other, that he measures it with the standards he inherited from the socialists.

The deficiency of the book is indicated by its very title. The question is so badly formulated that it cannot be answered correctly. *Ancient* “*property relations*” were superseded by *feudal* property relations and these by “*bourgeois*” property relations. Thus history itself had expressed its criticism upon past *property relations*. What Proudhon was actually dealing with was *modern bourgeois property* as it exists today. The question of what this is

<sup>3</sup> T. R. Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population*.—Ed.

could have only been answered by a critical analysis of “*political economy*”, embracing the totality of these *property relations*, considering not their *legal* aspect as *relations of volition* but their real form, that is, as *relations of production*. But as Proudhon entangled the whole of these economic relations in the general legal concept of “*property*”, “*la propriété*”, he could not get beyond the answer which, in a similar work published before 1789,<sup>a</sup> Brissot had already given in the same words: “*La propriété c’est le vol.*”<sup>b</sup>

The upshot is at best that the bourgeois legal conceptions of “*theft*” apply equally well to the “*honest*” gains of the bourgeois himself. On the other hand, since “*theft*” as a forcible violation of property *presupposes the existence of property*, Proudhon entangled himself in all sorts of fantasies, obscure even to himself, about *true bourgeois property*.

During my stay in Paris in 1844 I came into personal contact with Proudhon. I mention this here because to a certain extent I am also to blame for his “*SOPHISTICATION*”, as the English call the adulteration of commercial goods. In the course of lengthy debates often lasting all night, I infected him very much to his detriment with Hegelianism, which, owing to his lack of German, he could not study properly. After my expulsion from Paris Herr *Karl Grün* continued what I had begun. As a teacher of German philosophy he also had the advantage over me that he himself understood nothing about it.

Shortly before the appearance of Proudhon’s second important work, the *Philosophie de la misère, etc.*,<sup>c</sup> he himself announced this to me in a very detailed letter in which he said, among other things: “*J’attends votre féroce critique.*”<sup>d</sup> This criticism, however, soon dropped on him (in my *Misère de la philosophie, etc.*, Paris, 1847), in a way which ended our friendship for ever.

[*Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 17, February 3, 1865]

From what I have said here you can see that Proudhon’s *Philosophie de la misère ou Système des contradictions économiques* first contained the real answer to the question *Qu’est-ce que la propriété?* In fact it was only after the publication of this work that he had begun his economic studies; he had discovered that the question

<sup>a</sup> J. P. Brissot de Warville, *Recherches philosophiques sur le droit de propriété et sur le vol, considérés dans la nature et dans la société.*—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> “Property is theft.”—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> P. J. Proudhon, *Système des contradictions économiques, ou philosophie de la misère.*—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> “I await your severe criticism.”—Ed.

he had raised could not be answered by *invective*, but only by an *analysis* of modern "*political economy*". At the same time he attempted to present the *system* of economic categories dialectically. In place of Kant's insoluble "*antinomies*", the Hegelian "*contradiction*" was to be introduced as the means of development.

For an estimate of his book, which is in two fat volumes, I must refer you to the refutation I wrote. There I have shown, among other things, how little he had penetrated into the secret of scientific dialectics and how, on the contrary, he shares the illusions of speculative philosophy, for instead of regarding *economic categories as the theoretical expression of historical relations of production, corresponding to a particular stage of development in material production*, he garbles them into pre-existing *eternal ideas*, and how in this roundabout way he arrives once more at the standpoint of bourgeois economy.\*

I show furthermore how extremely deficient and at times even schoolboyish is his knowledge of "*political economy*" which he undertook to criticise, and that he and the utopians are hunting for a so-called "*science*" by means of which a formula for the "*solution of the social question*" is to be devised *a priori*, instead of deriving science from a critical knowledge of the historical movement, a movement which itself produces the *material conditions of emancipation*. My refutation shows in particular that Proudhon's view of *exchange-value*, the basis of the whole theory, remains confused, incorrect and superficial, and that he even mistakes the utopian interpretation of Ricardo's theory of value for the basis of a new science. With regard to his general point of view I have summarised my conclusions thus:

"Every economic relation has a good and a bad side; it is the one point on which M. Proudhon does not give himself the lie. He sees the good side expounded by the economists; the bad side he sees denounced by the socialists. He borrows from the economists the necessity of eternal relations; he borrows from the socialists the illusion of seeing in poverty nothing but poverty (instead of seeing in it the revolutionary, destructive aspect which will

\* "When the economists say that present-day relations—the relations of bourgeois production—are *natural*, they imply that these are the relations in which wealth is created and productive forces developed in conformity with the laws of nature. These relations therefore are themselves *natural laws* independent of the influence of time. They are *eternal laws* which must always govern society. Thus there has been history, but there is no longer any" (p. 113 of my work).<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 174.—Ed.

overthrow the old society).<sup>a</sup> He is in agreement with both in wanting to fall back upon the authority of science. Science for him reduces itself to the slender proportions of a scientific formula; he is the man in search of formulas. Thus it is that M. Proudhon flatters himself on having given a criticism of both political economy and of communism: he is beneath them both. Beneath the economists, since as a philosopher who has at his elbow a magic formula, he thought he could dispense with going into purely economic details; beneath the socialists, because he has neither courage enough nor insight enough to rise, be it even speculatively, above the bourgeois horizon....

“He wants to soar as the man of science above the bourgeois and the proletarians; *he is merely the petty bourgeois*, continually tossed back and forth between capital and labour, political economy and communism.”\*

Severe though the above judgment may sound I must even now endorse every word of it. At the same time, however, one has to bear in mind that when I declared his book to be the code of socialism of the *petit bourgeois* and proved this theoretically, Proudhon was still being decried as an ultra-arch-revolutionary both by political economists and by socialists. That is why later on I never joined in the outcry about his “*treachery*” to the revolution. It was not his fault that, originally misunderstood by others as well as by himself, he failed to fulfil unjustified hopes.

[*Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 18, February 5, 1865]

In the *Philosophie de la misère* all the defects of Proudhon’s method of presentation stand out very unfavourably in comparison with *Qu’est-ce que la propriété?* The style is often what the French call *ampoulé*.<sup>c</sup> High-sounding speculative jargon, purporting to be German-philosophical, appears regularly on the scene when his Gallic astuteness fails him. A noisy, self-glorifying, boastful tone and especially the twaddle about “*science*” and sham display of it, which are always so unedifying, are continually jarring on one’s ears. Instead of the genuine warmth which permeates his first work, he here systematically works himself up into a sudden flush of rhetoric in certain passages. There is in addition the clumsy repugnant show of erudition of the self-taught, whose natural pride in his original reasoning has already

\* I. c., pp. 119, 120.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The phrase in brackets was added by Marx in this article.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 178.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Bombastic.—*Ed.*

been broken and who now, as a *parvenu* of science, feels it necessary to give himself airs with what he neither is nor has. Then the mentality of the petty bourgeois who for instance makes an indecently brutal attack, which is neither shrewd nor profound nor even correct, on a man like *Cabet*—worthy of respect for his practical attitude towards the French proletariat,<sup>22</sup> and on the other hand pays compliments to a man like *Dunoyer* (a “State Councillor”, it is true) although the whole significance of this *Dunoyer* lay in the comic zeal with which, throughout three fat, unbearably boring volumes,<sup>a</sup> he preached a rigorism characterised by *Helvétius* as follows: “*On veut que les malheureux soient parfaits*” (It is demanded that the unfortunate should be perfect).

The February Revolution certainly came at a very inconvenient moment for Proudhon, who had irrefutably proved only a few weeks before that “*the era of revolutions*” was past for ever. His speech in the National Assembly, however little insight it showed into existing conditions, was worthy of every praise. After the June insurrection it was an act of great courage.<sup>23</sup> In addition it had the fortunate consequence that *M. Thiers*, by his reply opposing Proudhon’s proposals, which was then issued as a special booklet,<sup>b</sup> proved to the whole of Europe what infantile catechism served this intellectual pillar of the French bourgeoisie as a pedestal.<sup>24</sup> Compared with *M. Thiers*, *Proudhon* indeed swelled to the size of an antediluvian colossus.

Proudhon’s discovery of “*crédit gratuit*”<sup>c</sup> and the “*people’s bank*” (*banque du peuple*), based upon it, were his last economic “deeds”. My book *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, Part I, Berlin, 1859* (pp. 59-64) contains the proof that the theoretical basis of his idea arises from a misunderstanding of the basic elements of bourgeois “political economy”, namely of the relation between *commodities* and *money*, while the practical superstructure was simply a reproduction of much older and far better developed schemes. That under certain economic and political conditions the credit system can be used to accelerate the emancipation of the working class, just as, for instance, at the beginning of the eighteenth, and again later, at the beginning of the nineteenth century in England, it facilitated the transfer of

<sup>a</sup> Ch. Dunoyer, *De la liberté du travail ou simple exposé des conditions dans lesquelles les forces humaines s'exercent avec le plus de puissance*, t. I-III, Paris, 1845.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *Rapport du citoyen Thiers, précédé de la proposition du citoyen Proudhon relative à l'impôt sur le revenu, et suivi de son discours prononcé à l'Assemblée nationale, le 31 juillet 1848.*—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> Free credit.—Ed.

wealth from one class to another, is quite unquestionable and self-evident. But to regard *interest-bearing capital* as the *main form of capital* and to try to make a particular form of the credit system, comprising the alleged abolition of interest, the basis for a transformation of society is an out-and-out *petty-bourgeois* fantasy. This fantasy, further diluted, can therefore actually already be found among the *economic spokesmen of the English petty bourgeoisie in the seventeenth century*. Proudhon's polemic with Bastiat (1850) about interest-bearing capital<sup>a</sup> is on a far lower level than the *Philosophie de la misère*. He succeeds in getting himself beaten even by Bastiat and breaks into burlesque bluster when his opponent drives his blows home.

A few years ago Proudhon wrote a prize essay on *Taxation*,<sup>b</sup> the competition was sponsored, I believe, by the government of Lausanne. Here the last flicker of genius is extinguished. Nothing remains but the *petit bourgeois tout pur*.<sup>c</sup>

So far as Proudhon's political and philosophical writings are concerned they all show the same contradictory, dual character as his economic works. Moreover their value is purely local, confined to France. Nevertheless his attacks on religion, the church, etc., were of great merit locally at a time when the French socialists thought it desirable to show by their religiosity how superior they were to the bourgeois Voltairianism of the eighteenth century and the German godlessness of the nineteenth. Just as Peter the Great defeated Russian barbarism by barbarity, Proudhon did his best to defeat French phrase-mongering by phrases.

His work on the *Coup d'état*,<sup>d</sup> in which he flirts with Louis Bonaparte and, in fact, strives to make him palatable to the French workers, and his last work, written against *Poland*,<sup>e</sup> in which for the greater glory of the tsar he expresses moronic cynicism, must be described as works not merely bad but base, a baseness, however, which corresponds to the petty-bourgeois point of view.<sup>25</sup>

*Proudhon* has often been compared to *Rousseau*. Nothing could be more erroneous. He is more like *Nicolas Linguet*, whose *Théorie des loix civiles*, by the way, is a very brilliant book.

<sup>a</sup> *Gratuité du crédit. Discussion entre M. Fr. Bastiat et M. Proudhon*, Paris, 1850.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> P. J. Proudhon, *Théorie de l'impôt...*, Brussels and Paris, 1861.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Petty bourgeois pure and simple*.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> P. J. Proudhon, *La Révolution sociale démontrée par le coup d'état du 2 décembre*, Paris, 1852.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> P. J. Proudhon, *Si les traités de 1815 ont cessé d'exister? Actes du futur congrès*, Paris, 1863.—*Ed.*

Proudhon had a natural inclination for dialectics. But as he never grasped really scientific dialectics he never got further than sophistry. This is in fact connected with his petty-bourgeois point of view. Like the historian *Raumer*, the petty bourgeois is made up of on-the-one-hand and on-the-other-hand. This is so in his economic interests and *therefore* in his politics, religious, scientific and artistic views. And likewise in his morals, IN EVERYTHING. He is a living contradiction. If, like Proudhon, he is in addition an ingenious man, he will soon learn to play with his own contradictions and develop them according to circumstances into striking, ostentatious, now scandalous now brilliant paradoxes. Charlatanism in science and accommodation in politics are inseparable from such a point of view. There remains only one governing motive, the *vanity* of the subject, and the only question for him, as for all vain people, is the success of the moment, the *éclat* of the day. Thus the simple moral sense, which always kept a Rousseau, for instance, from even the semblance of compromise with the powers that be, is bound to disappear.

Posterity will perhaps sum up the latest phase of French development by saying that Louis Bonaparte was its Napoleon and Proudhon its Rousseau-Voltaire.

You yourself have now to accept responsibility for having imposed upon me the role of a judge of the dead so soon after this man's death.

Yours very respectfully,

*Karl Marx*

Written on January 24, 1865

First published in *Der Social-Demokrat*,  
Nos. 16, 17 and 18, February 1, 3 and 5,  
1865

Printed according to the news-  
paper text checked with the rough  
manuscript which has survived in  
part



## Frederick Engels

### HERR TIDMANN

#### OLD DANISH FOLK SONG<sup>26</sup>

Early one morning, when it was day,  
 Herr Tidmann dressed beside his bed,  
 And he put on his shirt so fine.  
     That all the Süder people praise.

And he put on his shirt so fine,  
 His green silk coat did bravely shine,  
 Buckskin boots he laced on his legs.  
     That all the Süder people praise.

Buckskin boots he laced on his legs,  
 Buckled on gilded spurs so neat,  
 And went to the Süder district Thing.  
     That all the Süder people praise.

He went to the Süder district Thing,  
 Demanded the tax from each *edeling*,  
 Seven bushels of rye from each man's plough.  
     That all the Süder people praise.

Seven bushels of rye from each man's plough,  
 One pig in four from the fattening woods—  
 But then up stood an aged man.  
     That all the Süder people praise.

But then up stood an aged man:  
 "Pay such taxes none of us can.  
 Before so heavy a tax we pay—"  
     That all the Süder people praise.

“Before so heavy a tax we pay,  
None from this Thing shall go away.  
You Süder peasants, stand in a ring.”  
That all the Süder people praise.

“You Süder peasants, stand in a ring,  
Herr Tidmann alive shan't leave the Thing.”  
The old man struck the very first blow.  
That all the Süder people praise.

The old man struck the very first blow,  
Down to the ground did Herr Tidmann go.  
There lies Herr Tidmann, he streams with blood.  
That all the Süder people praise.

There lies Herr Tidmann, he streams with blood,  
But the plough goes free on the black soil.  
The pigs go free in the fattening woods.  
That all the Süder people praise.<sup>a</sup>

This piece of medieval peasant war takes place in the Süder Harde (*harde* means judicial district) north of Aarhus in Jutland. The Thing, the assembled court of the district, handled questions of taxation and administration, as well as court matters. The song shows how the rising nobility confronted the *edelings*, i.e. the free peasants, and also how the peasants put an end to the nobility's arrogance. In a country like Germany, where the propertied class includes as much feudal nobility as bourgeoisie, and the proletariat includes as many agricultural labourers as industrial workers, if not more—the zestful old peasant song will be eminently apposite.

Written not later than January 27, 1865

First published in *Der Social-Demokrat*,  
No. 18, February 5, 1865

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Published in English in full for the  
first time

<sup>a</sup> Translated by Alex Miller.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels  
TO THE EDITOR OF THE SOCIAL-DEMOKRAT

STATEMENT<sup>27</sup>

In No. 16 of your newspaper Herr M. Hess from Paris casts suspicion on *the French members*, with whom he is entirely unacquainted, of *the London Central Committee* of the International Working Men's Association with the words:

"There is really no knowing whether it would matter if some friends of the *Palais-Royal*<sup>a</sup> also belonged to the London Association, since it is a public one, etc."

In an earlier issue,<sup>b</sup> while prattling about the newspaper *L'Association*, the same Herr M. H. made similar insinuations about the *Paris friends* of the London Committee. We declare his insinuations to be preposterous slander.

For the rest, we are glad to find in this incident confirmation of our conviction that the Paris proletariat is as irreconcilably opposed as ever to Bonapartism in both its forms, the Tuileries form<sup>c</sup> and the form of the Palais-Royal, and never for a moment considered the plan of selling its historical honour (or should we, instead of "*its historical honour*", say "*its historical birthright as bearer of revolution*"?) for a mess of pottage. We recommend this example to the German workers.

London and Manchester

Written on February 6, 1865

Printed according to the rough  
manuscript

First published in *Der Briefwechsel zwischen F. Engels und K. Marx*, Bd. 3, Stuttgart, 1913

<sup>a</sup> An allusion to Joseph Bonaparte, Napoleon III's cousin nicknamed Plon-Plon. Palais-Royal was his residence.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 8, January 13, 1865.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> An allusion to Napoleon III whose residence was the Tuileries.—*Ed.*

**FREDERICK ENGELS**

**THE PRUSSIAN MILITARY QUESTION  
AND  
THE GERMAN WORKERS' PARTY<sup>28</sup>**

Written between the end of January and  
February 12, 1865

First published as a separate pamphlet

Printed according to the pamphlet

Published in English for the first  
time

Die  
**preussische Militärfrage**

und die

**deutsche Arbeiterpartei.**

---

von

**Friedrich Engels.**

---

**Somburg.**

**Otto Reifner.**

**1865.**

Title page of the first edition  
of *The Prussian Military Question*  
and *the German Workers' Party* by Engels



Until now the debate on the military question has merely been conducted between the government and the feudal party on the one hand, and the liberal and radical bourgeoisie on the other. Now, as the crisis approaches, it is time for the workers' party to make its position known too.

In attempting a critique of the military situation in question, we can only proceed from the actual condition facing us. As long as present conditions persist in Germany and Europe we cannot expect the Prussian government to act with any other interests in mind than those of Prussia herself. No more can we seriously expect the bourgeois opposition to proceed from any other standpoint than that of its own bourgeois interests.

The workers' party, which in all questions at issue between reaction and bourgeoisie stands outside the actual conflict, enjoys the advantage of being able to treat such questions quite cold-bloodedly and impartially. It alone can treat them scientifically, historically, as though they were already in the past, anatomically, as though they were already corpses.



## I

After the attempts at mobilisation in 1850 and 1859<sup>29</sup> there can be but one verdict on the condition of the Prussian army under the old system. Since 1815 the absolute monarchy had been bound by a public promise: not to raise new taxes, nor to float loans without obtaining prior approval from the future representative assembly of the country. It was impossible to break this promise; no loan had the smallest chance of success without such approval. The general system of taxation was however so organised that the increase in yield quite failed to keep pace with the growth of the country's wealth. Absolutism was poor, poor indeed, and the extraordinary expenditure consequent upon the storms of 1830<sup>30</sup> was enough to oblige it to practise the utmost economy. Hence the introduction of two-year military service, and hence a system of economy in all branches of military administration which reduced the equipment to be held in readiness for mobilisation to the very lowest level, with regard both to quantity and quality. Despite this, Prussia's position as a great power was to be maintained; to this end the first field army needed to be as strong as possible at the outbreak of a war and therefore also included the first levy of the *Landwehr*.<sup>31</sup> The necessity for mobilisation at the very first threat of war was thereby ensured and with it the collapse of the whole edifice. This duly occurred in 1850, resulting in a complete and utter fiasco for Prussia.

In 1850 only the material shortcomings of the system became evident; the whole affair was over before the adverse effects on morale could emerge. The funds the Chambers had approved were used to alleviate the material shortcomings as far as possible. As far as possible; for under no circumstances will it be possible to

hold matériel in such a state of readiness as would within 14 days see the called-up reserves and after 14 days the whole of the first levy of the *Landwehr* fully equipped for battle. It should not be forgotten that while the soldiers of the line represented the recruitment of 3 years at most, the reserve and the first levy together represented 9 years' recruitment, and that for every 3 soldiers of the line in battle order therefore, at least 7 called-up men had to be equipped in 4 weeks. Then came the Italian war of 1859 and with it another general mobilisation. On this occasion too a goodly number of material shortcomings were still evident, but they paled into insignificance beside the adverse effects the system had on morale, which were only uncovered now that the state of mobilisation was prolonged. Undeniably the *Landwehr* had been neglected; its battalion-cadres for the most part simply did not exist and had first to be built up; of the existing officers many were unfit for service in the field. But even if all this had not been so, the fact still remained that the officers could not be other than quite estranged from their men, particularly regarding their military ability, and that this military ability was in most cases insufficient for battalions with such officers to be sent with confidence against seasoned troops. If the *Landwehr* officers gave an excellent account of themselves in the Danish war,<sup>32</sup> one should not forget that there is a great difference between a battalion which has  $\frac{4}{5}$  officers of the line and  $\frac{1}{5}$  *Landwehr* officers, and the reverse. But there was a further point that was decisive. As might have been realised beforehand, it became obvious at once that the *Landwehr* can certainly be used to fight, especially in defence of their own country, but under no circumstances can they be used for a show of force. The *Landwehr* is a defensive institution which only lends itself to offensive warfare after repelling an invasion, as in 1814 and 1815. A levy consisting for the most part of married men aged from 26 to 32 cannot be stationed idly at the frontiers for months whilst letters from home come in daily telling of the hardship suffered by their wives and children; for the support given to the families of the men called out also proved to be woefully inadequate. Then there was the fact that the men did not know whom they had to fight, the French or the Austrians—neither of whom had at that time injured Prussia in any way. How could such troops, demoralised by months of inactivity, be expected to attack highly organised and battle-hardened armies?

That a change was inevitable is obvious. In the prevailing circumstances, Prussia's first field army needed to be more strongly organised. How was this achieved?

The 36 regiments of conscripted infantry of the *Landwehr* were allowed to continue in existence for the time being, but were gradually transformed into new regiments of the line. Little by little the cavalry and artillery were also expanded until they achieved equivalent strength to the reinforced infantry; and finally the siege-artillery was detached from the field artillery, which was an improvement in any event, especially for Prussia. In a nutshell, the infantry was doubled and the cavalry and artillery expanded by about one half. In order to maintain this increased standing army, it was proposed to extend the period of service in the line from 5 years to 7—3 years with the colours (in the case of the infantry), 4 in the reserve; on the other hand, liability for the second levy of the *Landwehr* was to be cut by 4 years; and finally annual recruitment was to be increased from the previous figure of 40,000 to 63,000. In the meantime, the *Landwehr* was completely neglected.

The increased battalions, squadrons and batteries thus decreed corresponded almost exactly to the increase in Prussia's population from 10 million in 1815 to 18 million in 1861; since Prussia's wealth has meanwhile grown faster than her population, and since the other major European states have strengthened their armies to a much greater degree since 1815, such an increase in the number of cadres was undoubtedly not excessive. At the same time, of all the obligations borne by conscripts, the proposal added only to those of the youngest age-groups—the liability to serve in the reserve—but reduced liability for *Landwehr*-service for the oldest age-groups by twice as much and in fact almost totally did away with the second levy, the first levy more or less taking over the function the second formerly had.

On the other hand, the following objections could be made to the plan:

Universal conscription—incidentally the sole democratic institution existing in Prussia, albeit only on paper—marks such an enormous advance on all previous forms of military organisation that, having once existed, even if its implementation left much to be desired, it cannot again be permanently reversed. An army today must be based on one of the two clearly defined systems: either the recruitment of volunteers—which is antiquated and only possible in exceptional cases such as England—or universal conscription. All conscriptive systems and ballots<sup>33</sup> are after all no more than very imperfect forms of the latter. The basic idea behind the Prussian law of 1814 is that every citizen who is physically capable of bearing arms thereby has the obligation to do

so personally in defence of his country, during his years of military fitness; this basic idea is far superior to the principle of purchasing substitutes which we find in every other country having a conscriptive system, and having existed for fifty years it will undoubtedly not succumb to the bourgeoisie's burning desire for the introduction of the "trade in human flesh", as the French call it.

However once we accept that the Prussian military system is founded on universal, compulsory service without substitution, the only way it can be further improved without its own spirit being breached is for its basic principle to be put increasingly into practice. Let us consider how things stand in that respect.

40,000 conscripts for 10 million inhabitants in 1815 makes 4 per thousand. 63,000 conscripts for 18 million inhabitants in 1861 makes  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per thousand. This represents a deterioration, although it is an improvement compared with the position prior to 1859 when only  $2\frac{2}{9}$  per thousand were conscripted. Merely to restore the 1815 percentage, 72,000 men would have to be conscripted. (We shall see that every year approximately this number of men or more do indeed enter the army.) But is the fighting potential of the Prussian people exhausted if 4 per 1,000 of the population are recruited each year?

The Darmstadt *Allgemeine Militär-Zeitung* has time and again shown from the statistics of the middle states that in Germany a full half of the young men presenting themselves for recruitment are fit for service. Now according to the *Zeitschrift des preussischen statistischen Bureaus* (March 1864) the number of young men registering in 1861 was 227,005.<sup>a</sup> This would make 113,500 recruits fit for service each year. Of these we will discount 6,500 as not available or morally incapable, which still leaves us with 107,000. Why do only 63,000 of these, or at most 72,000-75,000 actually serve?

In the 1863 session, the Minister for War, von Roon, presented<sup>b</sup> the following analysis of the 1861 levy to the Military Commission of the Assembly:

Total population (1858 census) .....	17,758,823
Twenty-year-olds liable for military service class of 1861 .....	217,438

<sup>a</sup> The figures are taken from Dr. Engel, "Resultate des Ersatz-Aushebungsgeschäfts im preussischen Staate in den Jahren von 1855 bis mit 1862".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> On February 10, 1863.—*Ed.*

Men liable for military service carried over from previous years, pending final decision		<u>348,364</u>	565,802
Of these:			
1. Untraced .....		55,770	
2. Moved to other districts and required to register for service there .....		82,216	
3. Failed to register without being excused .....		10,960	
4. Enlisted as 3-year volunteers .....		5,025	
5. Entitled to serve as 1-year volunteers .....		14,811	
6. Theologians, deferred or exempted .....		1,638	
7. Liable for naval service .....		299	
8. Struck off as morally unfit .....		596	
9. Rejected by the Regional Commission as manifestly unfit .....		2,489	
10. Rejected by the Regional Commission as permanently unfit .....		15,238	
11. Transferred to the Supplementary Reserve <sup>34</sup> :			
a) Below 5 foot after three musters .....	8,998		
b) Below 5 foot 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ inches after three musters .....	9,553		
c) Temporarily unfit after three musters .....	46,761		
d) By reason of domestic circumstances after three musters .....	4,213		
e) Available after five musters .....	<u>291</u>	69,816	
12. Allocated to the Service Corps, not including those recruited for the Service Corps .....			6,774
13. Deferred for one year:			
a) Temporarily unfit .....	219,136		
b) By reason of domestic circumstances .....	10,013		
c) By reason of loss of civil rights and under investigation .....	<u>1,087</u>	<u>230,236</u>	<u>495,868</u>
Remainder available for recruitment .....			69,934
Actually recruited .....			<u>59,459</u>
Remainder still available .....			10,475

However imperfect these statistics are, however much they confuse the whole issue under every heading from 1 to 13 by amalgamating the men from the class of 1861 and those from the two previous classes who are still available, they do nevertheless contain some very valuable admissions.

59,459 men were conscripted. 5,025 enlisted as 3-year volunteers. 14,811 were entitled to serve for one year; as it is common knowledge that the authorities are not so punctilious about the fitness of the one-year volunteers because they cost nothing, we may assume that at least half of them, that is, 7,400, did actually enlist. That is a very low estimate; the class of men who qualify for one-year service in any case consists chiefly of people fit for service; those who are unfit at the outset do not even go to the trouble of qualifying. But let us assume 7,400. By this count a total of 71,884 men entered the army in 1861.

Let us take this further. 1,638 men were deferred or exempted as theologians. Why theologians should be too grand to serve is incomprehensible. On the contrary, a year's army service, living in the open air, and contact with the outside world can only benefit them. So without more ado we will recruit them;  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the total number for the current year, with  $\frac{3}{4}$  unfit, still leaves 139 men to be included.

18,551 men were rejected for not being of sufficient stature. Note: not rejected for service altogether but "passed to the reserve". Therefore, in the event of war they should serve after all. They are only excused parade-service in peace-time, being insufficiently imposing for that. It is thus admitted that these short men are quite good enough for service, and it is intended to use them even in emergencies. *The fact that* these short men can be quite good soldiers is demonstrated by the French army, which includes men down to 4 feet 8 inches. We therefore have no hesitation in counting them in with the military resources of the country. The above figure merely includes those who were finally rejected after three musters as being too short; it is thus a number that recurs each year. We will discount half of them as unfit for other reasons and we are then left with 9,275 little fellows whom a capable officer would no doubt soon knock into splendid soldiers.

Then we find 6,774 allocated to the Service Corps, *not including* the men recruited for the Service Corps. The Service Corps is however also part of the army, and there is no evident reason why these men should not spend the short six-month period of service with the Service Corps, which would be of benefit both to them and to the Service Corps.

We thus have:

Men actually serving .....	71,884
Theologians .....	139
Men who are fit but not tall enough .....	9,275
Men allocated to the Service Corps .....	6,774
<hr/>	
Total .....	88,072 men,

who on the *admission* of von Roon's *own* statistics could join the army each year if universal conscription were seriously implemented.

Now let us examine those who are unfit.

Deferred for one year as temporarily unfit .....	219,136 men
Transferred to the reserve after three musters as ditto .....	46,761 "
Struck off as permanently unfit <i>only</i> .....	17,727 "
<hr/>	
Total .....	283,624 men,

so that the men *permanently* unfit on account of *real* physical defects do not even constitute 7% of all the group rejected as unfit and not even 4% of the total number of men appearing annually before the Recruitment Commissions. Almost 17% of the temporarily unfit are transferred each year to the reserve after three musters. These men are thus 23 years old, men at an age when the body's constitution is already beginning to settle down. We are surely not being too optimistic if we assume that of these a third will be quite fit for service by the time they are 25; that makes 15,587 men. The least that may be demanded of these men is that for two years they should serve in the infantry for three months each year, in order to receive at least basic training. This would be the equivalent of an addition of 3,897 men to the peace-time army.

However the whole way in which recruits are medically examined in Prussia has taken a peculiar turn. There were always more recruits than could be enlisted, and yet no one wanted to abandon the appearance of universal conscription. What could have been more convenient than to select the desired number of the best men and to declare the rest unfit on some pretext or other? In these circumstances, which, it should be noted, have obtained in Prussia since 1815 and still obtain today, the concept of unfitness has been extended there quite beyond normal usage, a fact that can best be demonstrated by comparison with the

middle states. There, where there is the possibility of buying out and selection by ballot, there was no reason to declare more people unfit than really were unfit. Conditions are the same as in Prussia; in some states, e.g., Saxony, even worse because the percentage of the industrial population is higher there. Now as we have said, it has been demonstrated time and time again in the *Allgemeine Militär-Zeitung* that in the middle states *fully one half* of the men registering for service are fit, and that must also be so in Prussia. As soon as a war breaks out in earnest, the notion of fitness will undergo drastic revision in Prussia, and the authorities will then discover, too late, to their cost, how many fit men have been allowed to slip away.

Now comes the most wonderful part of all. Of the 565,802 men liable for service about whom a decision has to be reached, we find:

Untraced .....	55,770 men
Moved to other districts <i>or</i> required to register for service there .....	82,216 "
Failed to register without being ex- cused .....	10,960 "
<hr/>	
Total .....	148,946 men.

So for all Prussia's much vaunted system of controls—and anyone who has ever been liable for the army in Prussia knows what that means—a full 27% of men liable for service disappear each year. How is that possible? And what has become of the 82,216 men who are struck off the list because they have “moved to other districts or required to register for service there”? Does one only need to move from Berlin to Potsdam these days in order to escape liability for service? We will assume that here—after all, even Homer nods off at times—the officials have simply blundered in their statistics, that is, that these 82,216 figure *twice* in the grand total of 565,802: firstly in their native district and secondly in the district to which they have migrated. This point really ought to be clarified—the Military Commission of the Chamber has the best opportunity of doing so—since if the number of men really liable for military service is reduced to 483,586 this would have a significant effect on all the percentages. Let us meanwhile assume that such is the case: there still remain 66,730 men who disappear into thin air every year and neither the Prussian system of controls nor the police manages to get them into uniform. This represents nearly 14% of those liable for service. The implication of this is that all the restrictions on



freedom of movement which are imposed in Prussia on the pretext of controlling those liable for military service, are *totally superfluous*. It is well known that real emigration from Prussia is *very small* and bears no comparison with the number of missing recruits. Nor do these men, numbering almost 67,000, all emigrate. The majority of them either never leave the country or go abroad only for a short time. Indeed all the measures designed to prevent evasion of military duty are quite ineffective and at best an incitement to emigration. The overwhelming majority of young people cannot emigrate in any case. All that is needed is to insist strictly and without mercy that men who have avoided recruitment should make up the time afterwards, and then the whole rigmarole of harassment and paperwork would be unnecessary and there would be more recruits than previously.

In order to be quite certain of our position, we shall by the way only take as proven those facts which emerge from Herr von Roon's own statistics: in other words that not counting the one-year volunteers, 85,000 young men can be recruited each year. Now the strength of the present peace-time army is approximately 210,000 men. If the period of service is two years, 85,000 men per year together will make 170,000 men, to which must be added officers, non-commissioned officers and re-enlisted soldiers, some 25,000-35,000 men, making a total of 195,000 to 205,000 men, or 202,000 to 212,000 men including the one-year volunteers. With two-year service for the infantry and foot-artillery (we shall deal with the cavalry later), even taking the government's own figures, the total strength of the reorganised army could be brought up to its full peace-time level. If universal conscription were *really* implemented, with two-year service there would very probably be 30,000 more men; it would therefore be possible to release some of the men after just 1 or 1½ years, to avoid exceeding the figure of 200,000 to 210,000 men. As a reward for keenness, such early release would be of more use to the army as a whole than an extra six months' service.

War-time strength would then be as follows:

The reorganisation plan envisages 4 years' annual intake of 63,000 men, which makes 252,000 reservists. 3 years' annual intake of 85,000 men produce 255,000 reservists. This is surely just as good as the reorganisation plan. (As it is here only a question of the *relative numbers*, it makes no difference that we are here completely ignoring the reduction in the year-groups serving in the reserve.)

It is in this that the weakness of the reorganisation plan resides.

Whilst in appearance reverting to the original concept of universal conscription, which cannot of course function without a large army-reserve in the form of a *Landwehr*, it in fact executes an about-turn in the direction of the Franco-Austrian cadre-system,<sup>35</sup> and thereby introduces an element of uncertainty into the Prussian military system which cannot fail to have the direct consequences. The two systems cannot be mixed, one cannot have the advantages of both systems at the same time. It is undeniable and has never been disputed that a cadre-system with a long period of service and liability for immediate mobilisation confers great advantages at the outbreak of war. The men know each other better; even those on leave, and leave is mostly only granted for short periods at a time, regard themselves as soldiers throughout their leave and are constantly ready to be called to the colours at a moment's notice, which the Prussian reservists are certainly not; consequently battalions are necessarily a great deal steadier when they come under fire for the first time. Against this it may be argued that, if one considers this system best, one might just as well adopt the English system of ten years' service with the colours; that the French undoubtedly gained far more from their Algerian campaigns and the wars in the Crimea and Italy<sup>36</sup> than from long service; and finally that by this system only some of the men fit to bear arms can be trained, in other words by no means all of the nation's potential is exploited. Furthermore, experience shows that the German soldier readily accustoms himself to being under fire, and three hard-fought and at least partially successful engagements do as much for an otherwise good battalion as a whole year of extra service. For a state such as Prussia the cadre-system is an impossibility. With the cadre-system, Prussia could attain an army of 300,000 to 400,000 men *at the very most* with a peace-time strength of 200,000 men. But if she is to maintain herself as a Great Power, she requires as many as this simply to move the first field army out, in other words, for any serious war, she needs 500,000 to 600,000 men, including fortress garrisons, reinforcements, etc. If the 18 million Prussians are to put forward in time of war an army approaching the numbers of the 35 million French, 34 million Austrians and 60 million Russians, this can only be done by universal conscription, a short but intensive period of service and a comparatively long period of liability for the *Landwehr*. With this system inevitably some of the immediate striking-power and even battle-worthiness of the troops at the outbreak of war will have to be sacrificed; the state and its policies will become neutral and defensive in character; but we

ought also to remember that the attacking élan of the cadre-system led from Jena to Tilsit and the defensive modesty of the *Landwehr* system with universal conscription led from the Katzbach to Paris.<sup>37</sup> This therefore means: Either a conscriptive system involving substitution with 7-8 year service, of which about half would be with the colours, and then no subsequent liability for *Landwehr* service; or alternatively universal conscription with 5 or at the most 6 year service, of which two would be with the colours, and then liability for *Landwehr* service, as in Prussia or Switzerland.<sup>38</sup> But for the mass of the people first to have the burden of a conscriptive system and then additionally that of the *Landwehr* system is more than any European nation can take, not even the Turks, who in their military barbarism are still prepared to endure the most. A large number of trained men with short service and long-term liability for recall, or a small number with long service and a short period of liability for recall—that is the question; but the choice has to be either one or the other.

William Napier, who naturally declares the British soldier to be the best in the world, says in his *History of the Peninsular War* that after three years' service the British infantryman is fully trained in every respect.<sup>a</sup> Now it should be realised that the elements constituting the British army at the beginning of this century were the lowest from which an army can possibly be formed. The British army today comprises vastly superior elements, but even these are still infinitely worse, both morally and intellectually, than the elements that make up the Prussian army. And is it suggested that what those British officers achieved in three years with such riff-raff should not be attainable in two years in Prussia, where the raw material for recruitment is so exceptionally receptive to education and in some cases already so highly educated, and is at the outset morally sound?

It is true that soldiers today have more to learn. But that has never been seriously used as an argument against two-year service. The argument always used has been the cultivation of *true military spirit*, which is said only to emerge in the third year. If these gentlemen were to be perfectly honest and if we discount the increased battalion effectiveness which was conceded above, this is far more of a political issue than a military one. True military spirit is intended to prove itself in face of the enemy within<sup>39</sup> rather than abroad. It has never been our experience that the

---

<sup>a</sup> W. F. P. Napier, *History of the War in the Peninsula and in the South of France, from the Year 1807 to the Year 1814*, Vol. III, London, 1833, p. 271.—Ed.

individual Prussian soldier learnt anything in his third year except boredom and how to extort schnaps from the recruits and tell bad jokes about his superiors. If the majority of our officers had served as privates or non-commissioned officers even for a year, this could not possibly have escaped their notice.—Experience shows that “true military spirit”, insofar as it is a political quality, very rapidly goes to the dogs, never to be revived. Military virtues remain, even after two years' service.

Two years' service is thus perfectly adequate to train our soldiers for infantry duty. Since the field-artillery was detached from the siege-artillery, the same is true of the foot-artillery; any individual difficulties that may emerge here can be overcome either by further division of labour, or else by simplification of the field-artillery's equipment, which is desirable in any case. The enrolment of a larger number of re-enlisted soldiers would similarly raise no problems, but it is particularly in the Prussian army that this category of men is most unwelcome if they are not fitted to be non-commissioned officers—what a *condemnation* of long service! Only in the siege-artillery, with their great variety of equipment, and in the engineers, with their multiplicity of trades, which of course can never be kept entirely apart, will intelligent re-enlisted soldiers be valuable and yet a rarity. The mounted artillery will require the same length of service as the cavalry.

With regard to the cavalry, men born into the saddle need only a short period of service, whilst for those trained to it long service is indispensable. As we have few men born into the saddle, we undoubtedly need the four-year period of service envisaged by the reorganisation plan. The only form of warfare proper to mounted troops is the massed attack with drawn swords, for the execution of which extreme courage and complete confidence of the men in each other are necessary. The men must therefore know that they can rely on each other and on their commanders. This requires long service. But cavalry is useless if the rider has no confidence in his horse; the man must of course be able to ride, and long service is also necessary for him to be able to ensure control over his horse—i.e., more or less any horse which is assigned to him. In this branch of the service, re-enlisted soldiers are highly desirable, and the more like real mercenaries they are, the better, provided they enjoy the trade. We shall be criticised by members of the opposition on the grounds that this would mean a cavalry made up exclusively of mercenaries who would lend themselves to any coup d'état. We would reply: that may well be. But in present conditions the cavalry will always be reactionary (think of the

Baden dragoons in 1849<sup>40</sup>), just as the artillery will always be liberal. That is in the nature of things. A few re-enlisted soldiers more or less will make no difference. And cavalry is useless on the barricades anyway; and it is the barricades in the big cities, and especially the attitude of the infantry and artillery towards them, which nowadays decide the outcome of any coup d'état.

However, besides increasing the number of re-enlisted soldiers, there are also other means of strengthening the striking power and inner cohesion of a short-service army, such as for instance training camps, which the Minister for War, von Roon, himself described as a way of compensating for the reduction in the length of service. Then there is also the rational organisation of training, with regard to which a great deal remains to be done in Prussia. The whole superstitious notion that if you have short service it has to be compensated for by exaggerated precision on the parade-ground, "clockwork" drilling and ridiculously high leg-lift—"swinging from the hip" to kick nature in the teeth—this whole superstitious notion is based on nothing but exaggeration. The Prussian army has repeated this to itself so often that it has finally become an article of faith. What is gained by men thumping their rifles so violently against their shoulders when doing rifle drill that they almost fall over and a most unmilitary shudder, such as is seen in no other army, passes along the whole rank? Finally, improved physical education of youth must be regarded as counter-balancing the reduction in service—and in the most fundamental way. But it will then also be necessary to make quite certain that something really is done. It is true that in every village school parallel and horizontal bars have been set up, but our poor schoolmasters have little idea of what to do with them. At least one retired non-commissioned officer qualified as a gymnastics teacher should be placed in every district and given charge of physical education; care should be taken to see that young people at school are taught over a period of time to march in formation, to move as a platoon and as a company, and to understand the appropriate commands. In 6-8 years this will pay abundant dividends—there will be more recruits and they will be stronger.

In this critique of the reorganisation plan we have, as we said, confined ourselves solely to the military and political facts of the situation as it is. Among them is the assumption that in present circumstances the legal stipulation of two years' service for infantry and foot-artillery was the maximum reduction in the term of service feasible. We are even of the opinion that a state such as Prussia would commit a blunder of the greatest magnitude—

regardless of which party was in power—if it further reduced the normal term of service at the present moment. As long as we have the French army on the one side, the Russian on the other and the possibility of a combined attack by both at the same time, we need troops who will not have to learn the fundamentals of the art of war when they first face the enemy. We therefore totally discount the fantastic notion of a militia army with as it were no term of service at all; for a country of 18 million inhabitants and very exposed frontiers, such an idea is impossible today, and even if circumstances were different, it would not be possible in this form.

Taking all this into account: could an Assembly having Prussia's interests at heart accept the basic features of the reorganisation plan? Our opinion, which is based on military and political factors, is that to strengthen the cadres in the manner in which this was done, to increase the peace-time army to 180,000-200,000 men, to relegate the first levy of the *Landwehr* to the main army reserve or the second field army-cum-fortress garrisons, was acceptable on condition *that universal conscription was strictly implemented, that a two-year term of service with the colours, three with the reserve and up to the 36th birthday with the Landwehr, was fixed by law and, finally, that the cadres of the first levy of the Landwehr were re-established.* Were these conditions obtainable? Only few people who have followed the debates will deny that this was possible in the "New Era"<sup>41</sup> and perhaps even after that.

So what attitude did the bourgeois opposition adopt?

## II

The Prussian bourgeoisie, which, as the most advanced section of the whole German bourgeoisie, has a right here to be taken as representative of that whole class, is setting a term to its political existence, thanks to a lack of courage which is without parallel in the history even of that pusillanimous class and which is only excused to some extent by contemporary international events. In March and April 1848 it had the whip-hand; but hardly did the first independent stirrings of the working class begin when the bourgeoisie at once took fright and hastily retreated to shelter behind the self-same bureaucracy and the self-same feudal aristocracy which it had but a moment before conquered with the aid of the workers. The Manteuffel era<sup>42</sup> was the inevitable consequence. At last came the "New Era"—which the bourgeois opposition had done nothing to bring about. This unexpected piece of good fortune turned the heads of the bourgeoisie. It quite forgot the position it had created for itself by its repeated revisions of the constitution, its subordination to the bureaucracy and the feudal aristocracy (even to the extent of restoring the feudal Provincial and District Estates<sup>43</sup>) and its constant retreats from one position to the next. It now believed it had the whip-hand again, and quite forgot that it had itself restored all the powers hostile to it, which, subsequently reinvigorated, held the real power in the state in their possession, just as before 1848. Then the reorganisation of the army went off in its midst like a bombshell.

There are only two ways in which the bourgeoisie can gain political power for itself. Since it is an army of officers without any soldiers and can only acquire these soldiers from the ranks of the workers, it must either ensure that the workers are its allies, or it

must buy political power piecemeal from the powers opposing it from above, in particular from the monarchy. The history of the English and French bourgeoisie shows that there is no other way.

But the Prussian bourgeoisie had lost all its enthusiasm—and what is more quite without reason—for forming a sincere alliance with the workers. In 1848 the German workers' party, then still at a rudimentary stage of development and organisation, was prepared to do the bourgeoisie's work for it at a very modest price, but the latter was more afraid of the slightest independent stirring of the proletariat than it was of the feudal aristocracy and the bureaucracy. Peace bought at the price of servitude appeared more desirable to it than even the mere *prospect* of a freedom-struggle.<sup>44</sup> From that time on, this holy fear of the workers had become a habit with the bourgeoisie, until finally Herr Schulze-Delitzsch began his savings-box campaign.<sup>45</sup> The purpose of this was to show the workers that there could be no greater happiness for them than to be exploited industrially by the bourgeoisie for the rest of their lives, and even for generations to come; and indeed, that they should themselves contribute to this exploitation by themselves supplementing their income through all manner of industrial associations, thereby enabling the capitalists to reduce their wages. But although no doubt the industrial bourgeoisie is the most uneducated of the classes that constitute the German nation, apart from the junior cavalry officers, such a campaign had from the outset no prospect of lasting success with such an intellectually advanced people as the Germans. The more intelligent of the bourgeoisie themselves could not fail to perceive that nothing could come of this, and the alliance with the workers collapsed once more.

Which left bargaining with the government for political power, to be paid for in cash—from the pockets of the people, naturally. The bourgeoisie's *real* power in the state consisted only in the right to approve taxation, and even that was much hedged about with ifs and buts. This, then, is where the lever needed to be applied, and a class so skilled in bargaining could surely not fail to be at an advantage here.

But no. The bourgeois opposition in Prussia—in complete contrast especially to the classical bourgeoisie of England in the 17th and 18th centuries—saw the situation like this: they would bargain for power *without* paying any money for it.

Simply from the bourgeois point of view and taking full account of the circumstances in which the reorganisation of the army was put forward, what policy ought the bourgeois opposition to have



adopted now? If it appraised its own strength correctly, it could not have been unaware that having only just risen again from its humiliation at the hands of Manteuffel—and indeed without exerting itself to that end in the slightest—it was certainly powerless to prevent the plan being put into *actual practice*, a process which was in fact initiated. It could not be unaware that with every session that passed fruitlessly, the new, actually existing arrangement would be harder to abolish; that with each passing year the government would therefore offer less in exchange for the Chamber's approval. It could not be unaware that it was very far from being able to appoint and dismiss ministers, and that the longer the conflict lasted, therefore, the fewer would be the ministers it faced who would be inclined to compromise. Finally, it could not be unaware that it was above all in its own interest not to push the matter to the extreme. For at that stage in the development of the German workers, a serious conflict with the government could not fail to give rise to an independent workers' movement and thereby in the extreme case present it once again with the dilemma: either an alliance with the workers, but this time under far less favourable conditions than in 1848, or alternatively to go on bended knees before the government and confess: *pater, peccavi!*<sup>a</sup>

The liberal and progressist bourgeoisie<sup>46</sup> ought consequently to have subjected the reorganisation of the army and the necessarily concomitant increase in peace-time strength to a cool and objective examination, in which case they would probably have come to approximately the same conclusions as we ourselves. In so doing they should not have forgotten that after all they could not prevent the provisional introduction of the new system and could only delay its eventual consolidation, as long as the plan contained so many correct and useful elements. Above all therefore they ought to have taken good care not to adopt from the outset a directly hostile attitude to reorganisation; they ought on the contrary to have used this reorganisation and the finance that needed to be approved for it to obtain for themselves as much reimbursement from the "New Era" as possible, to convert the 9 or 10 million in new taxation into as much political power for themselves as possible.

And there were certainly enough things to be done in that regard! There was all Manteuffel's legislation concerning the press and the right of association; there were all the powers accorded to

<sup>a</sup> Father, I have sinned! (Luke 15:21).—Ed.

the police and bureaucracy which had been taken over unchanged from the absolute monarchy; the emasculation of the courts by disputing their competence; the Provincial and District Estates; above all, the way in which the constitution was interpreted under Manteuffel, which needed to be countered by a new constitutional practice; the attrition of local self-government in the towns by the bureaucracy; and a hundred and one other things for which any other bourgeoisie in the same situation would gladly have paid a tax-increase of  $\frac{1}{2}$  Taler per head of population and all of which they could have obtained if they had proceeded with a modicum of skill. But the bourgeois opposition thought otherwise. As far as freedom of the press, association and assembly were concerned, Manteuffel's laws had hit upon precisely that degree of freedom under which the bourgeoisie felt comfortable. It could demonstrate gently against the government without let or hindrance; any increase in freedom would have brought less advantage to it than to the workers, and rather than give the workers freedom for an independent movement, the bourgeoisie preferred to submit to a little more coercion on the part of the government. Precisely the same thing applied to the limitation of the powers enjoyed by the police and bureaucracy. The bourgeoisie believed that with the "New Era" ministry it had already got the better of the bureaucracy, and it approved of this bureaucracy keeping a free hand to deal with the workers. It quite forgot that the bureaucracy was far stronger and more vigorous than any ministry that might be well disposed towards the bourgeoisie. And then it imagined that with the fall of Manteuffel the millennium had arrived for the bourgeoisie and that all that was left to do was to reap the ripe harvest of bourgeois hegemony, without paying a penny for it.

But what about all the finance that would have to be approved, when those few years after 1848 had cost so much money, so increased the national debt and raised taxation to such heights?—Gentlemen, you are the representatives of the youngest constitutional state in the world, and you do not know that constitutional government is the most expensive form of government in the world? Almost more expensive than Bonapartism even, which—*après moi le déluge*<sup>a</sup>—pays off old debts by constantly incurring new ones and thus mortgages a century's resources in ten years? The golden days of limited absolutism, whose memory still haunts you, are gone forever.

But what about the clauses in the constitution relating to the

---

<sup>a</sup> After me the deluge (attributed to Louis XV and Mme. Pompadour).—*Ed.*

continued levying of taxes once they have been approved?—Everyone knows how coy the “New Era” was about asking for money. It would not have been a great loss to have included the costs of reorganisation in the budget, in exchange for a cast-iron guarantee of concessions. It was a question of approving new taxation to cover these costs. Here was an opportunity for being miserly, and for that no better ministry could have been hoped for than that of the “New Era”. You would have retained the whip-hand insofar as you had previously held it, and you would have won new instruments of power in other areas.

But would one not have strengthened reaction if one had doubled the army which is its chief weapon?—This is an issue where the progressist bourgeoisie runs into indissoluble conflict with itself. It asks of Prussia that it should play the part of the Piedmont of Germany. This requires a strong army with striking-power. It has a “New Era” ministry which secretly shares the same ideas, the best ministry which in the circumstances it can have. It *denies* this ministry army reinforcements.—Day after day, from morn till night, it talks about nothing but the glory of Prussia, the greatness of Prussia, the growth of Prussia’s power; but it *denies* the Prussian army reinforcements which would only be of the same order as those which the other great powers have themselves introduced since 1814.—What is the reason for all this? The reason is that it is afraid these reinforcements might benefit only reaction, might revive the decayed officer-aristocracy and in general give the feudal and bureaucratic-absolutist party the power to inter all constitutional government with a coup d’état.

Admittedly, the progressist bourgeoisie was right not to strengthen reaction, and the army was the surest bastion of reaction. But was there ever a better opportunity to bring the army under the control of the Chamber than this very reorganisation, proposed by the ministry most well-disposed towards the bourgeoisie that Prussia had ever experienced in peaceful times? As soon as the reinforcement of the army had been declared approved on certain conditions, was not this the precise moment in which to try to settle the matter of the cadet-schools, the preferential treatment of the aristocracy and all the other grievances, and to obtain guarantees which would give the officer-corps a more bourgeois character? The “New Era” was clear about one thing only: that the reinforcement of the army had to be pushed through. The devious paths and subterfuges by which it carried reorganisation through proved more than anything its bad conscience and its fear of the deputies. This

opportunity needed to be seized with both hands; such a chance for the bourgeoisie could not be expected again in a hundred years. What might not be extracted from this ministry, in point of detail, if the progressist bourgeoisie viewed the situation not as misers but as great speculators!

And then what about the practical consequences of reorganisation on the officer-corps itself! Officers had to be found for twice the number of battalions. The cadet-schools became totally inadequate. There had never been such liberality before in peace-time; lieutenant's commissions were positively offered as bounty to students, probationary lawyers and all educated young men. Anyone seeing the Prussian army again after reorganisation found the officer-corps unrecognisable. We say this not from hearsay but from our own observation. That dialect peculiar to lieutenants had been pushed into the background, the younger officers spoke their natural mother-tongue, they were by no means members of an exclusive caste but more than at any time since 1815 represented all educated classes and all provinces in the state. Here, then, the force of events had enabled this position to be won; it was now just a matter of maintaining and making full use of it. Instead, all this was ignored and talked away by the progressist bourgeoisie, as though all these officers were aristocratic cadets. And yet since 1815 there had never been more bourgeois officers in Prussia than at that very moment.

And incidentally we would attribute the gallant conduct of the Prussian officers before the enemy in the Schleswig-Holstein war<sup>47</sup> chiefly to this infusion of new blood. The old class of junior officers by themselves would not have dared to act so often on their own responsibility. In this connection the government is right in saying that reorganisation had an important influence on the "panache" of these successes; in what other respect reorganisation struck terror into the hearts of the Danes is not apparent to us.

Finally, the main point: would reinforcement of the peace-time army facilitate a coup d'état?—It is perfectly true that armies are the instrument by which coups d'état are effected, and that any reinforcement of an army therefore also increases the feasibility of a coup d'état. But the strength of army required by a great power is not determined by the greater or lesser likelihood of a coup d'état but by the size of the armies of the other great powers. In for a penny, in for a pound. If one accepts a mandate as a Prussian deputy, if one emblazons the Greatness of Prussia and Her Power in Europe on one's escutcheon, then one must also

agree to the means being procured without which there can be no question of Prussia's greatness and power. If these means cannot be procured without facilitating a coup d'état, so much the worse for these gentlemen of Progress. Had they not conducted themselves in such an absurdly cowardly and clumsy fashion in 1848, the era of coups d'état would probably have been long past. In the circumstances obtaining, however, they have no choice but finally to accept the reinforcement of the army in one form or another after all and to keep their anxieties about coups d'état to themselves.

However, there are yet other aspects to the matter. Firstly, it would always have been more advisable to negotiate approval of the means for a coup d'état with a "New Era" ministry than with a ministry headed by Bismarck. Secondly, it is self-evident that every further step towards the real implementation of universal conscription makes the Prussian army a less fitting instrument for a coup d'état. As soon as the demand for self-government and the necessity of the struggle against all recalcitrant elements had once penetrated the whole mass of the people, even 20-21-year-old young men would inevitably have been caught up in the movement, and even under feudal and absolutist officers, they would necessarily have lent themselves less and less readily to the making of a coup d'état. The further the political education of the country progresses, the more intractable will become the mood of the called-up conscripts. Even the present struggle between the government and bourgeoisie must already have provided testimony of this.

Thirdly, the two-year term of service sufficiently outweighs the increase in the army. To the extent that reinforcement of the army increases the government's material capacity for coups d'état, to that extent will the two-year term of service lessen its moral capacity to do so. In the third year of service the continual inculcation of absolutist doctrines and the habit of obedience may bear some immediate fruit among the soldiers, and for the duration of their service. In the third year of service, when the individual soldier has scarcely anything more of a military nature to learn, our compulsory conscript already begins somewhat to resemble the long-serving soldier of the Franco-Austrian system. He acquires some of the characteristics of the professional soldier and as such is always far more compliant than the younger soldier. The retirement of the men in their third year of service would undoubtedly compensate for the recruitment of 60,000 to 80,000 extra men, from the point of view of a coup d'état.

But there is yet another point, which is crucial. We would not deny that circumstances might arise—we know our bourgeoisie too well for that—in which a coup d'état might nevertheless be possible, even without mobilisation and simply using the standing peace-time army. However that is unlikely. In order to carry out a large-scale coup, it will almost always be necessary to mobilise. And this is what will tip the balance. The Prussian peace-time army may in certain circumstances become a mere tool in the government's hands, for domestic use; the Prussian war-time army would certainly never do so. Anyone who has ever had the opportunity of seeing a battalion first on its peace-time footing and then on a war footing will be familiar with the enormous difference in the whole attitude of the men, in their collective character. The men who had joined the army as little more than boys now return to it as men; they bring with them a fund of self-respect, self-confidence, solidity and character which benefits the whole battalion. The relationship of men to officers and officers to men is at once different. Militarily the battalion is substantially stronger for this, but politically it becomes—for absolutist purposes—totally untrustworthy. This could be seen even during the entry to Schleswig, where to the great astonishment of English newspaper-correspondents Prussian soldiers everywhere openly took part in political demonstrations and fearlessly expressed their by no means orthodox views. And this result—the political decomposition of the mobilised army for absolutist purposes—we chiefly owe to the Manteuffel period and to the “Newest” Era. In 1848 the situation was still quite different.

And that is in fact one of the most positive aspects of the Prussian military system, both before and after reorganisation: that with *this* military system Prussia can neither wage an unpopular war nor carry out a coup d'état which has any prospect of permanence. For even if the peace-time army did allow itself to be used for a small coup d'état, then the first mobilisation and the first threat of war would suffice to call all these “achievements” in question once more. Without the ratification of the war-time army, the heroic deeds of the peace-time army against the “enemy within” would be merely of temporary significance; and the longer this ratification takes, the harder it will be to obtain. Reactionary papers have stated that the “army”, as opposed to parliament, truly represents the people. By this they meant of course only the officers. If it should ever happen that the gentlemen of the *Kreuz-Zeitung* were to carry out a coup d'état, for which they would need the *mobilised* army, these people's representatives

would give them the shock of their lives, they may be sure of that.

Ultimately however that is not the main safeguard against a coup d'état either. That is to be found in the fact that no coup d'état can enable a government to convene a Chamber which will approve new taxation and loans for it; and that, even if it did manage to find a Chamber willing to do so, no banker in Europe would give it credit on the basis of resolutions passed by such a Chamber. In most European states the position would be different. But it so happens that, since the promises made in 1815<sup>48</sup> and the many futile manoeuvres aimed at raising money from then up until 1848, it is generally accepted that no one may lend Prussia a penny without the legal and unimpeachable approval of the Chamber. Even Herr Raphael von Erlanger, who after all did lend money to the American Confederates,<sup>49</sup> would scarcely entrust cash to a government that had come to power in Prussia through a coup d'état. Prussia owes this simply and solely to the narrow-mindedness of absolutism.

And this is where the strength of the bourgeoisie lies: that if the government gets into financial difficulties—which sooner or later it is bound to do—it is *itself* obliged to turn to the bourgeoisie for money, and this time not to the political representatives of the bourgeoisie who are ultimately aware that they exist to provide money, but to the great financiers, who would like a profitable transaction with the government, who measure the credit-worthiness of a government by the same token as they would any private individual and are quite indifferent to the question of whether the Prussian state needs more soldiers or less. These gentlemen only discount bills of exchange which bear three signatures, and if one has only been signed by the Upper House, in addition to the government, and not by the House of Deputies, or by a House of Deputies consisting of puppets, they regard this as unsound practice and decline the deal.

It is at this point that the military question ends and the constitutional question begins. It is immaterial by what errors and complications the bourgeois opposition is now forced into the following position: it must fight the military question through to the end, or it will lose the remnants of political power it still possesses. The government has already called in question its whole right to approve budgets. But if the government sooner or later nevertheless *has to* make its peace with the Chamber, is not the best policy in this situation simply to remain adamant until that moment arrives?

Now that the conflict has in fact been taken to these lengths—the answer can only be yes. The possibility of coming to an agreement on an acceptable basis with this government is more than doubtful. By overestimating its own strength, the bourgeoisie has got itself into the situation of having to use this military question as a test-case to see whether it is the decisive force in the state or nothing at all. If it wins, it will simultaneously acquire the power of appointing and dismissing ministers, such as the English Lower House possesses. If it is vanquished, it will never again achieve any kind of significance by constitutional means.

But no one familiar with our German bourgeoisie will expect such perseverance from it. The courage of the bourgeoisie in political matters is always exactly proportional to the importance that it enjoys in the civil society of the country in question. In Germany the social power of the bourgeoisie is far less than in England and even in France; it has neither allied itself with the old aristocracy as in England, nor destroyed it with the help of the peasants and workers as in France. The feudal aristocracy in Germany is still a power, a power hostile to the bourgeoisie and, what is more, allied to government. Factory industry, the basis of all social power of the modern bourgeoisie, is far less developed in Germany than in France and England, enormous though its progress has been since 1848. The colossal accumulations of capital that frequently occur in individual classes in England and even France are rarer in Germany. This is the reason for the petty-bourgeois character of our bourgeoisie as a whole. The circumstances in which it lives and the range of thought of which it is capable are of a petty kind; is it surprising that its whole mentality is equally petty! How could it be expected to find the courage to fight an issue through to the bitter end? The Prussian bourgeoisie knows very well how dependent it is on the government for its own industrial activity. Concessions<sup>50</sup> and administrative checks weigh down on it like a bad dream. The government can make difficulties for it in any new enterprise, and nowhere more so than in the political sphere! In the course of the dispute over the military question, the bourgeois Chamber can only adopt a negative stance, it is driven purely on to the defensive; meanwhile the government moves over to the attack, interprets the constitution in its own way, disciplines liberal officials, annuls liberal municipal elections, sets all the wheels of bureaucratic power in motion to impress on the bourgeoisie its status as subjects; in fact overruns one line of defence after another and thus conquers for itself a position such as even Manteuffel did not have. Meanwhile the unbudgeted spending of money and levying of taxes quietly



continues, and the reorganisation of the army gains new strength with every year of its existence. In short, the prospect of an eventual victory for the bourgeoisie takes on a more revolutionary character with each passing year, and the government's tactical victories in every field, as they multiply day by day, increasingly assume the form of faits accomplis. On top of this there is a workers' movement completely independent of bourgeoisie and government alike, which compels the bourgeoisie either to make the most ominous concessions to the workers, or to face up to having to act without the workers at the decisive moment. Can the Prussian bourgeoisie be expected in these circumstances to have the courage to remain adamant, come what may? It would have to have changed remarkably for the better since 1848—by its own lights—and the yearning for compromise which has found expression daily in the sighs of the Party of Progress since the opening of this session, is not an auspicious sign. We fear that on this occasion too the bourgeoisie will have no scruples in betraying its own cause.

## III

“What attitude then does the workers’ party adopt towards this reorganisation of the army and the ensuing conflict between government and bourgeois opposition?”

For its political activity to develop fully, the working class needs a far wider arena than is offered by the separate states of today’s fragmented Germany. Particularism will hamper the free movement of the proletariat, but its existence will never be justified and will never merit serious consideration. The German proletariat will never have any truck with Imperial Constitutions, Prussian hegemonies, tripartite systems<sup>51</sup> and the like, unless it be to sweep them away; it is indifferent to the question of how many soldiers the Prussian state needs in order to prolong its vegetable existence as a great power. Whether reorganisation means some slight increase to the military burden or not, will make little difference to the working class as a *class*. On the other hand it certainly cannot remain indifferent to the question of whether or not universal conscription is fully implemented. The more workers who are trained in the use of weapons the better. Universal conscription is the necessary and natural corollary of universal suffrage; it puts the voters in the position of being able to enforce their decisions gun in hand against any attempt at a coup d’état.

The only aspect of army reorganisation in Prussia which is of interest to the German working class is the increasingly thorough implementation of universal conscription.

More important is the question: what attitude should the

workers' party adopt to the ensuing conflict between government and Chamber.

The modern worker, the proletarian, is a product of the great industrial revolution which has totally revolutionised the whole mode of production in all civilised countries, first in industry and subsequently in agriculture too, especially in the last hundred years, and as a result of it only two classes are still involved in production: the class of capitalists, who are in possession of the tools of labour, raw materials and means of subsistence, and the class of workers who possess neither the tools of labour, nor raw materials, nor food, but must first buy the latter from the capitalists with their labour. The modern proletarian therefore only has direct dealings with *one* class of society, which is hostile to him and exploits him: the class of capitalists, the bourgeoisie. In countries where this industrial revolution is complete, as in England, the worker really does have dealings only with capitalists, for even on the land the large tenant-farmer is nothing other than a capitalist; the aristocrat, who merely lives off the rent from his estates, has no points of social contact with the workers at all.

It is different in countries where this industrial revolution is only now taking place, such as in Germany. Here there are still numerous social elements which have survived from former feudal and post-feudal conditions, and which, if we may so express ourselves, cloud the solution (medium) that is society and deny the social condition of Germany that simple, clear, classical character which distinguishes England's stage of development. Here, in an atmosphere of daily modernisation, and amongst thoroughly modern capitalists and workers, we find the most wonderful antediluvian fossils alive and active: feudal lords, seignorial courts, country squires, birching, central government officials, local government officials, craft corporations, conflicts of authority, bureaucracy with penal powers, etc. And we find that in the struggle for political power all these living fossils are banding themselves together against the bourgeoisie, whose property makes it the most powerful class of the new epoch and who is demanding that the former should surrender political power to it in the name of the new epoch.

Apart from the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the large industry of today also gives rise to a kind of intermediate class between the two, the petty bourgeoisie. This consists partly of the relics of the former semi-medieval burghers and partly of workers who have risen somewhat in the world. Its function consists less in the production than in the distribution of goods; the retail trade is its

main activity. Whilst the old burghers were the most stable class in society, the modern petty bourgeoisie is the most changeable; bankruptcy has become one of its institutions. With its slender capital it shares the status of the bourgeoisie, but by the insecurity of its livelihood it shares that of the proletariat. Its political position is as contradictory as its social being; in general however "pure democracy" is its most proper expression. Its political vocation is to encourage the bourgeoisie in its struggle against the relics of the old society and especially against its own weakness and cowardice, and to help win those freedoms—freedom of the press, freedom of association and assembly, universal suffrage, local self-government—without which, despite its bourgeois character, a timid bourgeoisie can manage passably well but without which the workers can never win their emancipation.

In the course of the struggle between the relics of the old, antediluvian society and the bourgeoisie, sooner or later the time always comes when both combatants turn to the proletariat and seek its support. This moment usually coincides with the first stirrings of the working class itself. The feudal and bureaucratic representatives of the declining society appeal to the workers to join them in attacking the blood-suckers, the capitalists, the sole foes of the worker; the bourgeoisie make it clear to the workers that they jointly represent the new social era and therefore have a common interest at least with regard to the declining, *old* form of society. At about this time the working class then gradually becomes aware that it is a class in its own right with its own interests and its own independent future; and that gives rise to the question, which has forced itself upon their attention in England, in France and in Germany successively: what attitude should the workers' party adopt towards the combatants?

Above all this will depend on what kind of aims the workers' party, i.e., that part of the working class which has become aware of its common class interests, is striving for in the interests of that class.

It seems that the most advanced workers in Germany are demanding the emancipation of the workers from the capitalists by the transfer of state capital to associations of workers, so that production can be organised, without capitalists, for general account; and as a means to the achievement of this end: the conquest of political power by universal direct suffrage.<sup>52</sup>

This much is now clear: neither the feudal-bureaucratic party, which for the sake of brevity is customarily referred to as *reaction*,

nor the liberal-radical bourgeois party, will be inclined to concede these demands of their own volition. But the proletariat will become a power from the moment when an independent workers' party is formed, and a power has to be reckoned with. Both warring parties know this and will at the appropriate moment therefore tend to make apparent or real concessions to the workers. From which side can the workers wring the greatest concessions?

The mere existence of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is a thorn in the flesh of the reactionary party. Its power is based on suppressing or at least obstructing present-day social development. Otherwise all the possessing classes will gradually be transformed into capitalists and all the oppressed classes into proletarians, and in the process the reactionary party will disappear of its own accord. To be consistent, reaction will indeed attempt to dispose of the proletariat, however not by proceeding to association but by turning the present-day proletarians back into guild-journeymen or restoring them to a state of complete or semi-peasant serfdom. Is such a restoration in the interest of our proletarians? Do they wish to return to the paternal discipline of the guild-master and "his lordship", if such were possible? Surely not. For it is only when the working class became divorced from all these sham possessions and sham privileges of former times and the naked conflict between capital and labour became apparent that the very existence of a single great working class with common interests, a workers' movement and a workers' party became possible at all. And what is more, it is simply impossible to turn back the clock of history in this way. The steam-engines, the mechanical spinning and weaving looms, the steam-ploughs and threshing machines, the railways and electric telegraphs and the steam-presses of the present day do not permit such an absurd backward step, on the contrary, they are gradually and remorselessly destroying all the relics of feudal and guild conditions and are reducing all the petty social contradictions surviving from former times to the one contradiction of world-historical significance: that between capital and labour.

The bourgeoisie, on the other hand, has no other historical function than to proliferate in every field the aforesaid gigantic forces of production and means of communication in present-day society and intensify them to the utmost; to use their credit institutions to take over the means of production handed down from former times as well, landed property in particular; to operate every branch of production by modern means; to destroy

all relics of feudal forms of production and feudal conditions and thus reduce the whole of society to the simple contradiction that exists between a class of capitalists and a class of unpropertied workers. As these contradictions between classes in society are simplified, so the power of the bourgeoisie grows, but at the same time the proletariat's power, class-consciousness and potential for victory grow even more; it is only this increase in the power of the bourgeoisie that gradually enables the proletariat to become the majority, the dominant majority in the state, as it already is in England, but by no means yet in Germany, where in the country peasants of every kind and in the towns small craftsmen and shopkeepers, etc., are still outnumbering it.

Hence: every victory by reaction impedes social development and inevitably delays the time when the workers will be victorious. Every victory by the bourgeoisie over reaction on the other hand is at the same time in one sense a victory for the workers, contributes to the final downfall of capitalist rule and brings the moment closer when the workers will defeat the bourgeoisie.

Let us compare the position of the German workers' party in 1848 and now. There are in Germany still plenty of veterans who were involved in the initial stages of founding a German workers' party before 1848, and who after the revolution helped develop it for as long as the conditions of the time permitted. They all know the trouble it took, even in those agitated times, to set up a workers' movement, to keep it going and to get rid of reactionary guild-minded elements, and how a few years later the whole movement went back to sleep. If a workers' movement has now sprung up as it were of its own accord, what is the explanation? It is that since 1848 large-scale bourgeois industry has made unprecedented advances in Germany, because it has eliminated a great number of small craftsmen and other intermediaries between worker and capitalist, has brought a great number of workers into direct conflict with the capitalists, and in short has created a significant proletariat where previously one did not exist or did so only on a small scale. This development of industry has made a workers' party and workers' movement a necessity.

That is not to say that there may not be times when it appears advisable to reaction to make concessions to the workers. But these concessions are always of a very particular kind. They are never of a political nature. Feudal-bureaucratic reaction will neither extend the franchise nor grant freedom of the press, association and assembly, nor restrict the power of the bureaucracy. The concessions which it does make are always aimed directly against

the bourgeoisie, and are such as do not increase the political power of the workers at all. Thus in England the ten-hour law for factory-workers was passed against the wishes of the manufacturers.<sup>53</sup> Thus in Prussia the strict observance of the regulations concerning working hours in the factories—which exist at present only on paper—and in addition the right of association for workers,<sup>54</sup> etc., could be demanded from the government and possibly obtained. But it is clear that all these concessions on the part of reaction are obtained without anything being offered in return by the workers, and rightly so, for simply by aggravating the bourgeoisie reaction has gained its ends, and the workers owe it no debt of gratitude, nor do they ever express any.

But there is another form of reaction which has enjoyed much success in recent times and is becoming highly fashionable in certain circles; this is the form nowadays called Bonapartism. Bonapartism is the necessary form of state in a country where the working class, at a high level of its development in the towns but numerically inferior to the small peasants in rural areas, has been defeated in a great revolutionary struggle by the capitalist class, the petty bourgeoisie and the army. When the Parisian workers were defeated in the titanic struggle of June 1848 in France, the bourgeoisie had at the same time totally exhausted itself in this victory. It was aware it could not afford a second such victory. It continued to rule in name, but it was too weak to govern. Control was assumed by the army, the real victor, basing itself on the class from which it preferred to draw its recruits, the small peasants, who wanted peace from the rioters in the towns. The form this rule took was of course military despotism, its natural leader the hereditary heir to the latter, Louis Bonaparte.

As far as both workers and capitalists are concerned, Bonapartism is characterised by the fact that it prevents them coming to blows with each other. In other words, it protects the bourgeoisie from any violent attacks by the workers, encourages a little gentle skirmishing between the two classes and furthermore deprives both alike of the faintest trace of political power. No freedom of association, no freedom of assembly, no freedom of the press; universal suffrage under such bureaucratic pressure that election of the opposition is almost impossible; police-control of a kind that had previously been unknown even in police-ridden France. Besides which, sections of the bourgeoisie and of the workers are simply *bought*; the former by colossal credit-swindles, by which the money of the small capitalists is attracted into the pockets of the

big ones; the latter by colossal state construction-schemes which concentrate an artificial, imperial proletariat dependent on the government in the big towns alongside the natural, independent proletariat. Finally, national pride is flattered by apparently heroic wars, which are however always conducted with the approval of the high authorities of Europe against the general scapegoat of the day and only on such conditions as ensure victory from the outset.

The most that such a government can do either for the workers or for the bourgeoisie is to allow them to recuperate from the struggle, to allow industry to develop strongly—other circumstances being favourable—to allow the elements of a new and more violent struggle to evolve therefore, and to allow this struggle to erupt as soon as the need for such recuperation has passed. It would be the absolute height of folly to expect any more for the workers from a government which exists simply and solely for the purpose of holding the workers in check as far as the bourgeoisie is concerned.

Let us now turn to the specific issue we have before us. What can reaction in Prussia offer the workers' party?

Can this reaction offer the working class a real share of political power?—Definitely not. Firstly no reactionary government has ever done so in recent history, either in England or in France. Secondly, the present struggle in Prussia is concerned precisely with whether the government is to unite all real power in itself or to share it with parliament. And the government will certainly not use every means available to it to wrest power from the bourgeoisie, merely to make a present of that power to the proletariat!

The feudal aristocracy and the bureaucracy can retain their real power in Prussia even without parliamentary representation. Their traditional position at the court, in the army and in the civil service guarantees them this power. They may even not want any special representation, since after all there can be no question in Prussia nowadays of permanent chambers of the nobility and bureaucracy such as existed under Manteuffel. They would therefore dearly like to consign parliament and all its trappings to oblivion.

On the other hand the bourgeoisie and workers can only exercise real, organised, political power through parliamentary representation; and such parliamentary representation is valueless unless it has a voice and a share in making decisions, in other words, unless it holds the "purse-strings". That however is



precisely what Bismarck on his own admission is trying to prevent. We ask: is it in the interests of the workers that this parliament should be robbed of all power, this parliament which they themselves hope to enter by winning universal direct suffrage and in which they hope one day to form the majority? Is it in their interests to set all the wheels of agitation in motion in order to enter an assembly whose words ultimately carry no weight? Surely not.

But what if the government were to overturn the present electoral law and decree universal direct suffrage? Yes, *if!* *If* the government were to carry out such a Bonapartist trick and the workers swallowed it, they would thereby from the start have acknowledged the government's right to suspend universal direct suffrage again by a new edict whenever it thought fit, and what would all this universal direct suffrage be worth then?

*If* the government decreed universal direct suffrage, it would from the outset hedge it about with so many ifs and buts that it would in fact not be universal direct suffrage at all any more.

And regarding universal direct suffrage itself, one has only to go to France to realise what tame elections it can give rise to, if one has only a large and ignorant rural population, a well-organised bureaucracy, a well-regimented press, associations sufficiently kept down by the police and no political meetings at all. How many workers' representatives does universal direct suffrage send to the French chamber, then? And yet the French proletariat has the advantage over the German of far greater concentration and longer experience of struggle and organisation.

Which brings us to yet another point. In Germany the rural population is twice the size of the urban population, i.e.,  $\frac{2}{3}$  earn their living from agriculture and  $\frac{1}{3}$  from industry. And since in Germany the big landowner is the rule and the small peasant with his strips the exception, put another way that means: if  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the workers are at the beck and call of the capitalists,  $\frac{2}{3}$  are *at the beck and call of the feudal lords*. Let those who never stop railing at the capitalists but never utter a word in anger against the feudalists take that to heart!<sup>55</sup> The feudalists exploit twice as many workers in Germany as the bourgeoisie; in Germany they are just as directly opposed to the workers as the capitalists. But that is by no means all. The patriarchal economic system on the old feudal estates generates a hereditary dependence of the rural day labourer or cottager on "his lordship" which makes it far more difficult for the agricultural proletarian to enter the urban

workers' movement. The clergy, the systematic obscurantism in the country, the bad schooling and the remoteness of the people from the world at large do the rest. The agricultural proletariat is the section of the working class which has most difficulty in understanding its own interests and its own social situation and is the last to do so, in other words, it is the section which remains the longest as an unconscious tool in the hands of the privileged class which is exploiting it. And which class is that? Not the bourgeoisie, in Germany, but the *feudal aristocracy*. Now even in France, where after all virtually all the peasants are free and own their land, and where the feudal aristocracy has long been deprived of all political power, universal suffrage has not put workers into the Chamber but has almost totally excluded them from it. What would be the consequence of universal suffrage in Germany, where the feudal aristocracy is still a real social and political power and where there are two agricultural day labourers for every industrial worker? The battle against feudal and bureaucratic reaction—for the two are inseparable in our country—is in Germany identical with the struggle for the intellectual and political emancipation of the rural proletariat—and until such time as the rural proletariat is also swept along into the movement, the urban proletariat cannot and will not achieve anything at all in Germany and universal direct suffrage will not be a weapon for the proletariat but a *snare*.

Perhaps this exceptionally candid but necessary analysis will encourage the feudalists to espouse the cause of universal direct suffrage. So much the better.

Or do we imagine that the government is only stultifying the press, the right of association and the right of assembly, as far as the bourgeois opposition is concerned (if indeed there is much left to be stultified in present conditions) in order to make a present of a free press and free rights of association and assembly to the workers? Is not the workers' movement in fact calmly continuing on its own untroubled way?

But that is precisely the crux of the matter. The government *knows*, and the bourgeoisie knows too, that the whole German workers' movement today is only *tolerated*, only survives, for as long as the government *chooses*. For as long as it serves the government's purpose for this movement to exist and for the bourgeois opposition to be faced with new, independent opponents, thus long will it tolerate this movement. From the moment that this movement turns the workers into an independent force, and thereby becomes a danger to the government, there will be an

abrupt end to it all. The whole manner in which the men-of-Progress agitation in the press, associations and assemblies has been put down, should serve as a warning to the workers. The same laws, edicts and measures which were applied in that case, can be applied against them at any time and deal a lethal blow to their agitation; and they will be so applied as soon as this agitation becomes dangerous. It is of the greatest importance that the workers should be clear about this point, and do not fall prey to the same illusion as the bourgeoisie in the "New Era", when they were similarly only *tolerated* but imagined they were already in the saddle. And if anyone should imagine the present government would free the press, the right of association and the right of assembly from their present fetters, he is clearly among those to whom there is no point in talking. And unless there is freedom of the press, the right of association and the right of assembly, no workers' movement is possible.

The present government in Prussia is not so naive as to be likely to cut its own throat. And if it should ever happen that reaction were to throw a few sham political concessions to the German proletariat as a bait—then let us hope the German proletariat will answer with the proud words of the old *Lay of Hildebrand*<sup>56</sup>:

"Mit gêrû scal man geba infâhan, ort widar orte."

With the spear one should accept gifts, point against point.

Concerning the *social* concessions which reaction could offer to the workers—reduction of working hours in the factories, improved operation of the factory acts, the right of association, etc.—experience in every country has shown that reaction makes such propositions without the workers having to offer the slightest thing in return. Reaction needs the workers, but the workers do not need reaction. Therefore as long as the workers insist on these points in their own independent agitation, they can rest assured that the moment will come when reactionary elements will make the same demands merely in order to provoke the bourgeoisie; and in this way the workers will make gains over the bourgeoisie, without owing reaction any debt of gratitude.

But if the workers' party can expect nothing from reaction except small concessions which will come to it anyway without it needing to go begging for them—what then can it expect from the bourgeois opposition?

We have seen that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are both progeny of a new era and that in their social function both are

striving to eliminate the remnants of the bric-à-brac left over from earlier times. It is true that there is a most serious conflict to be settled between them, but this conflict can only be fought out when they are facing each other alone. Only by jettisoning the old lumber can the "decks be cleared for battle"—except that this time the battle will be fought not between two ships but on board the one ship, between officers and crew.

The bourgeoisie cannot win political power for itself nor give this political power constitutional and legal forms without at the same time putting weapons into the hands of the proletariat. As distinct from the old Estates, distinguished by birth, it must proclaim human rights, as distinct from the guilds, it must proclaim freedom of trade and industry, as distinct from the tutelage of the bureaucracy, it must proclaim freedom and self-government. To be consistent, it must therefore demand universal, direct suffrage, freedom of the press, association and assembly and the suspension of all special laws directed against individual classes of the population. And there is nothing else that the proletariat needs to demand from it. It cannot require that the bourgeoisie should cease to be a bourgeoisie, but it certainly can require that it practises its own principles consistently. But the proletariat will thereby also acquire all the weapons it needs for its ultimate victory. With freedom of the press and the right of assembly and association it will win universal suffrage, and with universal, direct suffrage, in conjunction with the above tools of agitation, it will win everything else.

It is therefore in the interests of the workers to support the bourgeoisie in its struggle against all reactionary elements, *as long as it remains true to itself*. Every gain which the bourgeoisie extracts from reaction, eventually benefits the working class, if that condition is fulfilled. And the German workers were quite correct in their instinctive appreciation of this. Everywhere, in every German state, they have quite rightly voted for the most radical candidates who had any prospect of getting in.

But what if the bourgeoisie is untrue to itself and betrays its own class interests, together with the principles these imply?

Then there are two paths left to the workers!

Either to drive the bourgeoisie on against its will and compel it as far as possible to extend the suffrage, to grant freedom of the press, association and assembly and thereby to create an arena for the proletariat in which it can move freely and organise. This is what the English workers have done since the Reform Bill of 1832

and the French workers since the July Revolution of 1830, furthering their own development and organisation precisely through and with this movement, whose immediate aims were purely bourgeois in nature, more than by any other method. There will always be cases like this, for with its lack of political courage the bourgeoisie everywhere will occasionally be untrue to itself.

Or alternatively, the workers might withdraw entirely from the bourgeois movement and leave the bourgeoisie to its fate. This was what happened in England, France and Germany after the failure of the European workers' movement from 1848 to 1850. It can only happen after violent and temporarily fruitless exertions, after which the class needs to rest. It cannot happen when the working class is in a healthy condition, for it would be the equivalent of total political abdication, and a class which is courageous by nature, a class which has nothing to lose and everything to gain, is incapable of that in the long term.

Even if the worst came to the worst and the bourgeoisie was to scurry under the skirts of reaction for fear of the workers, and appeal to the power of those elements hostile to itself for protection against them—even then the workers' party would have no choice but, notwithstanding the bourgeoisie, to continue its campaign for bourgeois freedom, freedom of the press and rights of assembly and association which the bourgeoisie had betrayed. Without these freedoms it will be unable to move freely itself; in this struggle it is fighting to establish the environment necessary for its existence, for the air it needs to breathe.

We are taking it for granted that in all these eventualities the workers' party will not play the part of a mere appendage to the bourgeoisie but of an independent party quite distinct from it. It will remind the bourgeoisie at every opportunity that the class interests of the workers are directly opposed to those of the capitalists and that the workers are aware of this. It will retain control of and further develop its own organisation as distinct from the party organisation of the bourgeoisie, and will only negotiate with the latter as one power with another. In this way it will secure for itself a position commanding respect, educate the individual workers about their class interests and when the next revolutionary storm comes—and these storms now recur as regularly as trade crises and equinoctial storms—it will be ready to act.

The policy of the workers' party in the Prussian constitutional conflict emerges therefore self-evidently:

above all to preserve the organisation of the workers' party as far as present conditions permit;

to drive the Party of Progress on to make *real* progress, as far as possible; to compel it to make its own programme more radical and to keep to it; to chide it and ridicule it mercilessly for all its inconsistencies and weaknesses;

to let the military question itself go the way that it will, in the knowledge that the workers' party will one day also carry out its own, 'German "army-reorganisation";

but to reply to the hypocritical enticements of reaction with the words:

"With the spear one should accept gifts, point against point."

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels  
TO THE EDITOR OF THE *SOCIAL-DEMOKRAT*<sup>57</sup>

The undersigned promised to contribute to the *Social-Demokrat* and permitted their being named as contributors on the express condition that the paper would be edited in the spirit of the brief programme submitted to them. They did not for a moment fail to appreciate the difficult position of the *Social-Demokrat* and therefore made no demands that were inappropriate to the meridian of Berlin. But they repeatedly demanded that the language directed at the ministry and the feudal-absolutist party should be at least as bold as that aimed at the men of Progress.<sup>58</sup> The tactics pursued by the *Social-Demokrat* preclude their further participation in it. The opinion of the undersigned as to the royal Prussian governmental socialism and the correct attitude of the workers' party to such deception has already been set out in detail in No. 73 of the *Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung* of September 12, 1847, in reply to No. 206 of the *Rheinischer Beobachter*<sup>a</sup> (then appearing in Cologne), in which the alliance of the "proletariat" with the "government" against the "liberal bourgeoisie" was proposed. We still subscribe today to every word of the statement we made then.

London and Manchester,  
February 23, 1865

First published in the *Barmer Zeitung*,  
No. 60 and the *Elberfelder Zeitung*, No. 60,  
February 26, 1865

Printed according to the news-  
paper text checked against the  
original

---

<sup>a</sup> A reference to Marx's article "The Communism of the *Rheinischer Beobachter*" (see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 220-34).—Ed.

Frederick Engels

[NOTICE CONCERNING  
*THE PRUSSIAN MILITARY QUESTION*  
*AND THE GERMAN WORKERS' PARTY*]<sup>59</sup>

A pamphlet by *Frederick Engels* entitled *The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party* will shortly be published by Otto Meissner in Hamburg (price 6 Sgr.); unlike the most recent "social-democratic" party tactics,<sup>a</sup> this pamphlet bases itself once more on the standpoint adopted by the literary representatives of the proletariat of 1846-1851 and develops this standpoint as against both reaction and the progressist bourgeoisie with regard to the currently topical question of the army and the budget.

Written on February 27, 1865

First published in the *Berliner Reform*, No. 53, the *Düsseldorfer Zeitung*, No. 62 and the *Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 62, March 3, 1865

Printed according to the text in the *Berliner Reform* checked with the *Düsseldorfer Zeitung*

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> In the text which Engels sent to Siebel on February 27, 1865, these tactics are described as follows: "the pro-Bismarck direction adopted by the latest 'Social-Democracy' furthermore made it impossible for the people at the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* to collaborate with the organs of this particular 'Social-Democracy'." The wording of the notice in the *Düsseldorfer Zeitung* also contains this variant.—Ed.



## Karl Marx

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CENTRAL COUNCIL  
ON THE CONFLICT IN THE PARIS SECTION<sup>60</sup>

I) *Resolution.* Whereas citizen Tolain has several times tendered his resignation, and the Central Council has as often refused to accept it, the said Council now leaves it to Citizen Tolain and the Paris Administration to reconsider, whether or not under present circumstances, this resignation be opportune. The Central Council confirms beforehand whatever resolution the administration may come to on this point.<sup>61</sup>

II) *Resolution.* In deference to the wishes of a meeting of 32 members of the Working Men's International Association held at Paris February 24,<sup>62</sup> and in obedience to the principles of popular sovereignty and self-government, the Central Council cancels its resolution relating to the appointment of an official vindicator for the French press. At the same time the Council seizes this opportunity of expressing its high esteem for Citizen Lefort, in particular as one of the initiators of the Working Men's International Society and in general for his approved public character,<sup>63</sup> and further it protests that it does not sanction the principle that none but an *ouvrier* is admissible as an official in our society.<sup>64</sup>

III) *Resolution.* The Council resolves that the present Administration with the addition of citizen Vinçard be confirmed.<sup>a 65</sup>

IV. *Resolution:* The Central Council earnestly requests the Administration at Paris to come to an understanding with citizens Lefort and Beluze, so as to admit them, and the group of *ouvriers*

<sup>a</sup> In the Minute Book (March 7, 1865) this resolution reads: "The Council resolves that citizens Fribourg, Limousin and Tolain be confirmed in their anterior positions and that the addition to the Administration of Citizen Vinçard is acknowledged".—Ed.

they represent, to be represented in the Administration by three members, but the Council while emitting such a wish, has no power nor design to dictate.

V. The Administration at Paris having expressed its readiness to acknowledge a direct delegation from the Central Council, the Council accordingly appoints Citizen Schily to be its delegate to the said Administration.<sup>66</sup>

*Private instruction to Schily*

“In case no compromise be arrived at, the Council declare that the group Lefort, **after having taken out their cards of membership**, will have the Power under our Statutes (see § 7<sup>a</sup>) to form a Local branch Society.”

*This to be held out in terrorem<sup>b</sup>* but confidentially, to Fribourg et Co., in order to induce them to make the necessary concessions, supposed Lefort and Beluze (the director of the Banque du Peuple<sup>67</sup>) are earnest in inducing their group to become members.

Adopted by the Central Council on  
March 7, 1865

First published in: Marx/Engels, *Gesamtausgabe*, Abt. 3, Bd. 3, Berlin, 1930

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

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 16.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> As a warning.— *Ed.*

Karl Marx

[SYNOPSIS OF ENGELS' PAMPHLET  
*THE PRUSSIAN MILITARY QUESTION*  
*AND THE GERMAN WORKERS' PARTY*<sup>68</sup>]

*The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party.*  
 By Frederick Engels. (Hamburg, Otto Meissner)

We can warmly commend this pamphlet to our readers as it treats the most urgent issues of the day in Germany with great incisiveness, impartiality and expert knowledge. The old organisation of the Prussian army, the aims behind its reorganisation, the origins of the constitutional conflict in Prussia,<sup>69</sup> the conduct of the opposition by the Party of Progress and the simultaneous feuding between the Party of Progress and the Workers' Party—all this is presented here in a brief, but original and exhaustive account.

Written in the middle of March 1865

First published in the *Londoner Anzeiger*,  
 March 17, 1865

Printed according to the news-  
 paper

Published in English for the first  
 time

Karl Marx

[REVIEW OF ENGELS' PAMPHLET  
*THE PRUSSIAN MILITARY QUESTION  
 AND THE GERMAN WORKERS' PARTY*<sup>70</sup>]

*The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party.*  
 By Frederick Engels. (Hamburg, Otto Meissner)

This most important pamphlet falls into three sections.

In the first the author subjects the reorganisation of the Prussian army to the critique of 'military science'. Its main fault he finds in the fact that the reorganisation plan "whilst in appearance reverting to the original concept of *universal conscription*, which cannot ... function without a large army-reserve in the form of a *Landwehr*, ... in fact executes an about-turn in the direction of the *Franco-Austrian cadre-system*".<sup>a</sup>

The second section sharply criticises the *bourgeois opposition's* handling of the military question. The author comes to the conclusion:

"It is immaterial by what errors and complications the bourgeois opposition is now forced into the following position: it must fight the military question through to the end, or it will lose the remnants of political power it still possesses... Can the Prussian bourgeoisie be expected ... to have the courage to remain adamant, come what may? It would have to have changed remarkably for the better since 1848, ... and the yearning for compromise which has found expression daily in the sighs of the Party of Progress since the opening of this session, is not an auspicious sign."<sup>b</sup>

In the third section the author examines the attitude adopted by "the workers' party towards this reorganisation of the army" and

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 51.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 64-66.— *Ed.*

the “ensuing constitutional conflict”. His answer is summarised in the following sentences:

“The only aspect of army reorganisation in Prussia which is of interest to the German working class is the increasingly thorough implementation of universal conscription.”<sup>a</sup>

The policy which the working class must pursue in the constitutional conflict is: “above all to preserve the organisation of the workers’ party as far as present conditions permit; to drive the Party of Progress on to make *real* progress, as far as possible; ...but to reply to the hypocritical enticements of reaction with the words:

‘With the spear one should accept gifts, point against point.’”<sup>b</sup>

Written earlier than March 13, 1865

First published in *Hermann*, March 18, 1865

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> *ibid.*, p. 67.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *ibid.*, p. 79.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

STATEMENT  
[REGARDING THE CAUSES OF THE BREACH  
WITH THE *SOCIAL-DEMOKRAT*<sup>71</sup>]

Into his postscript to the statement of resignation of Herren *Rüstow* and *Herwegh* (No. 31 of the *Social-Demokrat*) Herr von Schweitzer incorporates an article dispatched from London to the *Neue Frankfurter Zeitung*<sup>a</sup> as proof of "how *inconsistent and utterly unprincipled* the conduct of Herren *Marx and Engels* is". He attempts to falsify the facts. Hence the following factual information.

On *November 11, 1864* Herr v. Schweitzer informed me by letter of the foundation of the *Social-Demokrat*, organ of the *General Association of German Workers* and stated at the time, among other things:

"We have approached 6-8 proven members of the Party, or at least men standing close to it, in order to gain their collaboration and there seems to be virtually no doubt that these gentlemen will give their consent. Only we consider it *incomparably more important* that you, the founder of the *German Workers' Party*" (these words are underlined by Herr v. Schweitzer himself) "*and its first champion, honour us with your participation. We cherish the hope that after the great loss that has befallen it, you will stand by the side of an association that may, if only indirectly, be traced back to your own activity, in its hour of dire struggle.*"

Along with this letter of invitation was enclosed a *prospectus*, "*printed as a manuscript*". Far from "*Lassalle's words dominating*", or "*Lassalle's name being inscribed on the banner*", as Herr v. Schweitzer now lyingly informs the *Neue Frankfurter Zeitung*, Lassalle is neither quoted nor even mentioned in it. The prospectus contained only three points: "*Solidarity of the peoples' interests*", "*the whole of mighty Germany—a free people's state*",

<sup>a</sup> A reference to Karl Blind's article published in the *Neue Frankfurter Zeitung*, No. 64, March 5, 1865.—*Ed.*

“abolition of the rule of capital”. With express reference to *this* prospectus Engels and I agreed to contribute.

On *November 19, 1864* Herr v. Schweitzer wrote to me:

“If you should have any remarks to make regarding the issuing of the prospectus, this should be done *by return*.”

I made no remarks.

Herr v. Schweitzer went on to ask whether,

“we” (the editorial board) “may expect an article from you now and then and whether we might also be *permitted to announce this to our readers*”.

Engels and I demanded to know first in what company we were to figure publicly. Herr v. Schweitzer then enumerated them, adding:

“If you should take exception to one or the other of these gentlemen we hope that this will be outweighed by the consideration that no very strict solidarity exists between the contributors to a newspaper.”

On *November 28* Herr v. Schweitzer wrote:

“The consent of yourself and Engels has *produced the happiest sentiments in the Party* insofar as it *knows about it*.”

The two first sample issues already contained a good deal of dubious material. I remonstrated. And, *among other things*, I expressed my indignation that from a private letter which I had written to Countess Hatzfeldt<sup>a</sup> on receiving the news of Lassalle’s death, a few words of condolence had been torn out, published without my consent with my signature and disgracefully *abused* in order to “*ring in and out*” a servile panegyric of Lassalle.<sup>b</sup> He replied on December 30:

“Dear Sir, Have *patience* with us—matters will *gradually improve*, our position is very difficult. All good things take their time, and *so I hope that you will be reassured and wait a while*.”

This *already on December 30, 1864*, when I still only had the first sample issues in my hand!

At the beginning of *January 1865*, after the confiscation of one of the first issues of the *Social-Demokrat*, I congratulated Herr v. Schweitzer on this event, adding that he must publicly break with the Ministry.

<sup>a</sup> Marx to Sophie von Hatzfeldt, September 12, 1864. See present edition, Vol. 41.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> This refers to the article “Ferdinand Lassalle” printed in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 1, sample issue, December 15, 1864. The epigraph to this article contained the words from Marx’s letter to Countess Hatzfeldt: “He died young in triumph—as Achilles”. K. Marx.—*Ed.*

On the news of *Proudhon's* death he requested an article on Proudhon. I met his wish by return of post, but took this opportunity of characterising now in his own newspaper "even the *semblance of compromise* with the powers that be" as a contravention of "simple moral sense", and Proudhon's flirtation with Louis Bonaparte after the coup d'état as "baseness".<sup>a</sup> At the same time *Engels* sent him a translation of an Old Danish peasant ballad,<sup>b</sup> in order, in a marginal note, to impress on the readers of the *Social-Demokrat* the necessity of struggle against the rural squirearchy.

But during the same month of *January* I again had to protest against Herr v. Schweitzer's "tactics".<sup>72</sup> He replied on *February 4*:

"As regards *our tactics*, I beg you to consider how difficult our position is. We must definitely seek to *gain strength* first, etc."

*At the end of January* an insinuation by the Paris correspondent of the *Social-Demokrat*<sup>c</sup> prompted *Engels* and myself to make a statement<sup>d</sup> saying, among other things, that we were glad to find our view confirmed that "the Paris proletariat is as irreconcilably opposed as ever to Bonapartism in both its forms, the Tuileries form and the form of the Palais-Royal, and never for a moment considered the plan of selling its historical honour as the vanguard of the revolution for a mess of pottage". The statement concluded with the words: "We recommend this example to the German workers."

In the meantime, in No. 21 of the *Social-Demokrat*, the Paris correspondent had corrected his earlier allegation<sup>e</sup> and deprived our statement of its immediate pretext. We therefore accepted Herr v. Schweitzer's refusal to print it. But at the same time I wrote to him<sup>f</sup> that "we would express our opinion in detail elsewhere about the relationship of the workers to the Prussian Government". Finally I made one last attempt to demonstrate to him the wretchedness of his "tactics", however honestly they might be meant, with a *practical example, the coalition question*.<sup>73</sup> He replied on February 15:

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 32.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 34-35.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> M. Hess, "Paris, 28. Januar", *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 16, February 1, 1865.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See this volume, p. 36.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> M. Hess, "Paris, 7. Febr.", *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 21, February 12, 1865.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> On February 13, 1865.—*Ed.*



“If you wish to enlighten me, as in your last letter, on *theoretical (!) questions*, I would *gratefully* accept such *instruction* on your part. But as regards the *practical questions of immediate tactics* I beg you to consider that in order to assess these things one must be in the centre of the movement. You are therefore doing us an injustice if you *express your dissatisfaction with our tactics anywhere and anyhow*. You should only do this if you were absolutely familiar with conditions. Do not forget either that the General Association of [German] Workers is a consolidated body and remains to a certain extent bound to *its traditions*. Things *in concreto* always drag around some kind of *weight about their feet*.”

To this ultimatum from Schweitzer Engels and I replied with our public statement of resignation.<sup>a</sup>

*Karl Marx*

London, March 15, 1865

First published in the *Berliner Reform*,  
No. 67, March 19, 1865

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Published in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume. p. 80.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx  
TO THE EDITOR  
OF THE *BERLINER REFORM*<sup>74</sup>

From No. 68 of the *Reform* and No. 37 of the *Social-Demokrat*<sup>a</sup> forwarded to me here, I see that Herr v. Schweitzer is making embarrassed and mendacious attempts to extricate himself from the "fair impediments"<sup>b</sup> he has prepared for himself. *Habeat sibi!*<sup>c</sup> However, I will not permit him to distort my statement of March 15,<sup>d</sup> in which I simply let him describe himself, into a *statement on Lassalle*. The correspondence between myself and Lassalle in my possession, spanning about fifteen years, totally deprives the Schweitzers and company of the power to misrepresent our personal relationship or to cast suspicion on the motives for my neutral attitude to Lassalle's agitation. The relationship of Lassalle's theoretical works to mine, on the other hand, is a matter for scientific criticism. An occasion may perhaps arise later for discussing individual points. But under any circumstances, reverence prohibits me from making such matters the object of a polemic in the press with sycophants.

Zalt-Bommel, March 28, 1865

First published in the *Berliner Reform*,  
No. 78, April 1, 1865

Printed according to the news-  
paper text checked against the  
original

Published in English for the first  
time

<sup>a</sup> J. B. Schweitzer, "Der Redacteur des *Social-Demokraten* übersendet uns nachfolgende", *Berliner Reform*, No. 68, March 21, 1865 and "In Betreff der Bekannten...", *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 37, March 22, 1865.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> H. Heine, *Neuer Frühling*, Prolog.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> I don't care!—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See this volume, pp. 87-90.—*Ed.*

## Karl Marx

THE "PRESIDENT OF MANKIND"<sup>75</sup>

On my return from Holland to London No. 39 of the *Social-Demokrat* presents me with an asafœtida cake baked by the hand of Herr Bernhard Becker,<sup>a</sup> mainly consisting of Vogtian crumbs of slander. The legally documented refutation of Vogt's lying fairy-tales may be found in my work *Herr Vogt*, London, 1860.<sup>b</sup> But this time, quite contrary to his custom, Herr Bernhard Becker, the "President of Mankind", does not merely content himself with plagiarism. For the first time in his life he attempts to come up with something of his own as well.

"In fact," says the "President of Mankind", "through Dronke Marx pawned for 1,000 Thlr. a manuscript which was redeemed by the Prussian police inspector, Stieber, who was in London spying among the refugees."

And three times during the course of his personal presidential address our Bernhard Becker returns to this "fact" with ever increasing merriment.

On page 124 of my *Herr Vogt* I state in a footnote<sup>c</sup>:

"I myself had made the acquaintance of Bangya in London in 1850, together with his friend at the time, the present General Türri. His underhand dealings with parties of every complexion, Orleanists, Bonapartists, etc., and his association with policemen of every 'nationality' made me suspect him, but he dispelled my suspicions quite simply by showing me a document in *Kossuth's*

<sup>a</sup> "Rede des Vereins-Präsidenten Bernhard Becker, gehalten in der Versammlung der Hamburger Mitglieder des Allgemeinen deutschen Arbeiter-Vereins am 22. März 1865", *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 39, supplement, March 26, 1865.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See present edition, Vol. 17.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *ibid.*, p. 219.—*Ed.*

own hand in which he (who had formerly been provisional chief commissioner of the police in Komorn under Klapka) was appointed chief commissioner of the police *in partibus*.<sup>a</sup> As a secret chief of police in the service of the revolution he naturally had to keep in 'touch' with police in the service of the governments. In the course of the summer of 1852 I discovered that he had appropriated a manuscript<sup>b</sup> I had asked him to convey to a bookseller in Berlin and steered it into the hands of a German government. After I had written to a Hungarian" (Szemere) "in Paris"<sup>6</sup> describing this incident and a number of other striking peculiarities of the man's, and after the Bangya mystery had been completely cleared up thanks to the intervention of a third person well-informed in the matter, I sent an open denunciation, signed by myself, to the *New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung* early in 1853."<sup>c</sup>

The "President of Mankind" has obviously not read the detailed denunciation of Bangya (at that time still resident in London) published by me 13 years ago in the *New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung*. Otherwise he would probably have made his fiction fit the facts somewhat better. So he surrenders himself entirely to the play of his fair fantasy, and what was closer to it than the pleasant association of ideas between London and pawning? But I vouch for the fact that Bernhard Becker has never pawed his manuscripts.

The "President of Mankind" deigns to add:

"that on the foundation of the Vienna *Botschafter*, the semi-official organ of the Austrian government, Marx sought to win me" (just the same Bernhard Becker) "over as a correspondent for the same by concealing the semi-official character of the nascent journal, which, he said, had been sent to him, emphasising on the contrary that I should deliver out and out red articles."

Herr Bernhard Becker, who at that time was not yet "President of Mankind", was also possessed by the unflinching habit of scribbling "quite colourless articles" in the London *Hermann*, surprised me one fine evening (I had previously chanced to see him once or twice only) with a visit in person to my house, shortly before quietly sneaking away—for good reasons—from London. He pitifully bemoaned his ill-fortune to me and asked if I could

<sup>a</sup> The phrase *in partibus infidelium* (literally: in the land of infidels) was added to the title of Catholic bishops appointed to purely nominal dioceses in non-Christian countries. Here it means "in exile".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> K. Marx and F. Engels, *The Great Men of the Exile* (see present edition, Vol. 11).—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The reference is to K. Marx's article "Hirsch's Confessions" (see present edition, Vol. 12).—*Ed.*

obtain correspondences for him to help him out of his bitter distress. I replied that a few days before Herr Kolatschek had announced the foundation of a new, allegedly "very liberal" Vienna newspaper to Herr S. Borkheim, a political refugee and merchant in the City, sending him some sample issues and requesting him to recruit a London correspondent. At the earnest entreaty of Bernhard Becker I promised to take up the matter on his behalf with Herr Borkheim, who is always willing to oblige refugees. Bernhard Becker also wrote, as far as I remember, one or more sample articles for Vienna. And his unsuccessful attempt to become the correspondent of the *Botschafter* proves my alliance with the Austrian government! Herr Bernhard Becker obviously believes that because Countess Hatzfeldt has given him a post, the Lord God has also given him the intelligence necessary for it!

"Liebknecht," continues Bernhard Becker, "is now systematically working on Countess Hatzfeldt, to whom Marx, too, sends telegrams and letters in order to turn her against the Association."

Herr Bernhard Becker imagines that I take the importance he acquired by bequest<sup>77</sup> quite as "systematically" seriously as he does himself! My letters to Countess Hatzfeldt after the death of Lassalle<sup>a</sup> consisted of a message of condolence, of answers to various questions put to me on account of the planned Lassalle brochure and of discussions on a refutation against a libeller of Lassalle that I had been requested to, and subsequently did, undertake.<sup>b</sup> So as to avoid misunderstandings, however, I thought it very much to the point to remind the Countess in a letter of December 22, 1864 that I did not agree with Lassalle's politics. That concluded our correspondence, in which not a syllable was uttered about the Association. The Countess had requested me among other things to let her know by return whether the release of certain portraits for the planned brochure seemed appropriate to me. I replied by telegraph: No! This single telegram is put into the plural by Herr Bernhard Becker, who is no less eminent a grammarian than he is poet and thinker.

He relates that I also took part in a campaign directed against him at a later date. The sole step on my part in this all-important affair was this: I had heard from Berlin that Bernhard Becker was being persecuted from a certain quarter because he was not willing to allow the *Social-Demokrat* and the Association to be misused in

<sup>a</sup> Marx's letters to Sophie Hatzfeldt of September 12, October 16, November 26 and 28 and December 22, 1864.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 23-25.—*Ed.*

order to agitate for the incorporation of Schleswig-Holstein into Prussia.<sup>78</sup> At the same time I had been asked to bring this "intrigue" to the notice of Herr Klings in Solingen, over whom a certain degree of influence was attributed to me on account of some earlier contacts, and Herr Philipp Becker in Geneva, in order to give them due warning. I did both things, the former through a Barmen friend,<sup>a</sup> the latter through my friend Schily in Paris, who was labouring, as I was, under the delusion that something human had happened to the "President of Mankind" and that he had actually behaved decently for once. He now naturally distorts the facts of the matter into the exact opposite—being a dialectician.

The "President of Mankind" is, however, not only an eminent writer, thinker, grammarian and dialectician. He is a pathologist of the first water, to boot. My eighteen-month-old carbuncle complaint, which happened to last six months after Lassalle's death, this blood-red disease he explains as due to "pale envy at Lassalle's greatness".

"But," he emphatically adds, "he did not dare to oppose Lassalle in public because he knew full well that Lassalle would have struck him stone dead, like he did Bastiat-Schulze, with his giant's club."

Now precisely in this his last work on "Bastiat-Schulze"<sup>b</sup> Lassalle praises my *Critique of Political Economy*, Berlin, 1859, to the skies, calling it "epoch-making", a "masterpiece", and placing it in line with the works of A. Smith and Ricardo. From this, Herr Bernhard Becker, with that capacity for thought, peculiar to himself, concludes that Lassalle might strike me dead, as he did Bastiat-Schulze. Incidentally Lassalle had quite different ideas of what I "dare". When I wrote to him on an occasion which this is not the place to discuss, saying that Engels and I would, for reasons which I enumerated, be forced to make a public attack on him,<sup>79</sup> he replied at length in a letter lying here before me at this moment, first setting out his objections and then concluding in these terms:

"Consider all this before you speak out loud and publicly. Dissension and breach between us would be a deplorable event for our particular party, which is not a big one as it is!"<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Karl Siebel.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> F. Lassalle, *Herr Bastiat-Schulze von Delitzsch, der ökonomische Julian, oder: Capital und Arbeit*, Berlin, 1864.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Lassalle's letter to Marx written in mid-June 1859.—*Ed.*

Herr Bernhard Becker sees a complete contradiction in the fact that I wished to have nothing to do with an obscure international association in which he, Bernhard Becker, is supposed to have figured,<sup>80</sup> while on the contrary participating with great keenness in the International Association formed last September by the leaders of the London trade unions.

Herr Bernhard Becker's gift for discrimination obviously provides support for his power of reasoning. His association, he boasts, comprised all of "400 men" in its heyday, while our Association shows so little modesty that it already numbers 10,000 members in England alone. It is, in fact, impermissible that anything of this sort should take place behind the back as it were of the "President of Mankind".

All in all, and with particular respect to Herr Bernhard Becker's abundance of abilities only briefly suggested by me, one finds that he is hardly justified in his complaints that people have sought to impose too much at once on a man like him; that people have not only forced on him the job of exercising autocratic power as his main field, but also the lesser office of "buying eggs and butter for the house",<sup>81</sup> "on the side". It would seem, however, that a better domestic order could be achieved by re-arranging his dual functions. May his main task in future be the "buying of eggs and butter for the house", and, conversely, let him preside over mankind solely "on the side".

London, April 8, 1865

First published in the *Rheinische Zeitung*, No. 102, second supplement, April 12, 1865 and the *Berliner Reform*, No. 88, supplement, April 13, 1865

Printed according to the newspapers

Published in English for the first time

## Karl Marx

A CORRECTION<sup>82</sup>

After the two motions of Messrs. Beales and Levenson, mentioned in No. 30 of your newspaper, had been carried by the Polish meeting in London on March 1, *Mr. Peter Fox* (an Englishman), on behalf of the *International Working Men's Association*, proposed

"that an integral and independent Poland is an indispensable condition of democratic Europe, and that so long as this condition is unfulfilled, revolutionary triumphs on the Continent are short-lived [...] preludes to prolonged periods of counter-revolutionary rule."

After briefly outlining the history of the evils which had befallen Europe as a result of the loss of liberty by Poland, and of Russia's policy of conquest, *Mr. P. Fox* said that the stand of the *Liberal* party on this question did not coincide with that of the *democratic* society for which he was speaking. The motto of conservative Europe was: an enslaved Europe with an enslaved Poland as a basis. The motto of the *International Working Men's Association* was, on the contrary: a free Europe based upon a free and independent Poland.

*Mr. Eccarius* (a German worker, Vice-President of the *International Working Men's Association*) seconded the motion, referring in detail to the share Prussia had taken in the various partitions of Poland. In conclusion he said:

"*The downfall of the Prussian monarchy* is the *conditio sine qua non* for the establishment of Germany and the re-establishment of Poland."

*Mr. Le Lubez*, a French member of the *International Working Men's Association*, likewise spoke in support of the motion, which was carried unanimously, amid the continuous cheering of the meeting.



*The Daily News* and a few other “liberal” London dailies omitted this part of the report,<sup>a</sup> being vexed by the triumph of the *International Working Men’s Association*, without whose collaboration, incidentally, the Polish meeting at St. Martin’s Hall could not have taken place at all. On behalf of the International Working Men’s Association, I request you to print this correction.<sup>b</sup>

London, etc.

*H. Jung,*

Corresponding Secretary  
of the International Working Men’s Association  
for Switzerland

Written on April 13, 1865

First published in *Der weiße Adler*, No. 48,  
April 22, 1865

Printed according to the manu-  
script checked against the news-  
paper

---

<sup>a</sup> “The Late Polish Insurrection”, *The Daily News*, March 2, 1865.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The newspaper editors placed this request at the beginning of the article.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[ADDRESS  
FROM THE WORKING MEN'S INTERNATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION  
TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON<sup>83</sup>]

TO ANDREW JOHNSON,  
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Sir,

The demon of the "peculiar institution",<sup>a</sup> for the supremacy of which the South rose in arms, would not allow his worshippers to honourably succumb in the open field. What he had begun in treason, he must needs end in infamy. As Philip II's war for the Inquisition bred a Gérard, thus Jefferson Davis's pro-slavery war a Booth.

It is not our part to call words of sorrow and horror, while the heart of two worlds heaves with emotion. Even the sycophants who, year after year, and day by day, stick to their Sisyphus work of morally assassinating Abraham Lincoln, and the great Republic he headed, stand now aghast at this universal outburst of popular feeling, and rival with each other to strew rhetorical flowers on his open grave. They have now at last found out that he was a man, neither to be browbeaten by adversity, nor intoxicated by success, inflexibly pressing on to his great goal, never compromising it by blind haste, slowly maturing his steps, never retracing them, carried away by no surge of popular favour, disheartened by no slackening of the popular pulse, tempering stern acts by the gleams of a kind heart, illuminating scenes dark with passion by the smile of humour, doing his titanic work as humbly and homely as Heaven-born rulers do little things with the grandiloquence of pomp and state; in one word, one of the rare men who succeed in becoming great, without ceasing to be good. Such, indeed, was the

---

<sup>a</sup> This is how A. Stephens, a Southern leader, referred to the slave-owning system defending it in his speech at Savannah on March 21, 1861 (see *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6215, March 27, 1861).—*Ed.*

modesty of this great and good man, that the world only discovered him a hero after he had fallen a martyr.

To be singled out by the side of such a chief, the second victim to the infernal gods of slavery, was an honour due to Mr. Seward. Had he not, at a time of general hesitation, the sagacity to foresee and the manliness to foretell "the irrepressible conflict"?<sup>84</sup> Did he not, in the darkest hours of that conflict, prove true to the Roman duty to never despair of the Republic and its stars? We earnestly hope that he and his son<sup>a</sup> will be restored to health, public activity, and well-deserved honours within much less than "90 days".<sup>85</sup>

After a tremendous civil war, but which, if we consider its vast dimensions, and its broad scope, and compare it to the Old World's 100 years' wars, and 30 years' wars, and 23 years' wars,<sup>86</sup> can hardly be said to have lasted 90 days. Yours, Sir, has become the task to uproot by the law what has been felled by the sword, to preside over the arduous work of political reconstruction and social regeneration. A profound sense of your great mission will save you from any compromise with stern duties. You will never forget that, to initiate the new era of the emancipation of labour, the American people devolved the responsibilities of leadership upon two men of labour—the one Abraham Lincoln, the other Andrew Johnson.

Signed, on behalf of the International Working Men's Association, London, May 13th, 1865, by the Central Council—

*Charles Kaub, Edward Coulson, F. Lessner, Carl Pfänder, N. P. Hansen, Karl Schapper, William Dell, George Lochner, George Eccarius, John Osborne, P. Petersen, A. Janks, H. Klimosch, John Weston, H. Bolleter, B. Lucraft, J. Buckley, Peter Fox, N. Salvatella, George Howell, Bordage, A. Valltier, Robert Shaw, J. H. Longmaid, W. Morgan, G. W. Wheeler, J. D. Nieass, W. C. Worley, D. Stainsby, F. de Lassassie, J. Carter, Emile Holtorp, Secretary for Poland; Carl Marx, Secretary for Germany; H. Jung, Secretary for Switzerland; E. Dupont, Secretary for France; J. Whitlock, Financial Secretary; G. Odger, President; W. R. Cremer, Hon. Gen. Secretary.*

Written between May 2 and 9, 1865

Reproduced from *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*

First published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 188, May 20, 1865

<sup>a</sup> Frederick William Seward.—*Ed.*

KARL MARX

[VALUE, PRICE AND PROFIT<sup>87</sup>]

Written between the end of May and  
June 27, 1865

First published as a separate pamphlet in  
London in 1898

Reproduced from the manuscript

## [PRELIMINARY]

*Citizens,*

Before entering into the subject-matter, allow me to make a few preliminary remarks.

There reigns now on the Continent a real epidemic of strikes, and a general clamour for a rise of wages. The question will turn up at our Congress.<sup>88</sup> You, as the head of the International Association, ought to have settled convictions upon this paramount question. For my own part, I considered it, therefore, my duty to enter fully into the matter, even at the peril of putting your patience to a severe test.

Another preliminary remark I have to make in regard to Citizen Weston. He has not only proposed to you, but has publicly defended, in the interest of the working class, as he thinks, opinions he knows to be most unpopular with the working class. Such an exhibition of moral courage all of us must highly honour. I hope that, despite the unvarnished style of my paper, at its conclusion he will find me agreeing with what appears to me the just idea lying at the bottom of his theses, which, however, in their present form, I cannot but consider theoretically false and practically dangerous.

I shall now at once proceed to the business before us.

## 1) [PRODUCTION AND WAGES]

Citizen Weston's argument rested, in fact, upon two premises: firstly, that the *amount of national production is a fixed thing, a constant quantity or magnitude*, as the mathematicians would say;

secondly, that the *amount of real wages*, that is to say, of wages as measured by the quantity of the commodities they can buy, is a *fixed* amount, a *constant* magnitude.

Now, his first assertion is evidently erroneous. Year after year you will find that the value and mass of production increase, that the productive powers of the national labour increase, and that the amount of money necessary to circulate this increasing production continuously changes. What is true at the end of the year, and for different years compared with each other, is true for every average day of the year. The amount or magnitude of national production changes continuously. It is not a *constant* but a *variable* magnitude, and apart from changes in population it must be so, because of the continuous change in the *accumulation of capital* and the *productive powers of labour*. It is perfectly true that if a *rise in the general rate of wages* should take place today, that rise, whatever its ulterior effects might be, would, *by itself*, not *immediately* change the amount of production. It would, in the first instance, proceed from the existing state of things. But if *before* the rise of wages the national production was *variable*, and not *fixed*, it will continue to be variable and not fixed *after* the rise of wages.

But suppose the amount of national production to be *constant* instead of *variable*. Even then, what our friend Weston considers a logical conclusion would still remain a gratuitous assertion. If I have a given number, say eight, the *absolute* limits of this number do not prevent its parts from changing their *relative* limits. If profits were six and wages two, wages might increase to six and profits decrease to two, and still the total amount remains eight. Thus the fixed amount of production would by no means prove the fixed amount of wages. How then does our friend Weston prove this fixity? By asserting it.

But even conceding him his assertion, it would cut both ways, while he presses it only in one direction. If the amount of wages is a constant magnitude, then it can be neither increased nor diminished. If then, in enforcing a temporary rise of wages, the working men act foolishly, the capitalists, in enforcing a temporary fall of wages, would act not less foolishly. Our friend Weston does not deny that, under certain circumstances, the working men *can* enforce a rise of wages, but their amount being naturally fixed, there must follow a reaction. On the other hand, he knows also that the capitalists *can* enforce a fall of wages, and, indeed, continuously try to enforce it. According to the principle of the constancy of wages, a reaction ought to follow in this case not less than in the former. The working men, therefore, reacting against

the attempt at, or the act of, lowering wages, would act rightly. They would, therefore, act rightly in enforcing a *rise in wages*, because every *reaction* against the lowering of wages is an *action* for raising wages. According to Citizen Weston's own principle of the *constancy of wages*, the working men ought, therefore, under certain circumstances, to combine and struggle for a rise of wages.

If he denies this conclusion, he must give up the premise from which it flows. He must not say that the amount of wages is a *constant quantity*, but that, although it cannot and must not *rise*, it can and must *fall*, whenever capital pleases to lower it. If the capitalist pleases to feed you upon potatoes instead of upon meat, and upon oats instead of upon wheat, you must accept his will as a law of political economy, and submit to it. If in one country the rate of wages is higher than in another, in the United States, for example, than in England, you must explain this difference in the rate of wages by difference between the will of the American capitalist and the will of the English capitalist, a method which would certainly very much simplify, not only the study of economic phenomena, but of all other phenomena.

But even then, we might ask, *why* the will of the American capitalist differs from the will of the English capitalist? And to answer the question you must go beyond the domain of *will*. A parson may tell me that God wills one thing in France, and another thing in England. If I summon him to explain this duality of will, he might have the brass to answer me that God wills to have one will in France and another will in England. But our friend Weston is certainly the last man to make an argument of such a complete negation of all reasoning.

The *will* of the capitalist is certainly to take as much as possible. What we have to do is not to talk about his *will*, but to inquire into his *power*, the *limits of that power*, and the *character of those limits*.

## 2) [PRODUCTION, WAGES, PROFITS]

The address Citizen Weston read to us might have been compressed into a nutshell.

All his reasoning amounted to this: If the working class forces the capitalist class to pay five shillings instead of four shillings in the shape of money wages, the capitalist will return in the shape of commodities four shillings' worth instead of five shillings' worth. The working class would have to pay five shillings for what, before the rise of wages, they bought with four shillings. But why is this



the case? Why does the capitalist only return four shillings' worth for five shillings? Because the amount of wages is fixed. But why is it fixed at four shillings' worth of commodities? Why not at three, or two, or any other sum? If the limit of the amount of wages is settled by an economic law, independent alike of the will of the capitalist and the will of the working man, the first thing Citizen Weston had to do was to state that law and prove it. He ought then, moreover, to have proved that the amount of wages actually paid at every given moment always corresponds exactly to the necessary amount of wages, and never deviates from it. If, on the other hand, the given limit of the amount of wages is founded on the *mere will* of the capitalist, or the limits of his avarice, it is an arbitrary limit. There is nothing necessary in it. It may be changed by the will of the capitalist, and may, therefore, be changed *against* his will.

Citizen Weston illustrated his theory by telling you that when a bowl contains a certain quantity of soup, to be eaten by a certain number of persons, an increase in the broadness of the spoons would not produce an increase in the amount of soup. He must allow me to find this illustration rather spoony. It reminded me somewhat of the simile employed by Menenius Agrippa. When the Roman plebeians struck against the Roman patricians, the patrician Agrippa told them that the patrician belly fed the plebeian members of the body politic.<sup>89</sup> Agrippa failed to show that you feed the members of one man by filling the belly of another. Citizen Weston, on his part, has forgotten that the bowl from which the workmen eat is filled with the whole produce of the national labour, and that what prevents them fetching more out of it is neither the narrowness of the bowl nor the scantiness of its contents, but only the smallness of their spoons.

By what contrivance is the capitalist enabled to return four shillings' worth for five shillings? By raising the price of the commodity he sells. Now, does a rise and more generally a change in the prices of commodities, do the prices of commodities themselves, depend on the mere will of the capitalist? Or are, on the contrary, certain circumstances wanted to give effect to that will? If not, the ups and downs, the incessant fluctuations of market prices, become an insoluble riddle.

As we suppose that no change whatever has taken place either in the productive powers of labour, or in the amount of capital and labour employed, or in the value of the money wherein the values of products are estimated, but *only a change in the rate of wages*, how could that *rise of wages* affect the *prices of commodities*?

Only by affecting the actual proportion between the demand for, and the supply of, these commodities.

It is perfectly true that, considered as a whole, the working class spends, and must spend, its income upon *necessaries*. A general rise in the rate of wages would, therefore, produce a rise in the demand for, and consequently in the *market prices of, necessaries*. The capitalists who produce these necessaries would be compensated for the risen wages by the rising market prices of their commodities. But how with the other capitalists, who do *not* produce necessaries? And you must not fancy them a small body. If you consider that two-thirds of the national produce are consumed by one-fifth of the population—a member of the House of Commons stated it recently to be but one-seventh of the population—you will understand what an immense proportion of the national produce must be produced in the shape of luxuries, or be *exchanged* for luxuries, and what an immense amount of the necessaries themselves must be wasted upon flunkeys, horses, cats, and so forth, a waste we know from experience to become always much limited with the rising prices of necessaries.

Well, what would be the position of those capitalists who do *not* produce necessaries? For the *fall in the rate of profit*, consequent upon the general rise of wages, they could not compensate themselves by a *rise in the price of their commodities*, because the demand for those commodities would not have increased. Their income would have decreased, and from this decreased income they would have to pay more for the same amount of higher-priced necessaries. But this would not be all. As their income had diminished they would have less to spend upon luxuries, and therefore their mutual demand for their respective commodities would diminish. Consequent upon this diminished demand the prices of their commodities would fall. In these branches of industry, therefore, *the rate of profit would fall*, not only in simple proportion to the general rise in the rate of wages, but in the compound ratio of the general rise of wages, the rise in the prices of necessaries, and the fall in the prices of luxuries.

What would be the consequence of *this difference in the rates of profit* for capitals employed in the different branches of industry? Why, the consequence that generally obtains whenever, from whatever reason, *the average rate of profit* comes to differ in the different spheres of production. Capital and labour would be transferred from the less remunerative to the more remunerative branches; and this process of transfer would go on until the supply in the one department of industry would have risen

proportionately to the increased demand, and would have sunk in the other departments according to the decreased demand. *This change effected, the general rate of profit would again be equalised in the different branches.* As the whole derangement originally arose from a mere change in the proportion of the demand for, and the supply of, different commodities, the cause ceasing, the effect would cease, and *prices* would return to their former level and equilibrium. Instead of being limited to some branches of industry, the *fall in the rate of profit* consequent upon the rise of wages would have become *general*. According to our supposition, there would have taken place no change in the productive powers of labour, nor in the aggregate amount of production, but *that given amount of production would have changed its form.* A greater part of the produce would exist in the shape of necessaries, a lesser part in the shape of luxuries, or what comes to the same, a lesser part would be exchanged for foreign luxuries, and be consumed in its original form, or, what again comes to the same, a greater part of the native produce would be exchanged for foreign necessaries instead of for luxuries. The general rise in the rate of wages would, therefore, after a temporary disturbance of market prices, only result in a general fall of the rate of profit without any permanent change in the prices of commodities.

If I am told that in the previous argument I assume the whole surplus wages to be spent upon necessaries, I answer that I have made the supposition most advantageous to the opinion of Citizen Weston. If the surplus wages were spent upon articles formerly not entering into the consumption of the working men, the real increase of their purchasing power would need no proof. Being, however, only derived from an advance of wages, that increase of their purchasing power must exactly correspond to the decrease of the purchasing power of the capitalists. The *aggregate demand* for commodities would, therefore, not *increase*, but the constituent parts of that demand would *change*. The increasing demand on the one side would be counterbalanced by the decreasing demand on the other side. Thus the aggregate demand remaining stationary, no change whatever could take place in the market prices of commodities.

You arrive, therefore, at this dilemma: Either the surplus wages are equally spent upon all articles of consumption—then the expansion of demand on the part of the working class must be compensated by the contraction of demand on the part of the capitalist class—or the surplus wages are only spent upon some articles whose market prices will temporarily rise. Then the

consequent rise in the rate of profit in some, and the consequent fall in the rate of profit in other branches of industry will produce a change in the distribution of capital and labour, going on until the supply is brought up to the increased demand in the one department of industry, and brought down to the diminished demand in the other departments of industry. On the one supposition there will occur no change in the prices of commodities. On the other supposition, after some fluctuations of market prices, the exchangeable values of commodities will subside to the former level. On both suppositions the general rise in the rate of wages will ultimately result in nothing else but a general fall in the rate of profit.

To stir up your powers of imagination Citizen Weston requested you to think of the difficulties which a general rise of English agricultural wages from nine shillings to eighteen shillings would produce. Think, he exclaimed, of the immense rise in the demand for necessaries, and the consequent fearful rise in their prices! Now, all of you know that the average wages of the American agricultural labourer amount to more than double that of the English agricultural labourer, although the prices of agricultural produce are lower in the United States than in the United Kingdom, although the general relations of capital and labour obtain in the United States the same as in England, and although the annual amount of production is much smaller in the United States than in England. Why, then, does our friend ring this alarm bell? Simply to shift the real question before us. A sudden rise of wages from nine shillings to eighteen shillings would be a sudden rise to the amount of 100 per cent. Now, we are not at all discussing the question whether the general rate of wages in England could be suddenly increased by 100 per cent. We have nothing at all to do with the *magnitude* of the rise, which in every practical instance must depend on, and be suited to, given circumstances. We have only to inquire how a general rise in the rate of wages, even if restricted to one per cent., will act.

Dismissing friend Weston's fancy rise of 100 per cent., I propose calling your attention to the real rise of wages that took place in Great Britain from 1849 to 1859.

You are all aware of the Ten Hours' Bill, or rather Ten-and-a-Half Hours' Bill, introduced since 1848.<sup>90</sup> This was one of the greatest economic changes we have witnessed. It was a sudden and compulsory rise of wages, not in some local trades, but in the leading industrial branches by which England sways the markets of the world. It was a rise of wages under circumstances singularly

unpropitious. Dr. Ure, Professor Senior, and all the other official economical mouthpieces of the middle class, *proved*, and I must say upon much stronger grounds than those of our friend Weston, that it would sound the death-knell of English industry. They proved that it not only amounted to a simple rise of wages, but to a rise of wages initiated by, and based upon, a diminution of the quantity of labour employed. They asserted that the twelfth hour you wanted to take from the capitalist was exactly the only hour from which he derived his profit. They threatened a decrease of accumulation, rise of prices, loss of markets, stinting of production, consequent reaction upon wages, ultimate ruin. In fact, they declared Maximilien Robespierre's Maximum Laws<sup>91</sup> to be a small affair compared to it; and they were right in a certain sense. Well, what was the result? A rise in the money wages of the factory operatives, despite the curtailing of the working day, a great increase in the number of factory hands employed, a continuous fall in the prices of their products, a marvellous development in the productive powers of their labour, an unheard-of progressive expansion of the markets for their commodities. In Manchester, at the meeting, in 1861, of the Society for the Advancement of Science, I myself heard Mr. *Newman*<sup>a</sup> confess that he, Dr. Ure, Senior, and all other official propounders of economic science had been wrong, while the instinct of the people had been right.<sup>92</sup> I mention Mr. W. Newman, not Professor Francis Newman, because he occupies an eminent position in economic science, as the contributor to, and editor of, Mr. Thomas Tooke's *History of Prices*, that magnificent work which traces the history of prices from 1793 to 1856. If our friend Weston's fixed idea of a fixed amount of wages, a fixed amount of production, a fixed degree of the productive power of labour, a fixed and permanent will of the capitalists, and all his other fixedness and finality were correct, Professor Senior's woeful forebodings would have been right, and Robert Owen, who already in 1815 proclaimed a general limitation of the working day the first preparatory step to the emancipation of the working class<sup>b</sup> and actually in the teeth of the general prejudice inaugurated it on his own hook in his cotton factory at New Lanark, would have been wrong.

In the very same period during which the introduction of the Ten Hours' Bill, and the rise of wages consequent upon it,

---

<sup>a</sup> Here and below inaccuracy in the manuscript. Should be W. Newmarch.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> R. Owen, *Observations on the Effect of the Manufacturing System*, London, 1815.—*Ed.*

occurred, there took place in Great Britain, for reasons which it would be out of place to enumerate here, a *general rise in agricultural wages*.

Although it is not required for my immediate purpose, in order not to mislead you, I shall make some preliminary remarks.

If a man got two shillings weekly wages, and if his wages rose to four shillings, the *rate of wages* would have risen by 100 per cent. This would seem a very magnificent thing if expressed as a rise in the *rate of wages*, although the *actual amount of wages*, four shillings weekly, would still remain a wretchedly small, a starvation pittance. You must not, therefore, allow yourselves to be carried away by the high-sounding per cents in the *rate of wages*. You must always ask, What was the *original amount*?

Moreover, you will understand, that if there were ten men receiving each 2s. per week, five men receiving each 5s. and five men receiving 11s. weekly, the twenty men together would receive 100s., or £5, weekly. If then a rise, say by 20 per cent., upon the *aggregate* sum of their weekly wages took place, there would be an advance from £5 to £6. Taking the average, we might say that the *general rate of wages* had risen by 20 per cent., although, in fact, the wages of the ten men had remained stationary, the wages of the one lot of five men had risen from 5s. to 6s. only, and the wages of the other lot of five men from 55s. to 70s. One-half of the men would not have improved at all their position, one-quarter would have improved it in an imperceptible degree, and only one-quarter would have bettered it really. Still, reckoning by the *average*, the total amount of the wages of those twenty men would have increased by 20 per cent., and as far as the aggregate capital that employs them, and the prices of the commodities they produce, are concerned, it would be exactly the same as if all of them had equally shared in the average rise of wages. In the case of agricultural labour, the standard wages being very different in the different counties of England and Scotland, the rise affected them very unequally.

Lastly, during the period when that rise of wages took place counteracting influences were at work, such as the new taxes consequent upon the Russian war,<sup>a</sup> the extensive demolition of the dwelling-houses of the agricultural labourers,<sup>93</sup> and so forth.

Having premised so much, I proceed to state that from 1849 to 1859 there took place a *rise of about 40 per cent.* in the average rate of the agricultural wages of Great Britain. I could give you ample

---

<sup>a</sup> The Crimean War of 1853-56.—*Ed.*

details in proof of my assertion, but for the present purpose think it sufficient to refer you to the conscientious and critical paper read in 1859 by the late Mr. *John C. Morton* at the London Society of Arts,<sup>94</sup> on *The Forces Used in Agriculture*. Mr. Morton gives the returns, from bills and other authentic documents, which he had collected from about one hundred farmers, residing in twelve Scotch and thirty-five English counties.

According to our friend Weston's opinion, and taken together with the simultaneous rise in the wages of the factory operatives, there ought to have occurred a tremendous rise in the prices of agricultural produce during the period 1849 to 1859. But what is the fact? Despite the Russian war, and the consecutive unfavourable harvests from 1854 to 1856, the average price of wheat, which is the leading agricultural produce of England, fell from about £3 per quarter for the years 1838 to 1848 to about £2 10s. per quarter for the years 1849 to 1859. This constitutes a fall in the price of wheat of more than 16 per cent. simultaneously with an average rise of agricultural wages of 40 per cent. During the same period, if we compare its end with its beginning, 1859 with 1849, there was a decrease of official pauperism from 934,419 to 860,470, the difference being 73,949; a very small decrease, I grant, and which in the following years was again lost, but still a decrease.

It might be said that, consequent upon the abolition of the Corn Laws,<sup>95</sup> the import of foreign corn was more than doubled during the period from 1849 to 1859, as compared with the period from 1838 to 1848. And what of that? From Citizen Weston's standpoint one would have expected that this sudden, immense, and continuously increasing demand upon foreign markets must have sent up the prices of agricultural produce there to a frightful height, the effect of increased demand remaining the same, whether it comes from without or from within. What was the fact? Apart from some years of failing harvests, during all the period the ruinous fall in the price of corn formed a standing theme of declamation in France; the Americans were again and again compelled to burn their surplus of produce; and Russia, if we are to believe Mr. Urquhart, prompted the Civil War in the United States<sup>96</sup> because her agricultural exports were crippled by the Yankee competition in the markets of Europe.<sup>a</sup>

*Reduced to its abstract form*, Citizen Weston's argument would come to this: Every rise in demand occurs always on the basis of a

<sup>a</sup> D. Urquhart, "The Right of Search: Two Speeches (January 20 and 27, 1862)", London, March 1862.—*Ed.*

given amount of production. It can, therefore, *never increase the supply of the articles demanded*, but can *only enhance their money prices*. Now the most common observation shows that an increased demand will, in some instances, leave the market prices of commodities altogether unchanged, and will, in other instances, cause a temporary rise of market prices followed by an increased supply, followed by a reduction of the prices *to* their original level, and in many cases *below* their original level. Whether the rise of demand springs from surplus wages, or from any other cause, does not at all change the conditions of the problem. From Citizen Weston's standpoint the general phenomenon was as difficult to explain as the phenomenon occurring under the exceptional circumstances of a rise of wages. His argument had, therefore, no peculiar bearing whatever upon the subject we treat. It only expressed his perplexity at accounting for the laws by which an increase of demand produces an increase of supply, instead of an ultimate rise of market prices.

### 3) [WAGES AND CURRENCY]

On the second day of the debate<sup>a</sup> our friend Weston clothed his old assertions in new forms. He said: Consequent upon a general rise in money wages, more currency will be wanted to pay the same wages. The currency being *fixed*, how can you pay with this fixed currency increased money wages? First the difficulty arose from the fixed amount of commodities accruing to the working man, despite his increase of money wages; now it arises from the increased money wages, despite the fixed amount of commodities. Of course, if you reject his original dogma, his secondary grievance will disappear.

However, I shall show that this currency question has nothing at all to do with the subject before us.

In your country the mechanism of payments is much more perfected than in any other country of Europe. Thanks to the extent and concentration of the banking system, much less currency is wanted to circulate the same amount of values, and to transact the same or a greater amount of business. For example, as far as wages are concerned, the English factory operative pays his wages weekly to the shopkeeper, who sends them weekly to the banker, who returns them weekly to the manufacturer, who again

<sup>a</sup> Presumably the meeting of the Central Council on May 23, 1865.—*Ed.*



pays them away to his working men, and so forth. By this contrivance the yearly wages of an operative, say of £52, may be paid by one single sovereign turning round every week in the same circle. Even in England the mechanism is less perfect than in Scotland, and is not everywhere equally perfect; and therefore we find, for example, that in some agricultural districts, as compared with the mere factory districts, much more currency is wanted to circulate a much smaller amount of values.

If you cross the Channel, you will find that the *money wages* are much lower than in England, but that they are circulated in Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and France by a *much larger amount of currency*. The same sovereign will not be so quickly intercepted by the banker or returned to the industrial capitalist; and, therefore, instead of one sovereign circulating £52 yearly, you want, perhaps, three sovereigns to circulate yearly wages to the amount of £25. Thus, by comparing continental countries with England, you will see at once that low money wages may require a much larger currency for their circulation than high money wages, and that this is, in fact, a merely technical point, quite foreign to our subject.

According to the best calculations I know, the yearly income of the working class of this country may be estimated at £250,000,000. This immense sum is circulated by about £3,000,000. Suppose a rise of wages of 50 per cent. to take place. Then, instead of £3,000,000 of currency, £4,500,000 would be wanted. As a very considerable part of the working man's daily expenses is laid out in silver and copper, that is to say, in mere tokens, whose relative value to gold is arbitrarily fixed by law, like that of inconvertible money paper, a rise of money wages by 50 per cent. would, in the extreme case, require an additional circulation of sovereigns, say to the amount of one million. One million, now dormant, in the shape of bullion or coin, in the cellars of the Bank of England, or of private bankers, would circulate. But even the trifling expense resulting from the additional minting or the additional wear and tear of that million might be spared, and would actually be spared, if any friction should arise from the want of the additional currency. All of you know that the currency of this country is divided into two great departments. One sort, supplied by bank-notes of different descriptions, is used in the transactions between dealers and dealers, and the larger payments from consumers to dealers, while another sort of currency, metallic coin, circulates in the retail trade. Although distinct, these two sorts of currency intermix

with each other. Thus gold coin, to a very great extent, circulates even in larger payments for all the odd sums under £5. If tomorrow £4 notes, or £3 notes, or £2 notes were issued, the gold filling these channels of circulation would at once be driven out of them, and flow into those channels where it would be needed from the increase of money wages. Thus the additional million required by an advance of wages by 50 per cent. would be supplied without the addition of one single sovereign. The same effect might be produced, without one additional bank-note, by an additional bill circulation, as was the case in Lancashire for a very considerable time.

If a general rise in the rate of wages, for example, of 100 per cent., as Citizen Weston supposed it to take place in agricultural wages, would produce a great rise in the prices of necessaries, and, according to his views, require an additional amount of currency not to be procured, a *general fall in wages* must produce the same effect, on the same scale, in an opposite direction. Well! All of you know that the years 1858 to 1860 were the most prosperous years for the cotton industry, and that peculiarly the year 1860 stands in that respect unrivalled in the annals of commerce, while at the same time all other branches of industry were most flourishing. The wages of the cotton operatives and of all the other working men connected with their trade stood, in 1860, higher than ever before. The American crisis<sup>97</sup> came, and those aggregate wages were suddenly reduced to about one-fourth of their former amount. This would have been in the opposite direction a rise of 300 per cent. If wages rise from five to twenty, we say that they rise by 300 per cent.; if they fall from twenty to five, we say that they fall by 75 per cent., but the amount of rise in the one and the amount of fall in the other case would be the same, namely, fifteen shillings. This, then, was a sudden change in the rate of wages unprecedented, and at the same time extending over a number of operatives which, if we count all the operatives not only directly engaged in but indirectly dependent upon the cotton trade, was larger by one-half than the number of agricultural labourers. Did the price of wheat fall? It *rose* from the annual average of 47s. 8d. per quarter during the three years of 1858 to 1860 to the annual average of 55s. 10d. per quarter during the three years 1861-63. As to the currency, there were coined in the mint in 1861 £8,673,232, against £3,378,102 in 1860. That is to say, there were coined £5,295,130 more in 1861 than in 1860. It is true the bank-note circulation was in 1861 less by £1,319,000 than in 1860. Take this off. There remains still an overplus of currency

for the year 1861, as compared with the prosperity year, 1860, to the amount of £3,976,130, or about £4,000,000; but the bullion reserve in the Bank of England had simultaneously decreased, not quite to the same, but in an approximating proportion.

Compare the year 1862 with 1842. Apart from the immense increase in the value and amount of commodities circulated, in 1862 the capital paid in regular transactions for shares, loans, etc., for the railways in England and Wales amounted alone to £320,000,000, a sum that would have appeared fabulous in 1842. Still, the aggregate amounts in currency in 1862 and 1842 were pretty nearly equal, and generally you will find a tendency to a progressive diminution of currency in the face of an enormously increasing value, not only of commodities, but of monetary transactions generally. From our friend Weston's standpoint this is an unsolvable riddle.

Looking somewhat deeper into this matter, he would have found that, quite apart from wages, and supposing them to be fixed, the value and mass of the commodities to be circulated, and generally the amount of monetary transactions to be settled, vary daily; that the amount of bank-notes issued varies daily; that the amount of payments realised without the intervention of any money, by the instrumentality of bills, checks, bookcredits, clearing houses, varies daily; that, as far as actual metallic currency is required, the proportion between the coin in circulation and the coin and bullion in reserve or sleeping in the cellars of banks varies daily; that the amount of bullion absorbed by the national circulation and the amount being sent abroad for international circulation vary daily. He would have found that his dogma of a fixed currency is a monstrous error, incompatible with the everyday movement. He would have inquired into the laws which enable a currency to adapt itself to circumstances so continually changing, instead of turning his misconception of the laws of currency into an argument against a rise of wages.

#### 4) [SUPPLY AND DEMAND]

Our friend Weston accepts the Latin proverb that *repetitio est mater studiorum*, that is to say, that repetition is the mother of study, and consequently he repeated his original dogma again under the new form that the contraction of currency, resulting from an enhancement of wages, would produce a diminution of capital, and so forth. Having already dealt with his currency

crotchet, I consider it quite useless to enter upon the imaginary consequences he fancies to flow from his imaginary currency mishap. I shall proceed to at once reduce his *one and the same dogma*, repeated in so many different shapes, to its *simplest theoretical form*.

The uncritical way in which he has treated his subject will become evident from one single remark. He pleads against a rise of wages or against high wages as the result of such a rise. Now, I ask him, What are high wages and what are low wages? Why constitute, for example, five shillings weekly low, and twenty shillings weekly high, wages? If five is low as compared with twenty, twenty is still lower as compared with two hundred. If a man was to lecture on the thermometer, and commenced by declaiming on high and low degrees, he would impart no knowledge whatever. He must first tell me how the freezing-point is found out, and how the boiling-point, and how these standard points are settled by natural laws, not by the fancy of the sellers or makers of thermometers. Now, in regard to wages and profits, Citizen Weston has not only failed to deduce such standard points from economical laws, but he has not even felt the necessity to look after them. He satisfied himself with the acceptance of the popular slang terms of low and high as something having a fixed meaning, although it is self-evident that wages can only be said to be high or low as compared with a standard by which to measure their magnitudes.

He will be unable to tell me why a certain amount of money is given for a certain amount of labour. If he should answer me, "This was settled by the law of supply and demand," I should ask him, in the first instance, by what law supply and demand are themselves regulated. And such an answer would at once put him out of court. The relations between the supply and demand of labour undergo perpetual change, and with them the market prices of labour. If the demand overshoots the supply wages rise; if the supply overshoots the demand wages sink, although it might in such circumstances be necessary to *test* the real state of demand and supply by a strike, for example, or any other method. But if you accept supply and demand as the law regulating wages, it would be as childish as useless to declaim against a rise of wages, because, according to the supreme law you appeal to, a periodical rise of wages is quite as necessary and legitimate as a periodical fall of wages. If you do *not* accept supply and demand as the law regulating wages, I again repeat the question, why a certain amount of money is given for a certain amount of labour?

But to consider matters more broadly: You would be altogether mistaken in fancying that the value of labour or any other commodity whatever is ultimately fixed by supply and demand. Supply and demand regulate nothing but the temporary *fluctuations* of market prices. They will explain to you why the market price of a commodity rises above or sinks below its *value*, but they can never account for that *value* itself. Suppose supply and demand to equilibrate, or, as the economists call it, to cover each other. Why, the very moment these opposite forces become equal they paralyse each other, and cease to work in the one or the other direction. At the moment when supply and demand equilibrate each other, and therefore cease to act, the *market price* of a commodity coincides with its *real value*, with the standard price round which its market prices oscillate. In inquiring into the nature of that *value*, we have, therefore, nothing at all to do with the temporary effects on market prices of supply and demand. The same holds true of wages and of the prices of all other commodities.

#### 5) [WAGES AND PRICES]

Reduced to their simplest theoretical expression, all our friend's arguments resolve themselves into this one single dogma: "*The prices of commodities are determined or regulated by wages.*"

I might appeal to practical observation to bear witness against this antiquated and exploded fallacy. I might tell you that the English factory operatives, miners, shipbuilders, and so forth, whose labour is relatively high-priced, undersell, by the cheapness of their produce, all other nations; while the English agricultural labourer, for example, whose labour is relatively low-priced, is undersold by almost every other nation, because of the dearness of his produce. By comparing article with article in the same country, and the commodities of different countries, I might show, apart from some exceptions more apparent than real, that on an average the high-priced labour produces the low-priced, and the low-priced labour produces the high-priced commodities. This, of course, would not prove that the high price of labour in the one, and its low price in the other instance, are the respective causes of those diametrically opposed effects, but at all events it would prove that the prices of commodities are not ruled by the prices of labour. However, it is quite superfluous for us to employ this empirical method.

It might, perhaps, be denied that Citizen Weston has put forward the dogma: "*The prices of commodities are determined or regulated by wages.*" In point of fact, he has never formulated it. He said, on the contrary, that profit and rent form also constituent parts of the prices of commodities, because it is out of prices of commodities that not only the working man's wages, but also the capitalist's profits and the landlord's rents must be paid. But how, in his idea, are prices formed? First by wages. Then an additional percentage is joined to the price on behalf of the capitalist, and another additional percentage on behalf of the landlord. Suppose the wages of the labour employed in the production of a commodity to be ten. If the rate of profit was 100 per cent. to the wages advanced, the capitalist would add ten, and if the rate of rent was also 100 per cent. upon the wages, there would be added ten more, and the aggregate price of the commodity would amount to thirty. But such a determination of prices would be simply their determination by wages. If wages in the above case rose to twenty, the price of the commodity would rise to sixty, and so forth. Consequently all the superannuated writers on political economy, who propounded the dogma that wages regulate prices, have tried to prove it by treating profit and rent as mere additional percentages upon wages. None of them were, of course, able to reduce the limits of those percentages to any economic law. They seem, on the contrary, to think profits settled by tradition, custom, the will of the capitalist, or by some other equally arbitrary and inexplicable method. If they assert that they are settled by the competition between the capitalists, they say nothing. That competition is sure to equalise the different rates of profit in different trades, or reduce them to one average level, but it can never determine the level itself, or the general rate of profit.

What do we mean by saying that the prices of the commodities are determined by wages? Wages being but a name for the price of labour, we mean that the prices of commodities are regulated by the price of labour. As "*price*" is exchangeable value—and in speaking of value I speak always of exchangeable value—is exchangeable value expressed in money, the proposition comes to this, that "*the value of commodities is determined by the value of labour*", or that "*the value of labour is the general measure of value*".

But how, then, is the "*value of labour*" itself determined? Here we come to a standstill. Of course, to a standstill if we try reasoning logically. Yet the propounders of that doctrine make short work of logical scruples. Take our friend Weston, for example. First he told us that wages regulate the price of

commodities and that consequently when wages rise prices must rise. Then he turned round to show us that a rise of wages will be no good because the prices of commodities had risen, and because wages were indeed measured by the prices of the commodities upon which they are spent. Thus we begin by saying that the value of labour determines the value of commodities, and we wind up by saying that the value of commodities determines the value of labour. Thus we move to and fro in the most vicious circle, and arrive at no conclusion at all.

On the whole it is evident that by making the value of one commodity, say labour, corn, or any other commodity, the general measure and regulator of value, we only shift the difficulty, since we determine one value by another, which on its side wants to be determined.

The dogma that “wages determine the prices of commodities”, expressed in its most abstract terms, comes to this, that “value is determined by value”, and this tautology means that, in fact, we know nothing at all about value. Accepting this premise, all reasoning about the general laws of political economy turns into mere twaddle. It was, therefore, the great merit of Ricardo that in his work *On the Principles of Political Economy*, published in 1817, he fundamentally destroyed the old, popular, and worn-out fallacy that “wages determine prices”, a fallacy which Adam Smith and his French predecessors had spurned in the really scientific parts of their researches, but which they reproduced in their more exoterical and vulgarising chapters.

## 6) [VALUE AND LABOUR]

Citizens, I have now arrived at a point where I must enter upon the real development of the question. I cannot promise to do this in a very satisfactory way, because to do so I should be obliged to go over the whole field of political economy. I can, as the French would say, but *effleurer la question*, touch upon the main points.

The first question we have to put is: What is the *value* of a commodity? How is it determined?

At first sight it would seem that the value of a commodity is a thing quite *relative*, and not to be settled without considering one commodity in its relations to all other commodities. In fact, in speaking of the value, the value in exchange of a commodity, we mean the proportional quantities in which it exchanges with all other commodities. But then arises the question: How are the

proportions in which commodities exchange with each other regulated?

We know from experience that these proportions vary infinitely. Taking one single commodity, wheat, for instance, we shall find that a quarter of wheat exchanges in almost countless variations of proportion with different commodities. Yet, *its value remaining always the same*, whether expressed in silk, gold, or any other commodity, it must be something distinct from, and independent of, these *different rates of exchange* with different articles. It must be possible to express, in a very different form, these various equations with various commodities.

Besides, if I say a quarter of wheat exchanges with iron in a certain proportion, or the value of a quarter of wheat is expressed in a certain amount of iron, I say that the value of wheat and its equivalent in iron are equal *to some third thing*, which is neither wheat nor iron, because I suppose them to express the same magnitude in two different shapes. Either of them, the wheat or the iron, must, therefore, independently of the other, be reducible to this third thing which is their common measure.

To elucidate this point I shall recur to a very simple geometrical illustration. In comparing the areas of triangles of all possible forms and magnitudes, or comparing triangles with rectangles, or any other rectilinear figure, how do we proceed? We reduce the area of any triangle whatever to an expression quite different from its visible form. Having found from the nature of the triangle that its area is equal to half the product of its base by its height, we can then compare the different values of all sorts of triangles, and of all rectilinear figures whatever, because all of them may be dissolved into a certain number of triangles.

The same mode of procedure must obtain with the values of commodities. We must be able to reduce all of them to an expression common to all, distinguishing them only by the proportions in which they contain that identical measure.

As the *exchangeable values* of commodities are only *social functions* of those things, and have nothing at all to do with their *natural* qualities, we must first ask, What is the common *social substance* of all commodities? It is *Labour*. To produce a commodity a certain amount of labour must be bestowed upon it, or worked up in it. And I say not only *Labour*, but *social Labour*. A man who produces an article for his own immediate use, to consume it himself, creates a *product*, but not a *commodity*. As a self-sustaining producer he has nothing to do with society. But to produce a *commodity*, a man must not only produce an article satisfying some



social want, but his labour itself must form part and parcel of the total sum of labour expended by society. It must be subordinate to the *Division of Labour within Society*. It is nothing without the other divisions of labour, and on its part is required to *integrate* them.

If we consider *commodities as values*, we consider them exclusively under the single aspect of *realised, fixed*, or, if you like, *crystallised social labour*. In this respect they can *differ* only by representing greater or smaller quantities of labour, as, for example, a greater amount of labour may be worked up in a silken handkerchief than in a brick. But how does one measure *quantities of labour*? By the *time the labour lasts*, in measuring the labour by the hour, the day, etc. Of course, to apply this measure, all sorts of labour are reduced to average or simple labour as their unit.

We arrive, therefore, at this conclusion. A commodity has a *value*, because it is a *crystallisation of social labour*. The *greatness* of its value, or its *relative value*, depends upon the greater or less amount of that social substance contained in it; that is to say, on the relative mass of labour necessary for its production. The *relative values of commodities* are, therefore, determined by the *respective quantities or amounts of labour, worked up, realised, fixed in them*. The *correlative quantities of commodities* which can be produced in the *same time of labour* are *equal*. Or the value of one commodity is to the value of another commodity as the quantity of labour fixed in the one is to the quantity of labour fixed in the other.

I suspect that many of you will ask, Does then, indeed, there exist such a vast, or any difference whatever, between determining the values of commodities by *wages*, and determining them by the *relative quantities of labour* necessary for their production? You must, however, be aware that the *reward* for labour, and *quantity of labour*, are quite disparate things. Suppose, for example, *equal quantities of labour* to be fixed in one quarter of wheat and one ounce of gold. I resort to the example because it was used by *Benjamin Franklin* in his first Essay published in 1729, and entitled, *A Modest Inquiry into the Nature and Necessity of a Paper Currency*, where he, one of the first, hit upon the true nature of value. Well. We suppose, then, that one quarter of wheat and one ounce of gold are *equal values or equivalents*, because they are *crystallisations of equal amounts of average labour*, of so many days' or so many weeks' labour respectively fixed in them. In thus determining the relative values of gold and corn, do we refer in any way whatever to the *wages* of the agricultural labourer and the miner? Not a bit. We leave it quite *indeterminate how* their day's or

week's labour was paid, or even whether wages labour was employed at all. If it was, wages may have been very unequal. The labourer whose labour is realised in the quarter of wheat may receive two bushels only, and the labourer employed in mining may receive one-half of the ounce of gold. Or, supposing their wages to be equal, they may deviate in all possible proportions from the values of the commodities produced by them. They may amount to one-half, one-third, one-fourth, one-fifth, or any other proportional part of the one quarter of corn or the one ounce of gold. Their *wages* can, of course, not *exceed*, not be *more* than the values of the commodities they produced, but they can be *less* in every possible degree. Their *wages* will be *limited* by the *values* of the products, but the *values of their products* will not be limited by the wages. And above all, the values, the relative values of corn and gold, for example, will have been settled without any regard whatever to the value of the labour employed, that is to say, to *wages*. To determine the values of commodities by the *relative quantities of labour fixed in them*, is, therefore, a thing quite different from the tautological method of determining the values of commodities by the value of labour, or by *wages*. This point, however, will be further elucidated in the progress of our inquiry.

In calculating the exchangeable value of a commodity we must add to the quantity of labour *last* employed the quantity of labour *previously* worked up in the raw material of the commodity, and the labour bestowed on the implements, tools, machinery, and buildings, with which such labour is assisted. For example, the value of a certain amount of cotton-yarn is the crystallisation of the quantity of labour added to the cotton during the spinning process, the quantity of labour previously realised in the cotton itself, the quantity of labour realised in the coal, oil and other auxiliary substances used, the quantity of labour fixed in the steam engine, the spindles, the factory building, and so forth. Instruments of production properly so-called, such as tools, machinery, buildings, serve again and again for a longer or shorter period during repeated processes of production. If they were used up at once, like the raw material, their whole value would at once be transferred to the commodities they assist in producing. But as a spindle, for example, is but gradually used up, an average calculation is made, based upon the average time it lasts, and its average waste or wear and tear during a certain period, say a day. In this way we calculate how much of the value of the spindle is transferred to the yarn daily spun, and how much, therefore, of the total amount of labour realised in a pound of yarn, for

example, is due to the quantity of labour previously realised in the spindle. For our present purpose it is not necessary to dwell any longer upon this point.

It might seem that if the value of a commodity is determined by the *quantity of labour bestowed upon its production*, the lazier a man, or the clumsier a man, the more valuable his commodity, because the greater the time of labour required for finishing the commodity. This, however, would be a sad mistake. You will recollect that I used the word "*Social labour*", and many points are involved in this qualification of "*Social*". In saying that the value of a commodity is determined by the *quantity of labour* worked up or crystallised in it, we mean *the quantity of labour necessary* for its production in a given state of society, under certain social average conditions of production, with a given social average intensity, and average skill of the labour employed. When, in England, the power-loom came to compete with the hand-loom, only one half of the former time of labour was wanted to convert a given amount of yarn into a yard of cotton or cloth. The poor hand-loom weaver now worked seventeen or eighteen hours daily, instead of the nine or ten hours he had worked before. Still the product of twenty hours of his labour represented now only ten social hours of labour, or ten hours of labour socially necessary for the conversion of a certain amount of yarn into textile stuffs. His product of twenty hours had, therefore, no more value than his former product of ten hours.

If then the quantity of socially necessary labour realised in commodities regulates their exchangeable values, every increase in the quantity of labour wanted for the production of a commodity must augment its value, as every diminution must lower it.

If the respective quantities of labour necessary for the production of the respective commodities remained constant, their relative values also would be constant. But such is not the case. The quantity of labour necessary for the production of a commodity changes continuously with the changes in the productive powers of the labour employed. The greater the productive powers of labour, the more produce is finished in a given time of labour, and the smaller the productive powers of labour, the less produce is finished in the same time. If, for example, in the progress of population it should become necessary to cultivate less fertile soils, the same amount of produce would be only attainable by a greater amount of labour spent, and the value of agricultural produce would consequently rise. On the other hand, if with the modern means of production, a single spinner converts into yarn,

during one working day, many thousand times the amount of cotton which he could have spun during the same time with the spinning wheel, it is evident that every single pound of cotton will absorb many thousand times less of spinning labour than it did before, and, consequently, the value added by spinning to every single pound of cotton will be a thousand times less than before. The value of yarn will sink accordingly.

Apart from the different natural energies and acquired working abilities of different peoples, the productive powers of labour must principally depend:

Firstly. Upon the *natural* conditions of labour, such as fertility of soil, mines, and so forth;

Secondly. Upon the progressive improvement of the *Social Powers of Labour*, such as are derived from production on a grand scale, concentration of capital and combination of labour, subdivision of labour, machinery, improved methods, appliance of chemical and other natural agencies, shortening of time and space by means of communication and transport, and every other contrivance by which science presses natural agencies into the service of labour, and by which the social or co-operative character of labour is developed. The greater the productive powers of labour, the less labour is bestowed upon a given amount of produce; hence the smaller the value of this produce. The smaller the productive powers of labour, the more labour is bestowed upon the same amount of produce; hence the greater its value. As a general law we may, therefore, set it down that:—

*The values of commodities are directly as the times of labour employed in their production, and are inversely as the productive powers of the labour employed.*

Having till now only spoken of *Value*, I shall add a few words about *Price*, which is a peculiar form assumed by value.

*Price*, taken by itself, is nothing but the *monetary expression of value*. The values of all commodities of this country, for example, are expressed in gold prices, while on the Continent they are mainly expressed in silver prices. The value of gold or silver, like that of all other commodities, is regulated by the quantity of labour necessary for getting them. You exchange a certain amount of your national products, in which a certain amount of your national labour is crystallised, for the produce of the gold and silver producing countries, in which a certain quantity of *their* labour is crystallised. It is in this way, in fact by barter, that you learn to express in gold and silver the values of all commodities, that is, the respective quantities of labour bestowed upon them.

Looking somewhat closer into the *monetary expression of value*, or what comes to the same, the *conversion of value into price*, you will find that it is a process by which you give to the *values* of all commodities an *independent* and *homogeneous form*, or by which you express them as quantities of *equal* social labour. So far as it is but the monetary expression of value, price has been called *natural price* by Adam Smith, "*prix nécessaire*" by the French physiocrats.

What then is the relation between *value* and *market prices*, or between *natural prices* and *market prices*? You all know that the *market price* is the *same* for all commodities of the same kind, however the conditions of production may differ for the individual producers. The market price expresses only the *average amount of social labour* necessary, under the average conditions of production, to supply the market with a certain mass of a certain article. It is calculated upon the whole lot of a commodity of a certain description.

So far the *market price* of a commodity coincides with its *value*. On the other hand, the oscillations of market prices, rising now over, sinking now under the value or natural price, depend upon the fluctuations of supply and demand. The deviations of market prices from values are continual, but as *Adam Smith* says:

"The natural price ... is [...] the central price, to which the prices of all commodities are continually gravitating. Different accidents may sometimes keep them suspended a good deal above it, and sometimes force them down even somewhat below it. But whatever may be the obstacles which hinder them from settling in this centre of repose and continuance, they are constantly tending towards it."<sup>a</sup>

I cannot now sift this matter. It suffices to say that *if* supply and demand equilibrate each other, the market prices of commodities will correspond to their natural prices, that is to say, to their values, as determined by the respective quantities of labour required for their production. But supply and demand *must* constantly tend to equilibrate each other, although they do so only by compensating one fluctuation by another, a rise by a fall, and vice versa. If instead of considering only the daily fluctuations you analyse the movement of market prices for longer periods, as Mr. Tooke, for example, has done in his *History of Prices*, you will find that the fluctuations of market prices, their deviations from values, their ups and downs, paralyse and compensate each other; so that,

---

<sup>a</sup> A. Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1814, p. 93.—Ed.

apart from the effect of monopolies and some other modifications I must now pass by, all descriptions of commodities are, on the average, sold at their respective *values* or natural prices. The average periods during which the fluctuations of market prices compensate each other are different for different kinds of commodities, because with one kind it is easier to adapt supply to demand than with the other.

If then, speaking broadly, and embracing somewhat longer periods, all descriptions of commodities sell at their respective values, it is nonsense to suppose that profit, not in individual cases, but that the constant and usual profits of different trades, spring from *surcharging* the prices of commodities, or selling them at a price over and above their *value*. The absurdity of this notion becomes evident if it is generalised. What a man would constantly win as a seller he would as constantly lose as a purchaser. It would not do to say that there are men who are buyers without being sellers, or consumers without being producers. What these people pay to the producers, they must first get from them for nothing. If a man first takes your money and afterwards returns that money in buying your commodities, you will never enrich yourselves by selling your commodities too dear to that same man. This sort of transaction might diminish a loss, but would never help in realising a profit.

To explain, therefore, the *general nature of profits*, you must start from the theorem that, on an average, commodities are *sold at their real value*, and that *profits are derived from selling them at their values*, that is, in proportion to the quantity of labour realised in them. If you cannot explain profit upon this supposition, you cannot explain it at all. This seems paradox and contrary to everyday observation. It is also paradox that the earth moves round the sun, and that water consists of two highly inflammable gases. Scientific truth is always paradox, if judged by everyday experience, which catches only the delusive appearance of things.

## 7) LABOURING POWER

Having now, as far as it could be done in such a cursory manner, analysed the nature of *Value*, of the *Value of any commodity whatever*, we must turn our attention to the specific *Value of Labour*. And here, again, I must startle you by a seeming paradox. All of you feel sure that what they daily sell is their Labour; that, therefore, Labour has a Price, and that, the price of

a commodity being only the monetary expression of its value, there must certainly exist such a thing as the *Value of Labour*. However, there exists no such thing as the *Value of Labour* in the common acceptance of the word. We have seen that the amount of necessary labour crystallised in a commodity constitutes its value. Now, applying this notion of value, how could we define, say, the value of a ten hours' working day? How much labour is contained in that day? Ten hours' labour. To say that the value of a ten hours' working day is equal to ten hours' labour, or the quantity of labour contained in it, would be a tautological and, moreover, a nonsensical expression. Of course, having once found out the true but hidden sense of the expression "*Value of Labour*", we shall be able to interpret this irrational, and seemingly impossible application of value, in the same way that, having once made sure of the real movement of the celestial bodies, we shall be able to explain their apparent or merely phenomenal movements.

What the working man sells is not directly his *Labour*, but his *Labouring Power*, the temporary disposal of which he makes over to the capitalist. This is so much the case that I do not know whether by the English Laws, but certainly by some Continental Laws, the *maximum time* is fixed for which a man is allowed to sell his labouring power. If allowed to do so for any indefinite period whatever, slavery would be immediately restored. Such a sale, if it comprised his lifetime, for example, would make him at once the lifelong slave of his employer.

One of the oldest economists and most original philosophers of England—Thomas Hobbes—has already, in his *Leviathan*, instinctively hit upon this point overlooked by all his successors. He says:

"The value or worth of a man is, as in all other things, his *price*: that is, so much as would be given for the *Use of his Power*."<sup>a</sup>

Proceeding from this basis, we shall be able to determine the *Value of Labour* as that of all other commodities.

But before doing so, we might ask, how does this strange phenomenon arise, that we find on the market a set of buyers, possessed of land, machinery, raw material, and the means of subsistence, all of them, save land in its crude state, the *products of labour*, and on the other hand, a set of sellers who have nothing to sell except their labouring power, their working arms and brains? That the one set buys continually in order to make a profit and enrich themselves, while the other set continually sells in order to earn their livelihood? The inquiry into this question would be an

<sup>a</sup> *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, Vol. III, London, 1839, p. 76.—*Ed.*

inquiry into what the economists call "*Previous, or Original Accumulation*", but which ought to be called *Original Expropriation*. We should find that this so-called *Original Accumulation* means nothing but a series of historical processes, resulting in a *Decomposition of the Original Union* existing between the Labouring Man and his Instruments of Labour. Such an inquiry, however, lies beyond the pale of my present subject. The *Separation* between the Man of Labour and the Instruments of Labour once established, such a state of things will maintain itself and reproduce itself upon a constantly increasing scale, until a new and fundamental revolution in the mode of production should again overturn it, and restore the original union in a new historical form.

What, then, is the *Value of Labouring Power*?

Like that of every other commodity, its value is determined by the quantity of labour necessary to produce it. The labouring power of a man exists only in his living individuality. A certain mass of necessaries must be consumed by a man to grow up and maintain his life. But the man, like the machine, will wear out, and must be replaced by another man. Beside the mass of necessaries required for *his own* maintenance, he wants another amount of necessaries to bring up a certain quota of children that are to replace him on the labour market and to perpetuate the race of labourers. Moreover, to develop his labouring power, and acquire a given skill, another amount of values must be spent. For our purpose it suffices to consider only *average* labour, the costs of whose education and development are vanishing magnitudes. Still I must seize upon this occasion to state that, as the costs of producing labouring powers of different quality differ, so must differ the values of the labouring powers employed in different trades. The cry for an *equality of wages* rests, therefore, upon a mistake, is an *insane* wish never to be fulfilled. It is an offspring of that false and superficial radicalism that accepts premises and tries to evade conclusions. Upon the basis of the wages system the value of labouring power is settled like that of every other commodity; and as different kinds of labouring power have different values, or require different quantities of labour for their production, they *must* fetch different prices in the labour market. To clamour for *equal or even equitable retribution* on the basis of the wages system is the same as to clamour for *freedom* on the basis of the slavery system. What you think just or equitable is out of the question. The question is: What is necessary and unavoidable with a given system of production?



After what has been said, it will be seen that the *value of labouring power* is determined by the *value of the necessaries* required to produce, develop, maintain, and perpetuate the labouring power.

## 8) PRODUCTION OF SURPLUS-VALUE

Now suppose that the average amount of the daily necessaries of a labouring man require *six hours of average labour* for their production. Suppose, moreover, six hours of average labour to be also realised in a quantity of gold equal to 3s. Then 3s. would be the *Price*, or the monetary expression of the *Daily Value* of that man's *Labouring Power*. If he worked daily six hours he would daily produce a value sufficient to buy the average amount of his daily necessaries, or to maintain himself as a labouring man.

But our man is a wages labourer. He must, therefore, sell his labouring power to a capitalist. If he sells it at 3s. daily, or 18s. weekly, he sells it at its value. Suppose him to be a spinner. If he works six hours daily he will add to the cotton a value of 3s. daily. This value, daily added by him, would be an exact equivalent for the wages, or the price of his labouring power, received daily. But in that case *no surplus-value* or *surplus-produce* whatever would go to the capitalist. Here, then, we come to the rub.

In buying the labouring power of the workman, and paying its value, the capitalist, like every other purchaser, has acquired the right to consume or use the commodity bought. You consume or use the labouring power of a man by making him work as you consume or use a machine by making it run. By paying the daily or weekly value of the labouring power of the workman, the capitalist has, therefore, acquired the right to use or make that labouring power work during the *whole day or week*. The working day or the working week has, of course, certain limits, but those we shall afterwards look more closely at.

For the present I want to turn your attention to one decisive point.

The *value* of the labouring power is determined by the quantity of labour necessary to maintain or reproduce it, but the *use* of that labouring power is only limited by the active energies and physical strength of the labourer. The daily or weekly *value* of the labouring power is quite distinct from the daily or weekly *exercise* of that power, the same as the food a horse wants and the time it can carry the horseman are quite distinct. The quantity of labour

by which the *value* of the workman's labouring power is limited forms by no means a limit to the quantity of labour which his labouring power is apt to perform. Take the example of our spinner. We have seen that, to daily reproduce his labouring power, he must daily reproduce a value of three shillings, which he will do by working six hours daily. But this does not disable him from working ten or twelve or more hours a day. But by paying the daily or weekly *value* of the spinner's labouring power, the capitalist has acquired the right of using that labouring power during the *whole day or week*. He will, therefore, make him work daily, say, *twelve* hours. *Over and above* the six hours required to replace his wages, or the value of his labouring power, he will, therefore, have to work *six other hours*, which I shall call hours of *surplus-labour*, which surplus labour will realise itself in a *surplus-value* and a *surplus-produce*. If our spinner, for example, by his daily labour of six hours, added three shillings' value to the cotton, a value forming an exact equivalent to his wages, he will, in twelve hours, add six shillings' worth to the cotton, and produce a *proportional surplus of yarn*. As he has sold his labouring power to the capitalist, the whole value or produce created by him belongs to the capitalist, the owner *pro tempore* of his labouring power. By advancing three shillings, the capitalist will, therefore, realise a value of six shillings, because, advancing a value in which six hours of labour are crystallised, he will receive in return a value in which twelve hours of labour are crystallised. By repeating this same process daily, the capitalist will daily advance three shillings and daily pocket six shillings, one-half of which will go to pay wages anew, and the other half of which will form *surplus-value*, for which the capitalist pays no equivalent. It is *this sort of exchange between capital and labour* upon which capitalistic production, or the wages system, is founded, and which must constantly result in reproducing the working man as a working man, and the capitalist as a capitalist.

The *rate of surplus-value*, all other circumstances remaining the same, will depend on the proportion between that part of the working day necessary to reproduce the value of the labouring power and the *surplus-time* or *surplus-labour* performed for the capitalist. It will, therefore, depend on the *ratio in which the working day is prolonged over and above that extent*, by working which the working man would only reproduce the value of his labouring power, or replace his wages.

## 9) VALUE OF LABOUR

We must now return to the expression, "*Value, or Price of Labour*".

We have seen that, in fact, it is only the value of the labouring power, measured by the values of commodities necessary for its maintenance. But since the workman receives his wages *after* his labour is performed, and knows, moreover, that what he actually gives to the capitalist is his labour, the value or price of his labouring power necessarily appears to him as the *price* or *value* of *his labour itself*. If the price of his labouring power is three shillings, in which six hours of labour are realised, and if he works twelve hours, he necessarily considers these three shillings as the value or price of twelve hours of labour, although these twelve hours of labour realise themselves in a value of six shillings. A double consequence flows from this.

*Firstly.* The value or price of the labouring power takes the semblance of the *price* or *value* of *labour itself*, although, strictly speaking, value and price of labour are senseless terms.

*Secondly.* Although one part only of the workman's daily labour is *paid*, while the other part is *unpaid*, and while that unpaid or surplus-labour constitutes exactly the fund out of which *surplus-value* or *profit* is formed, it seems as if the aggregate labour was paid labour.

This false appearance distinguishes *wages labour* from other *historical* forms of labour. On the basis of the wages system even the *unpaid* labour seems to be *paid* labour. With the *slave*, on the contrary, even that part of his labour which is paid appears to be unpaid. Of course, in order to work the slave must live, and one part of his working day goes to replace the value of his own maintenance. But since no bargain is struck between him and his master, and no acts of selling and buying are going on between the two parties, all his labour seems to be given away for nothing.

Take, on the other hand, the peasant serf, such as he, I might say, until yesterday existed in the whole East of Europe. This peasant worked, for example, three days for himself on his own field or the field allotted to him, and the three subsequent days he performed compulsory and gratuitous labour on the estate of his lord. Here, then, the paid and unpaid parts of labour were visibly separated, separated in time and space; and our Liberals overflowed with moral indignation at the preposterous notion of making a man work for nothing.

In point of fact, however, whether a man works three days of

the week for himself on his own field and three days for nothing on the estate of his lord, or whether he works in the factory or the workshop six hours daily for himself and six for his employer, comes to the same, although in the latter case the paid and unpaid portions of labour are inseparably mixed up with each other, and the nature of the whole transaction is completely masked by the *intervention of a contract* and the *pay* received at the end of the week. The gratuitous labour appears to be voluntarily given in the one instance, and to be compulsory in the other. That makes all the difference.

In using the expression "*value of labour*", I shall only use it as a popular slang term for "*value of labouring power*".

#### 10) PROFIT IS MADE BY SELLING A COMMODITY AT ITS VALUE

Suppose an average hour of labour to be realised in a value equal to sixpence, or twelve average hours of labour to be realised in six shillings. Suppose, further, the value of labour to be three shillings or the produce of six hours' labour. If, then, in the raw material, machinery, and so forth, used up in a commodity, twenty-four hours of average labour were realised, its value would amount to twelve shillings. If, moreover, the workman employed by the capitalist added twelve hours of labour to those means of production, these twelve hours would be realised in an additional value of six shillings. The *total value of the product* would, therefore, amount to thirty-six hours of realised labour, and be equal to eighteen shillings. But as the value of labour, or the wages paid to the workman, would be three shillings only, no equivalent would have been paid by the capitalist for the six hours of surplus-labour worked by the workman, and realised in the value of the commodity. By selling this commodity at its value for eighteen shillings, the capitalist would, therefore, realise a value of three shillings, for which he had paid no equivalent. These three shillings would constitute the surplus-value or profit pocketed by him. The capitalist would consequently realise the profit of three shillings, not by selling his commodity at a price *over and above* its value, but by selling it *at its real value*.

The value of a commodity is determined by the *total quantity of labour* contained in it. But part of that quantity of labour is realised in a value for which an equivalent has been paid in the form of wages; part of it is realised in a value for which *no*

equivalent has been paid. Part of the labour contained in the commodity is *paid* labour; part is *unpaid* labour. By selling, therefore, the commodity *at its value*, that is, as the crystallisation of the *total quantity of labour* bestowed upon it, the capitalist must necessarily sell it at a profit. He sells not only what has cost him an equivalent, but he sells also what has cost him nothing, although it has cost his workman labour. The cost of the commodity to the capitalist and its real cost are different things. I repeat, therefore, that normal and average profits are made by selling commodities not *above* but *at their real values*.

#### 11) THE DIFFERENT PARTS INTO WHICH SURPLUS-VALUE IS DECOMPOSED

The *surplus-value*, or that part of the total value of the commodity in which the *surplus-labour* or *unpaid labour* of the working man is realised, I call *Profit*. The whole of that profit is not pocketed by the employing capitalist. The monopoly of land enables the landlord to take one part of that *surplus-value*, under the name of *rent*, whether the land is used for agriculture, buildings or railways, or for any other productive purpose. On the other hand, the very fact that the possession of the *means of labour* enables the employing capitalist to produce a *surplus-value*, or, what comes to the same, to *appropriate to himself a certain amount of unpaid labour*, enables the owner of the means of labour, which he lends wholly or partly to the employing capitalist—enables, in one word, the *money-lending capitalist* to claim for himself under the name of *interest* another part of that surplus-value, so that there remains to the employing capitalist *as such* only what is called *industrial* or *commercial* profit.

By what laws this division of the total amount of surplus-value amongst the three categories of people is regulated is a question quite foreign to our subject. This much, however, results from what has been stated.

*Rent, Interest, and Industrial Profit* are only *different names for different parts* of the *surplus-value* of the commodity, or the *unpaid labour enclosed in it*, and they are *equally derived from this source, and from this source alone*. They are not derived from *land* as such or from *capital* as such, but land and capital enable their owners to get their respective shares out of the surplus-value extracted by the employing capitalist from the labourer. For the labourer himself it is a matter of subordinate importance whether that

surplus-value, the result of his surplus-labour, or unpaid labour, is altogether pocketed by the employing capitalist, or whether the latter is obliged to pay portions of it, under the name of rent and interest, away to third parties. Suppose the employing capitalist to use only his own capital and to be his own landlord, then the whole surplus-value would go into his pocket.

It is the employing capitalist who immediately extracts from the labourer this surplus-value, whatever part of it he may ultimately be able to keep for himself. Upon this relation, therefore, between the employing capitalist and the wages labourer the whole wages system and the whole present system of production hinge. Some of the citizens who took part in our debate were, therefore, wrong in trying to mince matters, and to treat this fundamental relation between the employing capitalist and the working man as a secondary question, although they were right in stating that, under given circumstances, a rise of prices might affect in very unequal degrees the employing capitalist, the landlord, the moneyed capitalist, and, if you please, the tax-gatherer.

Another consequence follows from what has been stated.

That part of the value of the commodity which represents only the value of the raw materials, the machinery, in one word, the value of the means of production used up, forms *no revenue* at all, but replaces *only capital*. But, apart from this, it is false that the other part of the value of the commodity *which forms revenue*, or may be spent in the form of wages, profits, rent, interest, is *constituted* by the value of wages, the value of rent, the value of profits, and so forth. We shall, in the first instance, discard wages, and only treat industrial profits, interest, and rent. We have just seen that the *surplus-value* contained in the commodity or that part of its value in which *unpaid labour* is realised, *dissolves* itself into different fractions, bearing three different names. But it would be quite the reverse of the truth to say that its value is *composed* of, or *formed* by, the *addition* of the *independent values* of these three *constituents*.

If one hour of labour realises itself in a value of sixpence, if the working day of the labourer comprises twelve hours, if half of this time is unpaid labour, that surplus-labour will add to the commodity a *surplus-value* of three shillings, that is, a value for which no equivalent has been paid. This surplus-value of three shillings constitutes the *whole fund* which the employing capitalist may divide, in whatever proportions, with the landlord and the money-lender. The value of these three shillings constitutes the limit of the value they have to divide amongst them. But it is not

the employing capitalist who adds to the value of the commodity an arbitrary value for his profit, to which another value is added for the landlord and so forth, so that the addition of these arbitrarily fixed values would constitute the total value. You see, therefore, the fallacy of the popular notion, which confounds the *decomposition of a given value* into three parts, with the *formation* of that value by the addition of three *independent* values, thus converting the aggregate value, from which rent, profit, and interest are derived, into an arbitrary magnitude.

If the total profit realised by a capitalist be equal to £100, we call this sum, considered as *absolute* magnitude, the *amount of profit*. But if we calculate the ratio which those £100 bear to the capital advanced, we call this *relative* magnitude, the *rate of profit*. It is evident that this rate of profit may be expressed in a double way.

Suppose £100 to be the capital *advanced in wages*. If the surplus value created is also £100—and this would show us that half the working day of the labourer consists of *unpaid* labour—and if we measured this profit by the value of the capital advanced in wages, we should say that the *rate of profit* amounted to one hundred per cent., because the value advanced would be one hundred and the value realised would be two hundred.

If, on the other hand, we should not only consider the *capital advanced in wages*, but the *total capital* advanced, say for example £500, of which £400 represented the value of raw materials, machinery, and so forth, we should say that the *rate of profit* amounted only to twenty per cent., because the profit of one hundred would be but the fifth part of the *total* capital advanced.

The first mode of expressing the rate of profit is the only one which shows you the real ratio between paid and unpaid labour, the real degree of the *exploitation* (you must allow me this French word) *of labour*. The other mode of expression is that in common use, and is, indeed, appropriate for certain purposes. At all events, it is very useful for concealing the degree in which the capitalist extracts gratuitous labour from the workman.

In the remarks I have still to make I shall use the word *Profit* for the whole amount of the surplus-value extracted by the capitalist without any regard to the division of the surplus-value between different parties, and in using the words *Rate of Profit*, I shall always measure profits by the value of the capital advanced in wages.

12) GENERAL RELATION OF PROFITS,  
WAGES AND PRICES

Deduct from the value of a commodity the value replacing the value of the raw materials and other means of production used upon it, that is to say, deduct the value representing the *past* labour contained in it, and the remainder of its value will dissolve into the quantity of labour added by the working man *last* employed. If that working man works twelve hours daily, if twelve hours of average labour crystallise themselves in an amount of gold equal to six shillings, this additional value of six shillings is the *only* value his labour will have created. This given value, determined by the time of his labour, is the only fund from which both he and the capitalist have to draw their respective shares or dividends, the only value to be divided into wages and profits. It is evident that this value itself will not be altered by the variable proportions in which it may be divided amongst the two parties. There will also be nothing changed if in the place of one working man you put the whole working population, twelve million working days, for example, instead of one.

Since the capitalist and workman have only to divide this limited value, that is, the value measured by the total labour of the working man, the more the one gets the less will the other get, and vice versa. Whenever a quantity is given, one part of it will increase inversely as the other decreases. If the wages change, profits will change in an opposite direction. If wages fall, profits will rise; and if wages rise, profits will fall. If the working man, on our former supposition, gets three shillings, equal to one half of the value he has created, or if his whole working day consists half of paid, half of unpaid labour, the *rate of profit* will be 100 per cent., because the capitalist would also get three shillings. If the working man receives only two shillings, or works only one-third of the whole day for himself, the capitalist will get four shillings, and the rate of profit will be 200 per cent. If the working man receives four shillings, the capitalist will only receive two, and the rate of profit would sink to 50 per cent., but all these variations will not affect the value of the commodity. A general rise of wages would, therefore, result in a fall of the general rate of profit, but not affect values.

But although the values of commodities, which must ultimately regulate their market prices, are exclusively determined by the total quantities of labour fixed in them, and not by the division of that quantity into paid and unpaid labour, it by no means follows



that the values of the single commodities, or lots of commodities, produced during twelve hours, for example, will remain constant. The *number* or mass of commodities produced in a given time of labour, or by a given quantity of labour, depends upon the *productive power* of the labour employed, and not upon its *extent* or length. With one degree of the productive power of spinning labour, for example, a working day of twelve hours may produce twelve pounds of yarn, with a lesser degree of productive power only two pounds. If then twelve hours' average labour were realised in the value of six shillings, in the one case the twelve pounds of yarn would cost six shillings, in the other case the two pounds of yarn would also cost six shillings. One pound of yarn would, therefore, cost sixpence in the one case, and three shillings in the other. This difference of price would result from the difference in the productive powers of the labour employed. One hour of labour would be realised in one pound of yarn with the greater productive power, while with the smaller productive power, six hours of labour would be realised in one pound of yarn. The price of a pound of yarn would, in the one instance, be only sixpence, although wages were relatively high and the rate of profit low; it would be three shillings in the other instance, although wages were low and the rate of profit high. This would be so because the price of the pound of yarn is regulated by the *total amount of labour worked up* in it, and not by the *proportional division of that total amount into paid and unpaid labour*. The fact I have before mentioned that high-priced labour may produce cheap, and low-priced labour may produce dear commodities, loses, therefore, its paradoxical appearance. It is only the expression of the general law that the value of a commodity is regulated by the quantity of labour worked up in it, and that the quantity of labour worked up in it depends altogether upon the productive powers of the labour employed, and will, therefore, vary with every variation in the productivity of labour.

### 13) MAIN CASES OF ATTEMPTS AT RAISING WAGES OR RESISTING THEIR FALL

Let us now seriously consider the main cases in which a rise of wages is attempted or a reduction of wages resisted.

1. We have seen that the *value of the labouring power*, or in more popular parlance, the *value of labour*, is determined by the value of

necessaries, or the quantity of labour required to produce them. If, then, in a given country the value of the daily average necessaries of the labourer represented six hours of labour expressed in three shillings, the labourer would have to work six hours daily to produce an equivalent for his daily maintenance. If the whole working day was twelve hours, the capitalist would pay him the value of his labour by paying him three shillings. Half the working day would be unpaid labour, and the rate of profit would amount to 100 per cent. But now suppose that, consequent upon a decrease of productivity, more labour should be wanted to produce, say, the same amount of agricultural produce, so that the price of the average daily necessaries should rise from three to four shillings. In that case the *value* of labour would rise by one-third, or  $33\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. Eight hours of the working day would be required to produce an equivalent for the daily maintenance of the labourer, according to his old standard of living. The surplus-labour would therefore sink from six hours to four, and the rate of profit from 100 to 50 per cent. But in insisting upon a rise of wages, the labourer would only insist upon getting the *increased value of his labour*, like every other seller of a commodity, who, the costs of his commodities having increased, tries to get its increased value paid. If wages did not rise, or not sufficiently rise, to compensate for the increased values of necessaries, the *price* of labour would sink *below the value of labour*, and the labourer's standard of life would deteriorate.

But a change might also take place in an opposite direction. By virtue of the increased productivity of labour, the same amount of the average daily necessaries might sink from three to two shillings, or only four hours out of the working day, instead of six, be wanted to reproduce an equivalent for the value of the daily necessaries. The working man would now be able to buy with two shillings as many necessaries as he did before with three shillings. Indeed, the *value of labour* would have sunk, but that diminished value would command the same amount of commodities as before. Then profits would rise from three to four shillings, and, the rate of profit from 100 to 200 per cent. Although the labourer's absolute standard of life would have remained the same, his *relative wages*, and therewith his *relative social position*, as compared with that of the capitalist, would have been lowered. If the working man should resist that reduction of relative wages, he would only try to get some share in the increased productive powers of his own labour, and to maintain his former relative position in the social scale. Thus, after the abolition of the Corn

Laws, and in flagrant violation of the most solemn pledges given during the anti-corn law agitation, the English factory lords generally reduced wages ten per cent. The resistance of the workmen was at first baffled, but, consequent upon circumstances I cannot now enter upon, the ten per cent. lost were afterwards regained.

2. The *values* of necessaries, and consequently the *value of labour*, might remain the same, but a change might occur in their *money prices*, consequent upon a previous *change* in the *value of money*.

By the discovery of more fertile mines and so forth, two ounces of gold might, for example, cost no more labour to produce than one ounce did before. The *value* of gold would then be depreciated by one half, or fifty per cent. As the *values* of all other commodities would then be expressed in twice their former *money prices*, so also the same with the *value of labour*. Twelve hours of labour, formerly expressed in six shillings, would now be expressed in twelve shillings. If the working man's wages should remain three shillings, instead of rising to six shillings, the *money price of his labour* would only be equal to *half the value of his labour*, and his standard of life would fearfully deteriorate. This would also happen in a greater or lesser degree if his wages should rise, but not proportionately to the fall in the value of gold. In such a case nothing would have been changed, either in the productive powers of labour, or in supply and demand, or in values. Nothing could have changed except the *money names* of those values. To say that in such a case the workman ought not to insist upon a proportionate rise of wages, is to say that he must be content to be paid with names, instead of with things. All past history proves that whenever such a depreciation of money occurs the capitalists are on the alert to seize this opportunity for defrauding the workman. A very large school of political economists assert that, consequent upon the new discoveries of gold lands, the better working of silver mines, and the cheaper supply of quicksilver, the value of precious metals has been again depreciated. This would explain the general and simultaneous attempts on the Continent at a rise of wages.

3. We have till now supposed that the *working day* has given limits. The working day, however, has, by itself, no constant limits. It is the constant tendency of capital to stretch it to its utmost physically possible length, because in the same degree surplus-labour, and consequently the profit resulting therefrom, will be increased. The more capital succeeds in prolonging the working

day, the greater the amount of other people's labour it will appropriate. During the seventeenth and even the first two-thirds of the eighteenth century a ten hours' working day was the normal working day all over England. During the anti-Jacobin war, which was in fact a war waged by the British barons against the British working masses<sup>98</sup> capital celebrated its bacchanalia, and prolonged the working day from ten to twelve, fourteen, eighteen hours. *Malthus*, by no means a man whom you would suspect of a maudlin sentimentalism, declared in a pamphlet, published about 1815, that if this sort of things was to go on the life of the nation would be attacked at its very source.<sup>a</sup> A few years before the general introduction of the newly-invented machinery, about 1765, a pamphlet appeared in England under the title, *An Essay on Trade*.<sup>b</sup> The anonymous author, an avowed enemy of the working classes, declaims on the necessity of expanding the limits of the working day. Amongst other means to this end, he proposes *working houses*, which, he says, ought to be "*Houses of Terror*". And what is the length of the working day he prescribes for these "*Houses of Terror*"? *Twelve hours*, the very same time which in 1832 was declared by capitalists, political economists, and ministers to be not only the existing but the necessary time of labour for a child under twelve years.<sup>99</sup>

By selling his labouring power, and he must do so under the present system, the working man makes over to the capitalist the consumption of that power, but within certain rational limits. He sells his labouring power in order to maintain it, apart from its natural wear and tear, but not to destroy it. In selling his labouring power at its daily or weekly value, it is understood that in one day or one week that labouring power shall not be submitted to two days' or two weeks' waste or wear and tear. Take a machine worth £1,000. If it is used up in ten years it will add to the value of the commodities in whose production it assists £100 yearly. If it be used up in five years it would add £200 yearly, or the value of its annual wear and tear is in inverse ratio to the quickness with which it is consumed. But this distinguishes the working man from the machine. Machinery does not wear out exactly in the same ratio in which it is used. Man, on the contrary, decays in a greater ratio than would be visible from the mere numerical addition of work.

<sup>a</sup> Th. R. Malthus, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Progress of Rent, and the Principles by which it is regulated*, London, 1815.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *An Essay on Trade and Commerce: Containing Observations on Taxes*, London, 1770.—Ed.

In their attempts at reducing the working day to its former rational dimensions, or, where they cannot enforce a legal fixation of a normal working day, at checking overwork by a rise of wages, a rise not only in proportion to the surplus-time exacted, but in a greater proportion, working men fulfil only a duty to themselves and their race. They only set limits to the tyrannical usurpations of capital. Time is the room of human development. A man who has no free time to dispose of, whose whole lifetime, apart from the mere physical interruptions by sleep, meals, and so forth, is absorbed by his labour for the capitalist, is less than a beast of burden. He is a mere machine for producing Foreign Wealth, broken in body and brutalised in mind. Yet the whole history of modern industry shows that capital, if not checked, will recklessly and ruthlessly work to cast down the whole working class to the utmost state of degradation.

In prolonging the working day the capitalist may pay *higher wages* and still lower the *value of labour*, if the rise of wages does not correspond to the greater amount of labour extracted, and the quicker decay of the labouring power thus caused. This may be done in another way. Your middle-class statisticians will tell you, for instance, that the average wages of factory families in Lancashire have risen. They forget that instead of the labour of the man, the head of the family, his wife and perhaps three or four children are now thrown under the Juggernaut wheels<sup>100</sup> of capital, and that the rise of the aggregate wages does not correspond to the aggregate surplus-labour extracted from the family.

Even with given limits of the working day, such as now exist in all branches of industry subjected to the factory laws, a rise of wages may become necessary, if only to keep up the old standard *value of labour*. By increasing the *intensity* of labour, a man may be made to expend as much vital force in one hour as he formerly did in two. This has, to a certain degree, been effected in the trades, placed under the Factory Acts, by the acceleration of machinery, and the greater number of working machines which a single individual has now to superintend. If the increase in the intensity of labour or the mass of labour spent in an hour keeps some fair proportion to the decrease in the extent of the working day, the working man will still be the winner. If this limit is overshot, he loses in one form what he has gained in another, and ten hours of labour may then become as ruinous as twelve hours were before. In checking this tendency of capital, by struggling for a rise of wages corresponding to the rising intensity of labour, the

working man only resists the depreciation of his labour and the deterioration of his race.

4. All of you know that, from reasons I have not now to explain, capitalistic production moves through certain periodical cycles. It moves through a state of quiescence, growing animation, prosperity, overtrade, crisis, and stagnation. The market prices of commodities, and the market rates of profit, follow these phases, now sinking below their averages, now rising above them. Considering the whole cycle, you will find that one deviation of the market price is being compensated by the other, and that, taking the average of the cycle, the market prices of commodities are regulated by their values. Well! During the phase of sinking market prices and the phases of crisis and stagnation, the working man, if not thrown out of employment altogether, is sure to have his wages lowered. Not to be defrauded, he must, even with such a fall of market prices, debate with the capitalist in what proportional degree a fall of wages has become necessary. If, during the phases of prosperity, when extra profits are made, he did not battle for a rise of wages, he would, taking the average of one industrial cycle, not even receive his *average wages*, or the *value* of his labour. It is the utmost height of folly to demand that while his wages are necessarily affected by the adverse phases of the cycle, he should exclude himself from compensation during the prosperous phases of the cycle. Generally, the *values* of all commodities are only realised by the compensation of the continuously changing market prices, springing from the continuous fluctuations of demand and supply. On the basis of the present system labour is only a commodity like others. It must, therefore, pass through the same fluctuations to fetch an average price corresponding to its value. It would be absurd to treat it on the one hand as a commodity, and to want on the other hand to exempt it from the laws which regulate the prices of commodities. The slave receives a permanent and fixed amount of maintenance; the wages labourer does not. He must try to get a rise of wages in the one instance, if only to compensate for a fall of wages in the other. If he resigned himself to accept the will, the dictates of the capitalist as a permanent economical law, he would share in all the miseries of the slave, without the security of the slave.

5. In all the cases I have considered, and they form ninety-nine out of a hundred, you have seen that a struggle for a rise of wages follows only in the track of *previous* changes, and is the necessary offspring of previous changes in the amount of production, the productive powers of labour, the value of labour, the value of

money, the extent or the intensity of labour extracted, the fluctuations of market prices, dependent upon the fluctuations of demand and supply, and consistent with the different phases of the industrial cycle; in one word, as reactions of labour against the previous action of capital. By treating the struggle for a rise of wages independently of all these circumstances, by looking only upon the change of wages, and overlooking all the other changes from which they emanate, you proceed from a false premise in order to arrive at false conclusions.

#### 14) THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN CAPITAL AND LABOUR AND ITS RESULTS

1. Having shown that the periodical resistance on the part of the working men against a reduction of wages, and their periodical attempts at getting a rise of wages, are inseparable from the wages system, and dictated by the very fact of labour being assimilated to commodities, and therefore subject to the laws regulating the general movement of prices; having, furthermore, shown that a general rise of wages would result in a fall in the general rate of profit, but not affect the average prices of commodities, or their values, the question now ultimately arises, how far, in this incessant struggle between capital and labour, the latter is likely to prove successful.

I might answer by a generalisation, and say that, as with all other commodities, so with labour, its *market price* will, in the long run, adapt itself to its *value*; that, therefore, despite all the ups and downs, and do what he may, the working man will, on an average, only receive the value of his labour, which resolves into the value of his labouring power, which is determined by the value of the necessaries required for its maintenance and reproduction, which value of necessaries finally is regulated by the quantity of labour wanted to produce them.

But there are some peculiar features which distinguish the *value of the labouring power*, or the *value of labour*, from the values of all other commodities. The value of the labouring power is formed by two elements—the one merely physical, the other historical or social. Its *ultimate limit* is determined by the *physical* element, that is to say, to maintain and reproduce itself, to perpetuate its physical existence, the working class must receive the necessaries absolutely indispensable for living and multiplying. The *value* of

those indispensable necessities forms, therefore, the ultimate limit of the *value of labour*. On the other hand, the length of the working day is also limited by ultimate, although very elastic boundaries. Its ultimate limit is given by the physical force of the labouring man. If the daily exhaustion of his vital forces exceeds a certain degree, it cannot be exerted anew, day by day. However, as I said, this limit is very elastic. A quick succession of unhealthy and short-lived generations will keep the labour market as well supplied as a series of vigorous and long-lived generations.

Besides this mere physical element, the value of labour is in every country determined by a *traditional standard of life*. It is not mere physical life, but it is the satisfaction of certain wants springing from the social conditions in which people are placed and reared up. The English standard of life may be reduced to that of a Livonian peasant. The important part which historical tradition and social habitude play in this respect, you may learn from Mr. Thornton's work on *Over-population*, where he shows that the average wages in different agricultural districts of England still nowadays differ more or less according to the more or less favourable circumstances under which the districts have emerged from the state of serfdom.

This historical or social element, entering into the value of labour, may be expanded, or contracted; or altogether extinguished, so that nothing remains but the *physical limit*. During the time of the *anti-Jacobin war*, undertaken, as the incorrigible tax-eater and sinecurist, old George Rose, used to say, to save the comforts of our holy religion from the inroads of the French infidels, the honest English farmers, so tenderly handled in a former chapter of ours, depressed the wages of the agricultural labourers even beneath that *mere physical minimum*, but made up by *Poor Laws*<sup>101</sup> the remainder necessary for the physical perpetuation of the race. This was a glorious way to convert the wages labourer into a slave, and Shakespeare's proud yeoman into a pauper.

By comparing the standard wages or values of labour in different countries, and by comparing them in different historical epochs of the same country, you will find that the *value of labour* itself is not a fixed but a variable magnitude, even supposing the values of all other commodities to remain constant.

A similar comparison would prove that not only the *market rates of profit* change but its *average rates*.

But as to *profits*, there exists no law which determines their



*minimum*. We cannot say what is the ultimate limit of their decrease. And why cannot we fix that limit? Because, although we can fix the *minimum* of wages, we cannot fix their *maximum*. We can only say that, the limits of the working day being given, the *maximum of profit* corresponds to the *physical minimum of wages*; and that wages being given, the *maximum of profit* corresponds to such a prolongation of the working day as is compatible with the physical forces of the labourer. The maximum of profit is, therefore, limited by the physical minimum of wages and the physical maximum of the working day. It is evident that between the two limits of this *maximum rate of profit* an immense scale of variations is possible. The fixation of its actual degree is only settled by the continuous struggle between capital and labour, the capitalist constantly tending to reduce wages to their physical minimum, and to extend the working day to its physical maximum, while the working man constantly presses in the opposite direction.

The matter resolves itself into a question of the respective powers of the combatants.

2. As to the *limitation of the working day* in England, as in all other countries, it has never been settled except by *legislative interference*. Without the working men's continuous pressure from without that interference would never have taken place. But at all events, the result was not to be attained by private settlement between the working men and the capitalists. This very necessity of *general political action* affords the proof that in its merely economic action capital is the stronger side.

As to the *limits of the value of labour*, its actual settlement always depends upon supply and demand. I mean the demand for labour on the part of capital, and the supply of labour by the working men. In colonial countries the law of supply and demand favours the working man. Hence the relatively high standard of wages in the United States. Capital may there try its utmost. It cannot prevent the labour market from being continuously emptied by the continuous conversion of wages labourers into independent, self-sustaining peasants. The position of a wages labourer is for a very large part of the American people but a probational state, which they are sure to leave within a longer or shorter term. To mend this colonial state of things, the paternal British Government accepted for some time what is called the modern colonisation theory, which consists in putting an artificial high price upon colonial land, in order to prevent the too quick conversion of the wages labourer into the independent peasant.<sup>102</sup>

But let us now come to old civilised countries, in which capital domineers over the whole process of production. Take, for example, the rise in England of agricultural wages from 1849 to 1859. What was its consequence? The farmers could not, as our friend Weston would have advised them, raise the value of wheat, nor even its market prices. They had, on the contrary, to submit to their fall. But during these eleven years they introduced machinery of all sorts, adopted more scientific methods, converted part of arable land into pasture, increased the size of farms, and with this the scale of production, and by these and other processes, diminishing the demand for labour by increasing its productive power, made the agricultural population again relatively redundant. This is the general method in which a reaction, quicker or slower, of capital against a rise of wages takes place in old, settled countries. Ricardo has justly remarked that machinery is in constant competition with labour, and can often be only introduced when the price of labour has reached a certain height, but the appliance of machinery is but one of the many methods for increasing the productive powers of labour.<sup>a</sup> This very same development which makes common labour relatively redundant simplifies on the other hand skilled labour, and thus depreciates it.

The same law obtains in another form. With the development of the productive powers of labour the accumulation of capital will be accelerated, even despite a relatively high rate of wages. Hence, one might infer, as *Adam Smith*, in whose days modern industry was still in its infancy, did infer, that the accelerated accumulation of capital must turn the balance in favour of the working man, by securing a growing demand for his labour. From this same standpoint many contemporary writers have wondered that English capital having grown in the last twenty years so much quicker than English population, wages should not have been more enhanced. But simultaneously with the progress of accumulation there takes place a *progressive change* in the *composition of capital*. That part of the aggregate capital which consists of fixed capital, machinery, raw materials, means of production in all possible forms, progressively increases as compared with the other part of capital, which is laid out in wages or in the purchase of labour. This law has been stated in a more or less accurate manner by Mr. Barton, Ricardo, Sismondi, Professor Richard Jones, Professor Ramsay, Cherbuliez, and others.

---

<sup>a</sup> D. Ricardo, *On the Principles of Political Economy, and Taxation*, London, 1821, p. 479.—Ed.

If the proportion of these two elements of capital was originally one to one, it will, in the progress of industry, become five to one, and so forth. If of a total capital of 600, 300 is laid out in instruments, raw materials, and so forth, and 300 in wages, the total capital wants only to be doubled to create a demand for 600 working men instead of for 300. But if of a capital of 600, 500 is laid out in machinery, materials, and so forth, and 100 only in wages, the same capital must increase from 600 to 3,600 in order to create a demand for 600 workmen instead of 300. In the progress of industry the demand for labour keeps, therefore, no pace with accumulation of capital. It will still increase, but increase in a constantly diminishing ratio as compared with the increase of capital.

These few hints will suffice to show that the very development of modern industry must progressively turn the scale in favour of the capitalist against the working man, and that consequently the general tendency of capitalistic production is not to raise, but to sink the average standard of wages, or to push the *value of labour* more or less to its *minimum limit*. Such being the tendency of *things* in this system, is this saying that the working class ought to renounce their resistance against the encroachments of capital, and abandon their attempts at making the best of the occasional chances for their temporary improvement? If they did, they would be degraded to one level mass of broken wretches past salvation. I think I have shown that their struggles for the standard of wages are incidents inseparable from the whole wages system, that in 99 cases out of 100 their efforts at raising wages are only efforts at maintaining the given value of labour, and that the necessity of debating their price with the capitalist is inherent in their condition of having to sell themselves as commodities. By cowardly giving way in their everyday conflict with capital, they would certainly disqualify themselves for the initiating of any larger movement.

At the same time, and quite apart from the general servitude involved in the wages system, the working class ought not to exaggerate to themselves the ultimate working of these everyday struggles. They ought not to forget that they are fighting with effects, but not with the causes of those effects; that they are retarding the downward movement, but not changing its direction; that they are applying palliatives, not curing the malady. They ought, therefore, not to be exclusively absorbed in these unavoidable guerilla fights incessantly springing up from the never-ceasing encroachments of capital or changes of the market. They ought to

understand that, with all the miseries it imposes upon them, the present system simultaneously engenders the *material conditions* and the *social forms* necessary for an economical reconstruction of society. Instead of the *conservative* motto, "A fair day's wage for a fair day's work!" they ought to inscribe on their banner the *revolutionary* watchword, "Abolition of the wages system!"

After this very long and, I fear, tedious exposition which I was obliged to enter into to do some justice to the subject-matter, I shall conclude by proposing the following resolutions:

Firstly. A general rise in the rate of wages would result in a fall of the general rate of profit, but, broadly speaking, not affect the prices of commodities.

Secondly. The general tendency of capitalist production is not to raise, but to sink the average standard of wages.

Thirdly. Trades Unions work well as centres of resistance against the encroachments of capital. They fail partially from an injudicious use of their power. They fail generally from limiting themselves to a guerilla war against the effects of the existing system, instead of simultaneously trying to change it, instead of using their organised forces as a lever for the final emancipation of the working class, that is to say, the ultimate abolition of the wages system.

Karl Marx

[RESOLUTION  
ON THE CONVOCAATION OF A GENERAL CONGRESS  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL IN 1866]

The Standing Committee recommended to the Central Council to agree to the following as a recommendation to the conference<sup>103</sup>:

The Central Council shall in 1866 convoke a general congress unless unforeseen circumstances shall necessitate its further postponement.

Adopted by the Central Council on  
September 19, 1865

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny  
Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*,  
Moscow, 1961

Karl Marx

[RESOLUTION  
ON THE PROCEDURE OF DISCUSSING  
THE PROGRAMME OF THE CONGRESS<sup>104</sup>]

That the general purposes and ruling principles of the Association as laid down in the Address and Statutes be first defined before entering upon the discussion of the questions proposed by the conference.

Adopted by the Central Council on  
January 23, 1866

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny  
Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*,  
Moscow, 1961

# THE COMMONWEALTH.

REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

No. 159.

SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1866.

Price One Penny.

Frederick Engels

## WHAT HAVE THE WORKING CLASSES TO DO WITH POLAND?<sup>105</sup>

### I.

TO THE EDITOR OF *THE COMMONWEALTH*.

[*The Commonwealth*, No. 159, March 24, 1866]

Sir,—Wherever the working classes have taken a part of their own in political movements, there, from the very beginning, their foreign policy was expressed in the few words—*Restoration of Poland*. This was the case with the Chartist movement so long as it existed; this was the case with the French working men long before 1848, as well as during that memorable year, when on the 15th of May they marched on to the National Assembly to the cry of “*Vive la Pologne!*”—Poland for ever!<sup>106</sup> This was the case in Germany, when, in 1848 and '49, the organs of the working class<sup>a</sup> demanded war with Russia for the restoration of Poland.<sup>107</sup> It is the case even now;—with one exception—of which more anon—the working men of Europe unanimously proclaim the restoration of Poland as a part and parcel of their political programme, as the most comprehensive expression of their foreign policy. The middle-class, too, have had, and have still, “sympathies” with the Poles; which sympathies have not prevented them from leaving the Poles in the lurch in 1831, in 1846, in 1863,<sup>108</sup> nay, have not even prevented them from leaving the worst enemies of Poland, such as Lord Palmerston, to manage matters so as to actually assist Russia while they talked in favour of Poland. But with the working classes it is different. They mean intervention, not non-intervention; they mean war with Russia while Russia meddles with Poland; and they have proved it every time the Poles rose against their oppressors. And recently, the International Working Men’s Association has given a fuller expression to this universal

<sup>a</sup> A reference to the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* and other democratic and workers’ newspapers.—*Ed.*

instinctive feeling of the body it claims to represent, by inscribing on its banner, "Resistance to Russian encroachments upon Europe—Restoration of Poland."<sup>109</sup>

This programme of the foreign policy of the working men of Western and Central Europe has found a unanimous consent among the class to whom it was addressed, with one exception, as we said before. There are among the working men of France a small minority who belong to the school of the late P. J. Proudhon. This school differs *in toto* from the generality of the advanced and thinking working men; it declares them to be ignorant fools, and maintains, on most points, opinions quite contrary to theirs. This holds good in their foreign policy also. The Proudhonists, sitting in judgment on oppressed Poland, find the verdict of the Staleybridge jury, "Serves her right." They admire Russia as the great land of the future, as the most progressive nation upon the face of the earth, at the side of which such a paltry country as the United States is not worthy of being named. They have charged the Council of the International Association with setting up the Bonapartist principle of nationalities, and with declaring that magnanimous Russian people without the pale of civilised Europe; such being a grievous sin against the principles of universal democracy and the fraternity of all nations. These are the charges.<sup>110</sup> Barring the democratic phraseology at the wind-up, they coincide, it will be seen at once, verbally and literally with what the extreme Tories of all countries have to say about Poland and Russia. Such charges are not worth refuting; but, as they come from a fraction of the working classes, be it ever so small a one, they may render it desirable to state again the case of Poland and Russia, and to vindicate what we may henceforth call the foreign policy of the united working men of Europe.

But why do we always name Russia alone in connection with Poland? Have not two German Powers, Austria and Prussia, shared in the plunder? Do not they, too, hold parts of Poland in bondage, and, in connection with Russia, do they not work to keep down every national Polish movement?

It is well known how hard Austria has struggled to keep out of the Polish business; how long she resisted the plans of Russia and Prussia for the partition. Poland was a natural ally of Austria against Russia. When Russia once became formidable, nothing could be more in the interest of Austria than to keep Poland alive between herself and the newly-rising Empire. It was only when Austria saw that Poland's fate was settled, that with or without her,



the other two Powers were determined to annihilate her, it was only then that in self-protection she went in for a share of the territory. But as early as 1815 she held out for the restoration of an independent Poland; in 1831 and in 1863 she was ready to go to war for that object, and give up her own share of Poland, provided England and France were prepared to join her. The same during the Crimean war. This is not said in justification of the general policy of the Austrian Government. Austria has shown often enough that to oppress a weaker nation is congenial work to her rulers. But in the case of Poland the instinct of self-preservation was stronger than the desire for new territory or the habits of Government. And this puts Austria out of court for the present.

As to Prussia, her share of Poland is too trifling to weigh much in the scale. Her friend and ally, Russia, has managed to ease her of nine-tenths of what she got during the three partitions.<sup>111</sup> But what little is left to her weighs as an incubus upon her. It has chained her to the triumphal car of Russia, it has been the means of enabling her Government, even in 1863 and '64, to practise unchallenged, in Prussian-Poland, those breaches of the law, those infractions of individual liberty, of the right of meeting, of the liberty of the press, which were so soon afterwards to be applied to the rest of the country; it has falsified the whole middle-class Liberal movement which, from fear of risking the loss of a few square miles of land on the eastern frontier, allowed the Government to set all law aside with regard to the Poles. The working men, not only of Prussia, but of all Germany, have a greater interest than those of any other country in the restoration of Poland, and they have shown in every revolutionary movement that they know it. Restoration of Poland, to them, is emancipation of their own country from Russian vassalage. And this, we think, puts Prussia out of court, too. Whenever the working classes of Russia (if there is such a thing in that country, in the sense it is understood in Western Europe) form a political programme, and that programme contains the liberation of Poland—then, but not till then, Russia as a nation will be out of court too, and the Government of the Czar will remain alone under indictment.

## II.

TO THE EDITOR OF *THE COMMONWEALTH*.[*The Commonwealth*, No. 160, March 31, 1866]

Sir,—It is said that to claim independence for Poland is to acknowledge the “principle of nationalities”, and that the principle of nationalities is a Bonapartist invention concocted to prop up the Napoleonic despotism in France. Now what is this “principle of nationalities”?

By the treaties of 1815 the boundaries of the various States of Europe were drawn merely to suit diplomatic convenience, and especially to suit the convenience of the then strongest continental Power—Russia. No account was taken either of the wishes, the interests, or the national diversities of the populations. Thus, Poland was divided, Germany was divided, Italy was divided, not to speak of the many smaller nationalities inhabiting south-eastern Europe, and of which few people at that time knew anything. The consequence was that for Poland, Germany, and Italy, the very first step in every political movement was to attempt the restoration of that national unity without which national life was but a shadow. And when, after the suppression of the revolutionary attempts in Italy and Spain, 1821-23, and again, after the revolution of July, 1830, in France, the extreme politicians of the greater part of civilised Europe came into contact with each other, and attempted to work out a kind of common programme, the liberation and unification of the oppressed and subdivided nations became a watchword common to all of them.<sup>112</sup> So it was again in 1848, when the number of oppressed nations was increased by a fresh one, viz., Hungary. There could, indeed, be no two opinions as to the right of every one of the great national subdivisions of Europe to dispose of itself, independently of its neighbours, in all internal matters, so long as it did not encroach upon the liberty of the others. This right was, in fact, one of the fundamental conditions of the internal liberty of all. How could, for instance, Germany aspire to liberty and unity, if at the same time she assisted Austria to keep Italy in bondage, either directly or by her vassals? Why, the total breaking-up of the Austrian monarchy is the very first condition of the unification of Germany!

This right of the great national subdivisions of Europe to political independence, acknowledged as it was by the European democracy, could not but find the same acknowledgment with the working classes especially. It was, in fact, nothing more than to

recognise in other large national bodies of undoubted vitality the same right of individual national existence which the working men of each separate country claimed for themselves. But this recognition, and the sympathy with these national aspirations, were restricted to the large and well-defined historical nations of Europe; there was Italy, Poland, Germany, Hungary. France, Spain, England, Scandinavia, were neither subdivided nor under foreign control, and therefore but indirectly interested in the matter; and as to Russia, she could only be mentioned as the detainer of an immense amount of stolen property, which would have to be disgorged on the day of reckoning.

After the *coup d'état* of 1851, Louis Napoleon, the Emperor "by the grace of God and the national will", had to find a democraticised and popular-sounding name for his foreign policy. What could be better than to inscribe upon his banners the "principle of nationalities"? Every nationality to be the arbiter of its own fate—every detached fraction of any nationality to be allowed to annex itself to its great mother-country—what could be more liberal? Only, mark, there was not, now, any more question of *nations*, but of *nationalities*.

There is no country in Europe where there are not different nationalities under the same government. The Highland Gaels and the Welsh are undoubtedly of different nationalities to what the English are, although nobody will give to these remnants of peoples long gone by the title of nations, any more than to the Celtic inhabitants of Brittany in France. Moreover, no state boundary coincides with the natural boundary of nationality, that of language. There are plenty of people out of France whose mother tongue is French, same as there are plenty of people of German language out of Germany; and in all probability it will ever remain so. It is a natural consequence of the confused and slow-working historical development through which Europe has passed during the last thousand years, that almost every great nation has parted with some outlying portions of its own body, which have become separated from the national life, and in most cases participated in the national life of some other people; so much so, that they do not wish to rejoin their own main stock. The Germans in Switzerland and Alsace do not desire to be reunited to Germany, any more than the French in Belgium and Switzerland wish to become attached politically to France. And after all, it is no slight advantage that the various nations, as politically constituted, have most of them some foreign elements within themselves, which form connecting links with their neigh-

bours, and vary the otherwise too monotonous uniformity of the national character.

Here, then, we perceive the difference between the "principle of *nationalities*" and the old democratic and working-class tenet as to the right of the great European *nations* to separate and independent existence. The "principle of nationalities" leaves entirely untouched the great question of the right of national existence for the historic peoples of Europe; nay, if it touches it, it is merely to disturb it. The principle of nationalities raises two sorts of questions; first of all, questions of boundary between these great historic peoples; and secondly, questions as to the right to independent national existence of those numerous small relics of peoples which, after having figured for a longer or shorter period on the stage of history, were finally absorbed as integral portions into one or the other of those more powerful nations whose greater vitality enabled them to overcome greater obstacles. The European importance, the vitality of a people is as nothing in the eyes of the principle of nationalities; before it, the Roumans of Wallachia, who never had a history, nor the energy required to have one, are of equal importance to the Italians who have a history of 2,000 years, and an unimpaired national vitality; the Welsh and Manxmen, if they desired it, would have an equal right to independent political existence, absurd though it would be, with the English.<sup>113</sup> The whole thing is an absurdity, got up in a popular dress in order to throw dust in shallow people's eyes, and to be used as a convenient phrase, or to be laid aside if the occasion requires it.

Shallow as the thing is, it required cleverer brains than Louis Napoleon's to invent it. The principle of nationalities, so far from being a Bonapartist invention to favour a resurrection of Poland, is nothing but a *Russian invention concocted to destroy Poland*. Russia has absorbed the greater part of ancient Poland on the plea of the principle of nationalities, as we shall see hereafter. The idea is more than a hundred years old, and Russia uses it now every day. What is Panslavism but the application, by Russia, and in Russian interest, of the principle of nationalities to the Serbians, Croats, Ruthenes,<sup>114</sup> Slovaks, Czechs, and other remnants of bygone Slavonian peoples in Turkey, Hungary, and Germany? Even at this present moment, the Russian Government have agents travelling among the Lapponians in Northern Norway and Sweden, trying to agitate among these nomadic savages the idea of a "great Finnic nationality", which is to be restored in the extreme North of Europe, under Russian protection, of course. The "cry

of anguish" of the oppressed Laplanders is raised very loud in the Russian papers—not by those same oppressed nomads, but by the Russian agents—and indeed it is a frightful oppression, to induce these poor Laplanders to learn the civilised Norwegian or Swedish language, instead of confining themselves to their own barbaric, half Esquimaux idiom! The principle of nationalities, indeed, could be invented in Eastern Europe alone, where the tide of Asiatic invasion, for a thousand years, recurred again and again, and left on the shore those heaps of intermingled ruins of nations which even now the ethnologist can scarcely disentangle, and where the Turk, the Finnic Magyar, the Rouman, the Jew, and about a dozen Slavonic tribes, live intermixed in interminable confusion. That was the ground to work the principle of nationalities, and how Russia has worked it there, we shall see by-and-by in the example of Poland.<sup>a</sup>

### III.

#### THE DOCTRINE OF NATIONALITY APPLIED TO POLAND.

[*The Commonwealth*, No. 165, May 5, 1866]

*Poland*, like almost all other European countries, is inhabited by people of different nationalities. The mass of the population, the nucleus of its strength, is no doubt formed by the Poles proper, who speak the Polish language. But ever since 1390 Poland proper has been united to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania,<sup>115</sup> which has formed, up to the last partition in 1794, an integral portion of the Polish Republic. This Grand Duchy of Lithuania was inhabited by a great variety of races. The northern provinces, on the Baltic, were in possession of *Lithuanians* proper, people speaking a language distinct from that of their Slavonic neighbours; these Lithuanians had been, to a great extent, conquered by German immigrants, who, again, found it hard to hold their own against the Lithuanian Grand Dukes. Further south, and east of the present kingdom of Poland, were the *White Russians*, speaking a language betwixt Polish and Russian, but nearer the latter; and finally the southern provinces were inhabited by the so-called *Little Russians*,<sup>b</sup> whose language is now by most authorities considered as perfectly distinct from the Great Russian (the language we

<sup>a</sup> Here follows an editor's note: (To be continued).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Ukrainians.—*Ed.*

commonly call Russian). Therefore, if people say that, to demand the restoration of Poland is to appeal to the principle of nationalities, they merely prove that they do not know what they are talking about, for the restoration of Poland means the re-establishment of a State composed of at least four different nationalities.

When the old Polish State was thus being formed by the union with Lithuania, where was then Russia? Under the heel of the Mongolian conqueror, whom the Poles and Germans combined, 150 years before, had driven back east of the Dnieper. It took a long struggle until the Grand Dukes of Moscow finally shook off the Mongol yoke, and set about combining the many different principalities of Great Russia into one State.<sup>116</sup> But this success seems only to have increased their ambition. No sooner had Constantinople fallen to the Turk,<sup>a</sup> than the Moscovite Grand Duke<sup>b</sup> placed in his coat-of-arms the double-headed eagle of the Byzantine Emperors, thereby setting up his claim as their successor and future avenger; and ever since, it is well known, have the Russians worked to conquer Czaregrad, the town of the Czar, as they call Constantinople in their language. Then, the rich plains of Little Russia excited their lust of annexation; but the Poles were then a strong, and always a brave people, and not only knew how to fight for their own, but also how to retaliate; in the beginning of the seventeenth century they even held Moscow for a few years.<sup>117</sup>

The gradual demoralisation of the ruling aristocracy, the want of power to develop a middle class, and the constant wars devastating the country, at last broke the strength of Poland. A country which persisted in maintaining unimpaired the feudal state of society, while all its neighbours progressed, formed a middle class, developed commerce and industry, and created large towns—such a country was doomed to ruin. No doubt the aristocracy *did* ruin Poland, and ruin her thoroughly; and after ruining her, they upbraided each other for having done so, and sold themselves and their country to the foreigner. Polish history, from 1700 to 1772, is nothing but a record of Russian usurpation of dominion in Poland, rendered possible by the corruptibility of the nobles. Russian soldiers were almost constantly occupying the country, and the Kings of Poland, if not willing traitors themselves, were placed more and more under the thumb of the

---

<sup>a</sup> in 1453.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Ivan III.—*Ed.*

Russian Ambassador. So well had this game succeeded, and so long had it been played, that, when Poland at last was annihilated, there was no outcry at all in Europe, and, indeed, people were astonished at this only, that Russia should have the generosity of giving such a large slice of the territory to Austria and Prussia.

The way in which this partition was brought about, is particularly interesting. There was, at that time, already an enlightened "public opinion" in Europe. Although the *Times* newspaper had not yet begun to manufacture that article, there was that kind of public opinion which had been created by the immense influence of Diderot, Voltaire, Rousseau, and the other French writers of the eighteenth century. Russia always knew that it is important to have public opinion on one's side, if possible; and Russia took care to have it, too. The Court of Catherine II was made the head-quarters of the enlightened men of the day, especially Frenchmen; the most enlightened principle was professed by the Empress and her Court, and so well did she succeed in deceiving them that Voltaire and many others sang the praise of the "Semiramis of the North", and proclaimed Russia the most progressive country in the world, the home of liberal principles, the champion of religious toleration.

Religious toleration—that was the word wanted to put down Poland. Poland had always been extremely liberal in religious matters; witness the asylum the Jews found there while they were persecuted in all other parts of Europe. The greater portion of the people in the Eastern provinces belonged to the Greek faith, while the Poles proper were Roman Catholics. A considerable portion of these Greek Catholics had been induced, during the sixteenth century, to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope, and were called United Greeks<sup>118</sup>; but a great many continued true to their old Greek religion in all respects. They were principally the serfs, their noble masters being almost all Roman Catholics, they were Little Russians by nationality. Now, this Russian Government, which did not tolerate at home any other religion but the Greek, and punished apostasy as a crime; which was conquering foreign nations and annexing foreign provinces right and left; and which was at that time engaged in riveting still firmer the fetters of the Russian serf—this same Russian Government came soon upon Poland in the name of religious toleration, because Poland was said to oppress the Greek Catholics; in the name of the principle of nationalities, because the inhabitants of these Eastern provinces were *Little* Russians, and ought, therefore, to be annexed to *Great* Russia; and in the name of the right of revolution arming the

serfs against their masters. Russia is not at all scrupulous in the selection of her means. Talk about a war of class against class as something extremely revolutionary;—why, Russia set such a war on foot in Poland nearly 100 years ago, and a fine specimen of a class-war it was, when Russian soldiers and Little Russian serfs went in company to burn down the castles of the Polish lords, merely to prepare Russian annexation, which being once accomplished, the same Russian soldiers put the serfs back again under the yoke of their lords.

All this was done in the cause of religious toleration, because the principle of nationalities was not then fashionable in Western Europe. But it was held up before the eyes of the Little Russian peasants at the time, and has played an important part since in Polish affairs. The first and foremost ambition of Russia is the union of all Russian tribes under the Czar, who calls himself the Autocrat of all the Russias (*Samodergetz vseckh Rossyiskikh*), and among these she includes White and Little Russia. And in order to prove that her ambition went no further, she took very good care, during the three partitions, to annex none but White and Little Russian provinces; leaving the country inhabited by Poles, and even a portion of Little Russia (Eastern Galicia) to her accomplices. But how do matters stand now? The greater portion of the provinces annexed in 1793 and 1794 by Austria and Prussia are now under Russian dominion, under the name of the Kingdom of Poland, and from time to time hopes are raised among the Poles, that if they will only submit to Russian supremacy, and renounce all claims to the ancient Lithuanian provinces, they may expect a reunion of all other Polish provinces and a restoration of Poland, with the Russian Emperor for a King. And if at the present juncture Prussia and Austria came to blows, it is more than probable that the war will not be, ultimately, for the annexation of Schleswig-Holstein to Prussia, or of Venice to Italy, but rather of Austrian, and at least a portion of Prussian, Poland to Russia.

So much for the principle of nationalities in Polish affairs.

Written at the end of January and before  
April 6, 1866

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The Commonwealth*,  
Nos. 159, 160 and 165, March 24, 31 and  
May 5, 1866

Signed: *Frederic Engels*



## Karl Marx

A WARNING <sup>119</sup>

Some time ago the London journeymen tailors formed a general association <sup>120</sup> to uphold their demands against the London master tailors, who are mostly big capitalists. It was a question not only of bringing wages into line with the increased prices of means of subsistence, but also of putting an end to the exceedingly harsh treatment of the workers in this branch of industry. The masters sought to frustrate this plan by recruiting journeymen tailors, chiefly in Belgium, France and Switzerland. Thereupon the secretaries of the Central Council of the International Working Men's Association published in Belgian, French and Swiss newspapers a warning which was a complete success.<sup>121</sup> The London masters' manoeuvre was foiled; they had to surrender and meet their workers' just demands.

Defeated in England, the masters are now trying to take counter-measures, starting in *Scotland*. The fact is that, as a result of the London events, they had to agree, initially, to a 15 per cent. wage rise in Edinburgh as well. But secretly they sent agents to Germany to recruit journeymen tailors, particularly in the Hanover and Mecklenburg areas, for importation to Edinburgh. The first group has already been shipped off. The purpose of this importation is the same as that of the importation of Indian<sup>a</sup> COOLIES to Jamaica, namely, *perpetuation of slavery*. If the Edinburgh masters succeeded, through the import of German labour, in nullifying the concessions they had already made, it would inevitably lead to repercussions in England. *No one would suffer more than the German workers themselves*, who constitute in Great

---

<sup>a</sup> "Asiatic" in the original.—*Ed.*

Britain a larger number than the workers of all the other Continental nations. And the newly-imported workers, being completely helpless in a strange land, would soon sink to the level of pariahs.

Furthermore, it is a point of honour with the German workers to prove to other countries that they, like their brothers in France, Belgium and Switzerland, know how to defend the common interests of their class and will not become *obedient mercenaries of capital* in its struggle against labour.

On behalf of the Central Council<sup>a</sup>  
of the International Working Men's Association,

*Karl Marx*

London, May 4, 1866

German journeymen tailors who wish to know more about conditions in Britain are requested to address their letters to the German branch committee of the London Tailors' Association, c/o *Albert F. Haufe*, Crown Public House, Hedden Court, Regent Street, *London*.

First published in *Der Bote vom Niederrhein*, No. 57, May 13, 1866, reprinted in *Oberrheinischer Courier*, No. 113, May 15, 1866 and *Mitteldeutsche Volks-Zeitung*, No. 184, August 10, 1866

Printed according to the newspaper text checked against the manuscript

---

<sup>a</sup> "General Council" in the original.—*Ed.*

## Frederick Engels

### NOTES ON THE WAR IN GERMANY<sup>122</sup>

#### No. I

[*The Manchester Guardian*, No. 6190, June 20, 1866]

The following notes are intended to comment impartially, and from a strictly military point of view, upon the current events of the war, and, as far as possible, to point out their probable influence upon impending operations.

The locality where the first decisive blows must be struck is the frontier of Saxony and Bohemia. The war in Italy can scarcely lead to any decisive results so long as the Quadrilateral<sup>123</sup> remains untaken, and to take that will be rather a lengthy operation. There may be a good deal of warlike action in Western Germany, but from the strength of the forces engaged, it will be altogether subordinate in its results to the events on the Bohemian frontier. To this neighbourhood, therefore, we shall, for the present, exclusively direct our attention.

In order to judge of the strength of the contending armies it will suffice, for all practical purposes, if we take into account the infantry only, keeping in mind, however, that the strength of the Austrian cavalry will be to the Prussian as three to two. The artillery will be, in both armies, in about the same proportion as the infantry, say three guns per 1,000 men.

The Prussian infantry consists of 253 battalions of the line, 83 1/2 depot battalions, and 116 battalions of the Landwehr (first levy, containing the men from 27 to 32 years of age).<sup>124</sup> Of these, the depot battalions and Landwehr form the garrisons of the fortresses, and are intended, besides, to act against the smaller German states, while the line is massed in and around Saxony to oppose the Austrian army of the north. Deducting about 15 battalions occupying Schleswig-Holstein, and another 15 battalions—the late garrisons of Rastatt, Mainz, and Frankfurt, now

concentrated at Wetzlar—there remain about 220 battalions for the main army. With cavalry and artillery, and such Landwehr as may be drawn from the neighbouring fortresses, this army will contain about 300,000 men, in nine army corps.

The Austrian army of the north counts seven army corps, each of which is considerably stronger than a Prussian one. We know very little at present of their composition and organisation, but there is every reason to believe that they form an army of from 320,000 to 350,000 men. Numerical superiority, therefore, seems assured to the Austrians.

The Prussian army will be under the command-in-chief of the King<sup>a</sup>—that is to say, of a parade soldier of at best very mediocre capacities, and of weak, but often obstinate, character. He will be surrounded, firstly, by the general staff of the army, under General Moltke, an excellent officer; secondly, by his “private military cabinet”, composed of personal favourites; and, thirdly, by such other unattached general officers as he may call to his suite. It is impossible to invent a more efficient system for ensuring defeat at the very headquarters of an army. Here is, at the very beginning, the natural jealousy between the staff of the army and the Cabinet of the King, each of which sections will struggle for supreme influence and will concoct and advocate its own pet plan of operations. This alone would render almost impossible all singleness of purpose, all consistent action. But then come the interminable councils of war, which are unavoidable under such circumstances, and which, in nine cases out of ten, end in the adoption of some half measure—the very worst course in war. The orders of to-day, in such cases, generally contradict those of yesterday, and when matters become complicated or threaten to go wrong, no orders at all are given out, and things take their own course. “*Ordre, contre-ordre, désordre,*” as Napoleon used to say. Nobody is responsible, because the irresponsible King takes all responsibility upon himself, and, therefore, nobody does anything until distinctly ordered to do so. The campaign of 1806 was commanded in a similar way by the father of the present King<sup>b</sup>; the defeat of Jena and Auerstädt, and the destruction of the whole Prussian army within three weeks,<sup>125</sup> was the consequence. There is no reason to suppose that the present King is superior in mettle to his father; and if he has found in Count Bismarck a man whose political direction he can implicitly follow, there is no man of

---

<sup>a</sup> William I.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Frederick William III.—*Ed.*

sufficient standing in the army to take exclusive charge, in a similar way, of military matters.

The Austrian army is under the unconditional command of General Benedek, who is an experienced officer and who, at least, knows his mind. The superiority of supreme command is decidedly on the side of the Austrians.

The Prussian troops are subdivided into two "armies"; the first, under Prince Frederick Charles, composed of the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 7th, and 8th corps; the second, under the Crown Prince,<sup>a</sup> of the 5th and 6th corps. The Guards, forming the general reserve, will probably join the first army. Now this subdivision not only breaks the unity of command, but it also induces, very often, the two armies to move on two different lines of operation, to make combined movements, to lay their mutual point of junction within the reach of the enemy; in other words, it tends to keep them separated whereas they ought, as much as possible, to keep together. The Prussians in 1806, and the Austrians in 1859, under very similar circumstances, followed the same course, and were beaten.<sup>126</sup> As to the two commanders, the Crown Prince is an unknown magnitude as a soldier; and Prince Frederick Charles certainly did not show himself to be a great commander in the Danish war.<sup>127</sup>

The Austrian army has no such subdivision; the commanders of the army corps are placed directly under General Benedek. They, are, therefore, again superior to their opponents as far as the organisation of the army goes.

The Prussian soldiers, especially the men of the reserve and such Landwehr men as had to be taken to fill up vacancies in the line (and there are many) go to war against their will; the Austrians, on the contrary, have long wished for a war with Prussia, and await with impatience the order to move. They have, therefore, also the advantage in the *morale* of the troops.

Prussia has had no great war for fifty years; her army is, on the whole, a peace army, with the pedantry and martinetism inherent to all peace armies. No doubt a great deal has been done latterly, especially since 1859, to get rid of this; but the habits of forty years are not so easily eradicated, and a great number of incapable and pedantic men must still be found, particularly in the most important places—those of the field officers. Now the Austrians have been fundamentally cured of this complaint by the war of 1859, and have turned their dearly-bought experience to the very

---

<sup>a</sup> Frederick William.—*Ed.*

best use. No doubt, in organisation of detail, in adaptation for, and experience in, warfare, the Austrians again are superior to the Prussians.

With the exception of the Russians the Prussians are the only troops whose normal formation for fighting is the deep close column. Imagine the eight companies of an English battalion in a quarter-distance column, but two companies instead of one forming the front, so that four rows of two companies each form the column, and you have the "Prussian column of attack". A better target for rifled fire-arms than this could not be imagined, and, since rifled cannon can throw a shell into it at 2,000 yards range, such a formation must render it almost impossible to reach the enemy at all. Let one single shell explode in the midst of this mass, and see whether that battalion is fit for anything afterwards on that day.

The Austrians have adopted the loose open column of the French, which is scarcely to be called a column; it is more like two or three lines following each other at 20 or 30 yards distance, and is scarcely, if anything more exposed to losses by artillery than a deployed line. The advantage of tactical formation is, again, on the side of the Austrians.

Against all these advantages the Prussians have but two points to set off. Their commissariat is decidedly better, and the troops will therefore be better fed. The Austrian commissariat, like all Austrian Administration, is one den of bribery and peculation scarcely better than in Russia. Even now we hear of the troops being badly and irregularly fed; in the field and in the fortresses it will be worse still, and the Austrian Administration may happen to be a more dangerous enemy to the fortresses in the Quadrilateral than the Italian artillery.

The second set-off the Prussians have is their superior armament. Although their rifled artillery is decidedly better than that of the Austrians, this will make very little difference in the open field. The range, trajectory, and accuracy of the Prussian and Austrian rifles will be about on a par; but the Prussians have breech-loaders, and can deliver a steady well-aimed fire in the ranks at least four times in a minute. The immense superiority of this arm has been proved in the Danish war, and there is no doubt the Austrians will experience it in a far higher degree. If they, as it is said Benedek has instructed them to do, will not lose much time with firing, but go at the enemy at once with the bayonet, they will have enormous losses. In the Danish war, the loss of the Prussians was never more than one fourth, sometimes only one

tenth, of that of the Danes; and, as a military correspondent of *The Times* a short time ago very correctly pointed out, the Danes were almost everywhere beaten by a minority of troops actually engaged.<sup>a</sup>

Still, in spite of the needle gun, the odds are against the Prussians; and if they refuse to be beaten in the first great battle by the superior leadership, organisation, tactical formation, and *morale* of the Austrians, and last, not least, by their own commanders, then they must certainly be of a different mettle from that of which a peace army of 50 years' standing may be expected to be.

## No. II

[*The Manchester Guardian*, No. 6194, June 25, 1866]

People begin to grow impatient at the apparent inactivity of the two great armies on the Bohemian frontier. But there are plenty of reasons for this delay. Both the Austrians and the Prussians are perfectly aware of the importance of the impending collision, which may decide the result of the whole campaign. Both are hurrying up to the front whatever men they can lay their hands on; the Austrians from their new formations (the fourth and fifth battalions of the infantry regiments), the Prussians from the Landwehr, which at first was intended for garrison duty only.

At the same time, there appears to be on either side an attempt to out-manceuvre the opposing army, and to enter upon the campaign under the most favourable strategical conditions. To understand this, we shall have to look at the map and examine the country in which these armies are placed.

Taking it for granted that Berlin and Vienna are the normal points of retreat of the two armies, and that therefore the Austrians will aim at the conquest of Berlin and the Prussians at that of Vienna, there are three routes by which they might operate. A large army requires a certain extent of country from the resources of which it has to live on the march, and is compelled, in order to move quick, to march in several columns on as many parallel roads; its front will, therefore, be extended on a line which may vary between, say, sixty and sixteen miles, according to the proximity of the enemy and the distance of the roads from each other. This will have to be kept in mind.

---

<sup>a</sup> "Austrian and Prussian Armaments", *The Times*, No. 25507, May 25, 1866, p. 5, c. 4.—*Ed.*

The first route would be on the left bank of the Elbe and Moldau, by Leipzig and Prague. It is evident that on this route each of the belligerents would have to cross the river twice, the second time in the face of the enemy. Supposing either army to attempt to turn, by this route, the flank of its opponent, the latter, having the shorter, because straighter road, could still anticipate the turning force on the line of the river, and if successful in repelling it, could march straight upon the enemy's capital. This route, equally disadvantageous to both parties, may therefore be dismissed from consideration.

The second route is on the right bank of the Elbe, between it and the Sudetic mountain chain which divides Silesia from Bohemia and Moravia. This is almost on the straight line from Berlin to Vienna; the portion now lying between the two armies is marked out by the railway from Löbau to Pardubitz. This railway passes through that portion of Bohemia which is bounded by the Elbe to the south and west, and the mountains to the north-east. It has plenty of good roads, and if the two armies were to march straight at each other, here would be the point of collision.

The third route is that by Breslau, and thence across the Sudetic chain. This chain, of no considerable elevation, on the Moravian frontier, where it is crossed by several good roads, rises to greater elevation and abruptness in the Riesengebirge, which forms the boundary of Bohemia. Here there are but few roads across; in fact, between Trautenau and Reichenberg, a distance of forty miles, the whole north-eastern portion of the range is not traversed by a single military road. The only road in existence there, that from Hirschberg to the valley of the Iser, stops short at the Austrian frontier. It follows, then, that this whole barrier of forty miles in length, is impassable, at least for a large army, with its innumerable impediments, and that an advance upon or by Breslau must pass the mountains to the south-west of the Riesengebirge.

Now, what are the relative positions of the two armies, with regard to their communications, if engaged on this route?

The Prussians, by advancing due south from Breslau, lay open their communications with Berlin. The Austrians might, if strong enough to command the almost absolute certainty of victory, leave them to advance as far as the intrenched camp of Olmütz, which would stop them, while they themselves could march upon Berlin, trusting to re-open any temporarily-interrupted communications by a decisive victory; or they might meet the Prussian columns singly as they debouch from the mountains, and, if successful,



drive them back upon Glogau and Posen, whereby Berlin and the greater portion of the Prussian states would be at their mercy. Thus an advance by Breslau would be advisable for the Prussians in case of a great numerical superiority only.

The Austrians are in a far different position. They have the advantage that the bulk of the monarchy lies south-east of Breslau; that is, in the *direct prolongation* of a line drawn from Berlin to Breslau. Having fortified the northern bank of the Danube near Vienna, so as to shelter the capital from a surprise, they may, temporarily and even for a length of time, sacrifice their direct communication with Vienna, and draw their supplies of men and stores from Hungary. They can, therefore, with equal safety operate by way of Löbau and by way of Breslau, to the north or to the south of the hills; they have far greater freedom in manoeuvring than their opponents.

The Prussians, moreover, have further reasons to be cautious. From the northern frontier of Bohemia, the distance to Berlin is not much more than half of that to Vienna; Berlin is so much more exposed. Vienna is sheltered by the Danube, behind which a beaten army can find protection; by the fortifications erected to the north of that river; and by the intrenched camp of Olmütz, which the Prussians could not pass unnoticed with impunity, if the mass of the Austrian army, after a defeat, were to take up a position there. Berlin has no protection of any kind, except the army in the field. Under these circumstances, and those detailed in our first number, the part destined for the Prussians appears to be clearly marked out as a defensive one.

The same series of circumstances, and strong political necessity besides, almost compels Austria to act on the offensive. A single victory may ensure to her great results, while her defeat would not break her power of resistance.

The strategical plan of the campaign in its fundamental features is necessarily very simple. Whichever of the two attacks first, he has only this alternative: either a false attack *north-west* of the Riesengebirge, and the true attack south-east of it, or *vice versa*. The forty-mile barrier is the decisive feature of the seat of war, and round it the armies must gravitate. We shall hear of fighting at both its extremities, and a very few days afterwards will clear up the direction of the true attack, and probably the fate of the first campaign. Yet, with two such unwieldy armies opposed to each other, we feel inclined to think that the most direct route is the safest, and that the difficulty and danger of moving such large bodies of troops in separate columns on different roads through a

difficult mountain country, will almost naturally draw both opposing armies on the route Löbau-Pardubitz.

The actual movements which have taken place are as follows:— The Prussians, in the first week of June, massed their army of Saxony along the Saxon frontier, from Zeitz to Görlitz, and their Silesian army from Hirschberg to Neisse. By the 10th June they drew nearer together, having their right wing on the Elbe near Torgau, and their extreme left near Waldenburg. From the 12th to the 16th, the army of Silesia, now consisting of the 1st, 5th, and 6th corps and the Guards, were again extended to the east, this time as far as Ratibor, that is to say, into the extreme south-eastern corner of Silesia. This looks like a feint, especially the parading of the Guards, which are supposed to be always with the main army. If it be more than a feint, or if measures have not been taken to move these four corps back towards Görlitz at the shortest notice and in the shortest time, then this massing of more than 120,000 men in a remote corner is a palpable mistake; they may be cut off from all possibility of retreat and certainly from all connection with the remainder of the army.

Of the Austrians we know little more than that they were concentrated around Olmütz. The *Times* correspondent in their camp states that their sixth corps, 40,000 strong, arrived on the 19th from Weisskirchen at Olmütz indicating a movement to the westward. He adds that on the 21st headquarters were to be shifted to Trübau, on the frontier between Moravia and Bohemia.<sup>a</sup> This move would point in the same direction, if it did not look exceedingly like a *canard* sent on to London with the intention of being thence telegraphed to the Prussian headquarters in order to mislead them. A general who acts with such secrecy as Benedek, and who has such objections to newspaper correspondents, is not likely to inform them on the 19th where his headquarters will be on the 21st, unless he has his reasons for it.

Before concluding, we may be allowed to cast a glance at the operations in North-western Germany. The Prussians had more troops here than was at first known. They had 15 battalions disposable in Holstein, 12 in Minden, and 18 in Wetzlar. By rapid concentric moves, during which the troops showed a quite unexpected capability of supporting forced marches, they took possession in two days of all the country north of a line from

---

<sup>a</sup> "The Austrian Army (from our military correspondent). Headquarters of the Army of the North, Olmütz, June 19", *The Times*, No. 25532, June 23, 1866, p. 9, c. 4.—*Ed.*

Coblenz to Eisenach, and of every line of communication between the eastern and western provinces of the kingdom. The Hessian troops, about 7,000 strong, managed to escape, but the Hanoverians, 10,000 or 12,000, had their direct line of retreat towards Frankfurt cut off, and already on the 17th the rest of the 7th Prussian army corps, 12 battalions, together with the two Coburg battalions, arrived in Eisenach from the Elbe. Thus the Hanoverians appear to be hemmed in on all sides, and could escape only by a miracle of stupidity on the part of the Prussians. As soon as their fate will be settled, a force of 50 Prussian battalions will be available against the Federal army which Prince Alexander of Darmstadt is forming at Frankfurt, and which will consist of about 23,000 Württembergers, 10,000 Darmstaders, 6,000 Nassauers, 13,000 Badeners (only mobilising now), 7,000 Hessians, and 12,000 Austrians, now on the road from Salzburg; in all about 65,000 men, who may be possibly reinforced by from 10,000 to 20,000 Bavarians. About 60,000 men of these are now reported as already concentrated at Frankfurt, and Prince Alexander has ventured upon a forward move by re-occupying Giessen on the 22d. This, however, is of no consequence. The Prussians will not advance against him until they are well concentrated, and then, with 70,000 men of all arms, and their superior armament, they ought to make short work of this motley army.

### No. III

[*The Manchester Guardian*, No. 6197, June 28, 1866]

The first great battle has been fought, not in Bohemia, but in Italy, and the Quadrilateral has again given the Italians a lesson in strategy. The strength of this famous position, as indeed of all fortified positions of any value, consists, not so much in the high defensive capabilities of its four fortresses, but in their being so grouped in a country with strongly-marked military features that the attacking force is almost always induced, and often compelled, to divide itself and attack on two different points, while the defending force can send its whole combined strength against one of these attacks, crush it by superior numbers, and then turn against the other. The Italian army has been induced to commit this fault. The King stood with eleven divisions on the Mincio, while Cialdini with five divisions faced the Lower Po, near Ponte

Lagoscuero and Polesella. An Italian division counts 17 battalions of 700 men each; consequently, Victor Emmanuel would have, with cavalry and artillery, at least 120,000 or 125,000 men, and Cialdini about half that number. While the King crossed the Mincio on the 23d, Cialdini was to cross the Lower Po and act upon the rear of the Austrians; but up to the moment we write, no certain news has arrived of this latter movement having been effected. At all events, the 60,000 men whose presence might, and probably would, have turned the scale on Sunday last at Custozza,<sup>128</sup> cannot, so far, have obtained any advantage at all commensurate to the loss of a great battle.

The Lake of Garda lies encased between two spurs of the Alps, forming, to the south of it, two clusters of hills, between which the Mincio forces its way towards the lagoons of Mantua. Both of these groups form strong military positions; their slopes towards the south overlook the Lombard plain, and command it within gun-range. They are well known in military history. The western group, between Peschiera and Lonato, was the scene of the battles of Castiglione and Lonato in 1796, and of Solferino in 1859<sup>129</sup>; the eastern group, between Peschiera and Verona, was contested during three days in 1848,<sup>130</sup> and again in the battle of last Sunday.

This eastern group of hills slopes down on one side towards the Mincio, where it ends in the plain at Valeggio; on the other side, in a long arc, facing south-east, towards the Adige, which it reaches at Bussolengo. It is divided, from north to south, in two about equal portions by a deep ravine, through which flows the rivulet Tione; so that a force advancing from the Mincio will have first to force the passage of the river, and immediately afterwards find itself again arrested by this ravine. On the edge of the slope, facing the plain, and east of the ravine, are the following villages: Custozza, on the southern extremity; further north, in succession, Somma Campagna, Sona, and Santa Giustina. The railway from Peschiera to Verona crosses the hills at Somma Campagna, the high road at Sona.

In 1848, after the Piedmontese had taken Peschiera, they blockaded Mantua and extended their army from beyond that place to Rivoli, on the Lake of Garda, their centre occupying the hills in question. On the 23d July Radetzky advanced with seven brigades from Verona, broke through the centre of this over-extended line, and occupied the hills himself. On the 24th and 25th the Piedmontese tried to re-take the position, but were decisively beaten on the 25th, and retreated at once through Milan

beyond the Ticino. This first battle of Custozza decided the campaign of 1848.

The telegrams from the Italian headquarters about last Sunday's battle are rather contradictory; but, with the assistance of those from the other side, we get a pretty clear insight into the circumstances under which it was fought. Victor Emmanuel intended his 1st corps (General Durando, four divisions or 68 battalions), to take up a position between Peschiera and Verona, so as to be able to cover a siege of the former place. This position must, of course, be Sona and Somma Campagna. The 2d corps (General Cucchiari, three divisions or 51 battalions) and 3d corps (General Della Rocca, of the same strength as the second) were to cross the Mincio at the same time, to cover the operations of the 1st. The 1st corps must have crossed near or south of Saliongo, and taken the road of the hills at once; the 2d seems to have crossed at Valeggio, and the 3d at Goito, and advanced in the plain. This took place on Saturday the 23d. The Austrian brigade Pulz, which held the outposts on the Mincio, fell slowly back on Verona; and on Sunday,<sup>a</sup> the anniversary of Solferino, the whole of the Austrian army debouched from Verona to meet the enemy. They appear to have arrived in time to occupy the heights of Sona and Somma Campagna, and the eastern edge of the ravine of the Tione before the Italians. The struggle then would principally be fought for the passage of the ravine. At the southern extremity the two corps in the plain could co-operate with the 1st Italian corps in the hills, and thus Custozza fell into their hands. Gradually the Italians in the plain would advance more and more in the direction of Verona, in order to act upon the Austrian flank and rear, and the Austrians would send troops to meet them. Thus the front lines of the two armies, which were originally facing east and west respectively, would wheel round a quarter circle, the Austrians facing south and the Italians north. But, as the hills retreat from Custozza to the north-east, this flank movement of the Italian 2d and 3d corps could not immediately affect the position of their 1st corps in the hills, because it could not be extended far enough without danger to the flanking troops themselves. Thus the Austrians appear merely to have occupied the 2d and 3d corps by troops sufficient to break their first impetus, while they launched every available man upon the 1st corps, and crushed it by superior numbers. They were perfectly successful; the first corps was repulsed, after a gallant struggle,

---

<sup>a</sup> June 24, 1866.—*Ed.*

and at last Custozza was stormed by the Austrians. By this, the Italian right wing advanced east and north-east beyond Custozza, appears to have been seriously endangered; consequently a new struggle for the village took place, during which the lost connection must have been restored, and the Austrian advance from Custozza checked, but the place remained in their hands, and the Italians had to re-cross the Mincio the same night.

We give this sketch of the battle, not as a historical account—for which every detail is as yet wanting—but merely as an attempt, map in hand, to reconcile the various telegrams relating to it amongst each other, and with military common sense; and if the telegrams were anything like correct and complete, we feel confident that the general outline of the battle would appear to be not very different from what we have stated.

The Austrians lost about 600 prisoners, the Italians 2,000, and a few guns. This shows the battle to have been a defeat, but no disaster. The forces must have been pretty equally matched, although it is very probable that the Austrians had less troops under fire than their opponents. The Italians have every reason to congratulate themselves that they were not driven back into the Mincio; the position of the 1st corps between that river and the ravine, on a strip of land between two and four miles wide, and a superior enemy in front, must have been one of considerable danger. It was undoubtedly a mistake to send the main body of the troops into the plain; while the commanding heights, the decisive points, were neglected; but the greatest mistake was, as we pointed out before, to divide the army, to leave Cialdini with 60,000 men on the Lower Po, and to attack with the remainder alone. Cialdini could have contributed to a victory before Verona, and then, marching back to the Lower Po, have effected his passage much more easily, if this combined manoeuvre was to be insisted upon at all hazards. As it is, he seems no further advanced than on the first day, and may now have to meet stronger forces than hitherto. The Italians ought, by this time, to know that they have a very tough opponent to deal with. At Solferino, Benedek, with 26,000 Austrians, held the whole Piedmontese army of fully double that number at bay for the whole day, until he was ordered to retreat in consequence of the defeat of the other corps by the French. That Piedmontese army was much superior to the present Italian army; it was better schooled, more homogeneous, and better officered. The present army is but of very recent formation and must suffer from all the disadvantages inherent to such; while the Austrian army of to-day is much superior to that of 1859.

National enthusiasm is a capital thing to work upon, but until disciplined and organised, nobody can win battles with it. Even Garibaldi's "thousand"<sup>131</sup> were not a crowd of mere enthusiasts, they were drilled men who had learnt to obey orders and to face powder and shot in 1859. It is to be hoped that the staff of the Italian army, for their own good, will refrain from taking liberties with an army which, if numerically inferior, is intrinsically superior to theirs, and, moreover, holds one of the strongest positions in Europe.

#### No. IV

[*The Manchester Guardian*, No. 6201, July 3, 1866]

Suppose a young Prussian ensign or cornet, under examination for a lieutenancy, to be asked what would be the safest plan for a Prussian army to invade Bohemia? Suppose our young officer were to answer,—“Your best way will be to divide your troops into two about equal bodies, to send one round by the east of the Riesengebirge, the other to the west, and effect their junction in Gitschin.” What would the examining officer say to this? He would inform the young gentleman that this plan sinned against the two very first laws of strategy:—Firstly, never to divide your troops so that they cannot support each other, but to keep them well together; and, secondly, in case of an advance on different roads, to effect the junction of the different columns at a point which is not within reach of the enemy; that, therefore, the plan proposed was the very worst of all; that it could only be taken into consideration at all in case Bohemia was quite unoccupied by hostile troops; and that, consequently, an officer proposing such a plan of campaign was not fit to hold even a lieutenant's commission.

Yet, this is the very plan which the wise and learned staff of the Prussian army have adopted. It is almost incredible; but it is so. The mistake for which the Italians had to suffer at Custozza, has been again committed by the Prussians, and under circumstances which made it ten-fold worse. The Italians knew at least that, with ten divisions, they would be numerically superior to the enemy. The Prussians must have known that if they kept their nine corps together they would be at best barely on a par, as far as numbers went, with Benedek's eight corps; and that by dividing their troops they exposed the two armies to the almost certain fate of being crushed in succession by superior numbers. It would be completely

inexplicable how such a plan could ever be discussed, much less adopted, by a body of such unquestionably capable officers as form the Prussian staff—if it was not for the fact of King William being in chief command. But nobody could possibly expect that the fatal consequences of kings and princes taking high command would come out so soon and so strong. The Prussians are now fighting, in Bohemia, a life-and-death struggle. If the junction of the two armies at or about Gitschin is prevented, if each of the two, being beaten, has to retire out of Bohemia, and, by retiring, to get further away again from the other then the campaign may be said to be virtually over. Then Benedek may leave the army of the Crown Prince<sup>a</sup> unnoticed while it retires towards Breslau, and follow up, with all his forces, the army of Prince Frederick Charles, which can hardly escape utter destruction.

The question is, Will this junction have been prevented? Up to the moment we write we have no news of events later than Friday evening, the 29th. The Prussians, beaten out of Gitschin (the name of the place, in Bohemian, is spelt Jičín) on the 28th by General Edelsheim, claim to have stormed the town again on the 29th, and this is the last information we possess. The junction was not then effected; at least four Austrian and parts of the Saxon army corps had then been engaged against about five or six Prussian corps.

The various columns of the army of the Crown Prince, as they descended into the valley on the Bohemian side of the hills, were met by the Austrians at favourable points where the valley, widening out, allowed them to offer a larger front to the Prussian columns, and to attempt to prevent them from deploying; while the Prussians would send troops, wherever practicable, through the lateral valleys, to take their opponents in flank and rear. This is always the case in mountain warfare, and accounts for the great number of prisoners that are always made under such circumstances. On the other side, the armies of Prince Frederick Charles and Herwarth von Bittenfeld appear to have got through the passes almost unopposed; the first engagements took place on the line of the Iser river, that is almost midway between the starting points of the two armies. It would be idle to try to disentangle and bring into harmony the fearfully contradictory, and often totally unauthenticated, telegrams which have come to hand these last three or four days.

The fighting has been necessarily very much chequered in its results: as new forces came up, victory favoured first one and then

---

<sup>a</sup> Frederick William.—*Ed.*



the other side. Up to Friday, however, the general result appears to have been, so far, in favour of the Prussians. If they maintained themselves in Gitschin, no doubt the junction was effected on Saturday or Sunday, and then their greatest danger would be passed. The final fight for the junction would probably be fought with concentrated masses on both sides, and decide the campaign for some time, at least. If the Prussians were victorious, they would be at once out of all their self-begotten difficulties, but they might have obtained the same, and even greater, advantages without exposing themselves to such unnecessary dangers.

The fighting appears to have been very severe. The very first Austrian brigade which met the Prussians in battle, was the "black and yellow" brigade, which, in Schleswig, stormed the Königsberg, near Oberselk, the day before the evacuation of the Dannevirke. It is called black and yellow after the facings of the two regiments composing it, and was always considered one of the best brigades in the service. They were, however, beaten by the needle-gun, and above 500 men of one of its regiments (Martini) were taken prisoners after they had charged the Prussian lines five times in vain. In a later engagement, the colours of the 3d battalion, of the Deutschmeister regiment were taken. This regiment, recruited in Vienna exclusively, is considered the best in the whole army. Thus the very best troops have been already in action. The Prussians must have behaved splendidly for an old peace army. When war was actually declared, a totally different spirit came over the army, brought on, chiefly, by the clearing-out of the small fry of potentates in the north-west.<sup>132</sup> It gave the troops—rightly or wrongly, we merely register the fact—the idea that they were asked to fight, this time, for the unification of Germany, and the hitherto sullen and sulky men of the reserve and Landwehr then crossed the frontier of Austria with loud cheers. It is owing to this chiefly that they fought so well; but at the same time we must ascribe the greater portion of whatever success they have had to their breech-loaders; and if they ever get out of the difficulties into which their generals so wantonly placed them, they will have to thank the needle-gun for it. The reports as to its immense superiority over the muzzle-loaders are again unanimous. A sergeant from the Martini regiment, taken prisoner, said to the correspondent of the *Cologne Gazette*<sup>a</sup>:

"We have surely done whatever may be expected from brave soldiers, but no man can stand against that rapid fire."

<sup>a</sup> "Reichenberg, 27. Juni, Mittags", *Kölnische Zeitung*, No. 179, June 29, 1866.—*Ed.*

If the Austrians are beaten, it will be not so much General Benedek or General Ramming as General Ramrod who is to blame for the result.

In the north-west, the Hanoverians, brought to a sense of their position by a sharp attack from General Manteuffel's advanced guard under General Flies, have surrendered, and thereby 59 Prussian battalions will be at liberty to act against the Federal troops. It was high time, too, that this should be done before Bavaria had completed all her armaments, for otherwise much stronger forces would be required to subdue South-western Germany. Bavaria is notoriously always slow and behindhand with her military arrangements, but when they are complete, she can bring into the field from 60,000 to 80,000 good troops. We may now soon hear of a rapid concentration of Prussians on the Main and of active operations against Prince Alexander of Hesse Darmstadt and his army.

#### No. V

[*The Manchester Guardian*, No. 6204, July 6, 1866]

The campaign which the Prussians opened with a signal strategic blunder has been since carried on by them with such a terrible tactical energy that it was brought to a victorious close in exactly eight days.

We said in our last note that the only case in which the Prussian plan of invading Bohemia by two armies separated by the Riesengebirge could be justified was that in which Bohemia was unoccupied by hostile troops. The mysterious plan of General Benedek appears to have mainly consisted in creating a situation of that sort. There appear to have been but two Austrian army corps—the 1st (Clam-Gallas) and the 6th (Ramming)—in the north-western corner of Bohemia, where, from the beginning, we expected the decisive actions would be fought. If this was intended to draw the Prussians into a trap, Benedek has succeeded so well that he got caught in it himself. At all events, the Prussian advance on two lines, with from forty to fifty miles of impassable ground between them, towards a point of junction two full marches from the starting points, and within the enemy's lines,—this advance remains a highly dangerous manoeuvre under all circumstances, and one which would have been followed by signal defeat but for Benedek's strange slowness, for the unexpected dash of the Prussian troops, and for their breech-loading rifles.

The advance of Prince Frederick Charles took place with three corps (the 3d, 4th, and 2d, the latter in reserve) by Reichenberg, north of a difficult range of hills, on the southern side of which General Herwarth advanced with a corps and a half (the 8th and one division of the 7th). At the same time, the Crown Prince stood, with the 1st, 5th, and 6th corps, and the Guards, in the mountains about Glatz. Thus the army was divided into three columns—one on the right, of 45,000, one in the centre, of 90,000, and one on the left, of 120,000 men—none of which could support either of the others for at least several days. Here, if ever, there was a chance for a general commanding at least an equal number of men to crush his opponents in detail. But nothing appears to have been done. On the 26th Prince Frederick Charles had the first serious engagement, at Turnau, with a brigade of the 1st corps, by which he established his communication with Herwarth; on the 27th, the latter took Münchengrätz, while, of the army of the Crown Prince, a first column, the 5th corps, advanced beyond Nachod, and beat the 6th Austrian corps (Ramming) severely; on the 28th, the only slightly unlucky day for the Prussians, Prince Frederick Charles's advance guard took Gitschin, but was again dislodged by General Edelsheim's cavalry, while the 1st corps of the army of the Crown Prince was checked with some loss at Trautenau by the 10th Austrian corps of Gablenz, and only disengaged by the advance of the Guards towards Eipel, on an intermediate road between the 1st and 5th Prussian corps. On the 29th, Prince Frederick Charles stormed Gitschin, and the army of the Crown Prince totally defeated the 6th, 8th, and 10th Austrian corps. On the 30th, a fresh attempt of Benedek's to re-take Gitschin by the 1st corps and the Saxon army was signally foiled, and the two Prussian armies effected a junction. The Austrian loss represents men to the number of at least a corps and a half, while that of the Prussians is less than one fourth that number.

Thus we find that on the 27th there were only two Austrian army corps, of about 33,000 men each, at hand; on the 28th, three; on the 29th, four, and if one Prussian telegram be correct, part of a fifth (the 4th corps); while on the 30th the Saxon army corps only had been able to come up in support. There were, then, two, if not three, corps absent from the contested ground during all that time, while the Prussians brought every man down into Bohemia. In fact, up to the evening of the 29th, the whole of the Austrian troops on the spot were barely superior in numbers to either of the two Prussian armies, and being brought into line

successively, the supports arriving after the defeat only of the troops first engaged, the result was disastrous.

The 3d army corps (Archduke Ernst), which fought at Custozza, is reported to have been sent to the north by rail immediately after that battle, and is, in some accounts, set down among Benedek's available forces. This corps, which would make the whole force, including the Saxons, nine corps, could not have been up in time for the battles in the latter days of June.

The Prussians, whatever the faults of their plan of operations were, made up for them by their rapidity and energy of action. No fault can be found with the operations of either of their two armies. Short, sharp, and decisive were all their blows, and completely successful. Nor did this energy forsake them after the two armies were joined; on they marched, and already on the 3d they met Benedek's combined forces with the whole of theirs, and gave them a last crushing blow.<sup>133</sup>

It is hardly possible to suppose that Benedek accepted this battle of his own free will. No doubt the rapid pursuit of the Prussians compelled him to take a strong position with all his army, in order to re-form his troops, and to give a day's start to his retiring army train, expecting not to be attacked in force during the day, and to be able to draw off during the night. A man in his position, with four of his corps completely shattered, and after such tremendous losses, cannot have desired, there and then, to deliver a decisive battle, if he could draw off in safety. But the Prussians appear to have compelled him to fight, and the result was the complete rout of the Austrians, who, if the armistice be not granted, will now be trying to make towards Olmütz or Vienna, under the most disadvantageous circumstances, for the slightest out-flanking movement of the Prussians on their right must cut off numerous detachments from the direct road, and drive them into the hills of Glatz, to be made prisoners. The "army of the north", as splendid a host as there was in Europe ten days ago, has ceased to exist.

No doubt the needle-gun, with its rapid fire, has done a great part of this. It may be doubted whether without it the junction of the two Prussian armies could have been effected; and it is quite certain that this immense and rapid success could not have been obtained without such superior fire, for the Austrian army is habitually less subject to panic than most European armies. But there were other circumstances co-operating. We have already mentioned the excellent dispositions and unhesitating action of the two Prussian armies, from the moment they entered Bohemia. We may add that they also deviated, in this campaign, from the

column system, and brought their masses forward principally in deployed lines, so as to bring every rifle into activity, and to save their men from the fire of artillery. We must acknowledge that the movements both on the march and before the enemy were carried out with an order and punctuality which no man could have expected from an army and administration covered with the rust of fifty years' peace. And, finally, all the world must have been surprised at the dash displayed by these young troops in each and every engagement without exception. It is all very well to say the breech-loaders did it, but they are not self-acting, they want stout hearts and strong arms to carry them. The Prussians fought very often against superior numbers, and were almost everywhere the attacking party; the Austrians, therefore, had the choice of ground. And in attacking strong positions and barricaded towns, the advantages of the breech-loader almost disappear; the bayonet has to do the work, and there has been a good deal of it. The cavalry, moreover, acted with the same dash, and with them cold steel and speed of horse are the only weapons in a charge. The French *canards* of Prussian cavalry lines first peppering their opponents with carbine fire (breech-loading or otherwise) and then rushing at them sword in hand, could only originate among a people whose cavalry has very often been guilty of that trick, and always been punished for it by being borne down by the superior impetus of the charging enemy. There is no mistaking it, the Prussian army has, within a single week, conquered a position as high as ever it held, and may well feel confident now to be able to cope with any opponent. There is no campaign on record where an equally signal success, in an equally short time, and without any noteworthy check, has been obtained, except that campaign of Jena which annihilated the Prussians of that day, and, if we except the defeat of Ligny,<sup>134</sup> the campaign of Waterloo.

Written between June 19 and July 5,  
1866

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The Manchester Guardian*, Nos. 6190, 6194, 6197, 6201 and 6204, June 20, 25 and 28, July 3 and 6, 1866

Karl Marx

[PROPOSALS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE  
ON THE PROGRAMME  
OF THE GENEVA CONGRESS<sup>135</sup>]

1. They recommend the order as published in the French programme with the single amendment that the last question be amalgamated with the first.<sup>136</sup>

2. That the Secretary be instructed to make out a report of the number of members and a general statement of income and expenditure.

3. They recommend the Congress to make an enquiry into the condition of the working classes according to the following schedule of enquiries<sup>137</sup>:

- 1) Occupation,<sup>a</sup> name of.
- 2) Age and sex of the employed.
- 3) Number of the employed.
- 4) Hiring and wages. A. Apprentices. B. Wages, day or piece work. Whether paid by middlemen, etc. Weekly, yearly average earnings.
- 5) Hours of labour. In factories. Hours of small employers and home work if the business carried on in those modes. Nightwork, daywork.
- 6) Meal times and treatment.
- 7) State of place and work, overcrowding, defective ventilation, want of sunlight, use of gaslight, etc., cleanliness, etc.
- 8) Nature of the occupation.
- 9). Effect of employment upon the physical condition.

---

<sup>a</sup> In the Minute Book this word is written instead of "Industry" which is crossed out.— *Ed.*

10) Moral condition. Education.

11) State of trade, whether season trade or more or less uniformly distributed over year, whether greatly fluctuating, whether exposed to foreign competition, whether destined principally for home or foreign consumption, etc.

[4] That a yearly contribution of  $\frac{1}{2}$  [d.] per member be paid by societies joining, cost price of cards or *livrets* to be charged extra. The Secretary to have power to negotiate with poor societies on easier terms.<sup>a</sup>

[5] The Committee recommends that the Council advise members to found benefit societies and to organise an international exchange between benefit societies.<sup>b</sup>

[6] That the local committees keep reports of the state of trade in their districts and act as intelligence officers for working men.

Adopted by the Central Council on  
July 31, 1866 with certain alterations

First published in *The Commonwealth*,  
No. 180, August 18, 1866

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

---

<sup>a</sup> In *The Commonwealth* this para reads: "They also recommend to the Congress the election of a General Secretary who shall be permanently engaged on the business of the Association, which has now assumed such proportions as to make the above a necessity. They also recommend that the rate of contributions for organised bodies be at the rate of one half-penny per member per year, the cost price of cards (*livrets*) to be charged extra."—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> After this the Minute Book has: "A debate arose on this point. The recommendation was amended so as to require that the Swiss members take the initiative at the Congress on this question.

"The resolution in its amended form was carried unanimously."—*Ed.*

# THE INTERNATIONAL COURIER

ENGLISH PART.

Published every Wednesday.

No 6 & 7. Vol. IV. (Registered for transmission abroad.)

LONDON, FEBRUARY 20, 1867.

ONE PENNY.

Karl Marx

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE DELEGATES OF THE PROVISIONAL GENERAL COUNCIL. THE DIFFERENT QUESTIONS<sup>138</sup>

### 1.—ORGANISATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Upon the whole, the Provisional Central Council recommend the *plan of Organisation* as traced in the Provisional Statutes. Its soundness and facilities of adaptation to different countries without prejudice to unity of action have been proved by two years' experience. For the next year we recommend London as the seat of the Central Council, the Continental situation looking unfavourable for change.

The members of the Central Council will of course be elected by Congress (5 of the Provisional Statutes) with power to add to their number.

The *General Secretary* to be chosen by Congress for one year and to be the only paid officer of the Association. We propose £2 for his weekly salary.<sup>a</sup>

The uniform *annual contribution of each individual member of the Association* to be *one half penny* (perhaps one penny). The cost price of cards of membership (carnets) to be charged extra.

While calling upon the members of the Association to form benefit societies and connect them by an international link, we leave the initiation of this question (*établissement des sociétés de secours mutuels. Appui moral et matériel accordé aux orphelins de l'association*<sup>b</sup>) to the Swiss who originally proposed it at the conference of September last.

<sup>a</sup> In the French text the following paragraph has been added: "The *Standing Committee*, which is in fact an executive of the Central Council, to be chosen by Congress, the function of any of its member to be defined by the Central Council." The same paragraph is given in the German text.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> foundation of benefit societies; moral and material assistance to the Association's orphans.—*Ed.*



2.—INTERNATIONAL COMBINATION OF EFFORTS,  
BY THE AGENCY OF THE ASSOCIATION,  
IN THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN LABOUR AND CAPITAL

(a) From a general point of view, this question embraces the whole activity of the International Association which aims at combining and generalising the till now disconnected efforts for emancipation by the working classes in different countries.

(b) To counteract the intrigues of capitalists always ready, in cases of strikes and lockouts, to misuse the foreign workman as a tool against the native workman, is one of the particular functions which our Society has hitherto performed with success. It is one of the great purposes of the Association to make the workmen of different countries not only *feel* but *act* as brethren and comrades in the army of emancipation.

(c) One great "International combination of efforts" which we suggest is a *statistical inquiry into the situation of the working classes of all countries to be instituted by the working classes themselves*. To act with any success, the materials to be acted upon must be known. By initiating so great a work, the workmen will prove their ability to take their own fate into their own hands. We propose therefore:

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.

That the Congress invite all workmen of Europe and the United States of America to collaborate in gathering the elements of the statistics of the working class; that reports and evidence be forwarded to the Central Council. That the Central Council elaborate them into a general report, adding the evidence as an appendix.

That this report together with its appendix 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 middlemen. 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. Nature of occupation.

9. Effect of employment upon the physical condition.

10. Moral condition. Education.

11. State of trade: whether season trade, or more or less uniformly distributed over year, whether greatly fluctuating, whether exposed to foreign competition, whether destined principally for home or foreign competition,<sup>a</sup> etc.<sup>139</sup>

### 3.—LIMITATION OF THE WORKING DAY

A preliminary condition, without which all further attempts at improvement and emancipation must prove abortive, is the *limitation of the working day*.

It is needed to restore the health and physical energies of the working class, that is, the great body of every nation, as well as to secure them the possibility of intellectual development, sociable intercourse, social and political action.

We propose *8 hours work* as the *legal limit* of the working day. This limitation being generally claimed by the workmen of the United States of America,<sup>140</sup> the vote of the Congress will raise it to the common platform of the working classes all over the world.

For the information of continental members, whose experience of factory law is comparatively short-dated, we add that all legal restrictions will fail and be broken through by Capital if the *period of the day* during which the 8 working hours must be taken, be not fixed. The length of that period ought to be determined by the 8 working hours and the additional pauses for meals. For instance, if the different interruptions for meals amount to *one hour*, the legal period of the day ought to embrace 9 hours, say from 7 a.m. to 4 p.m., or from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., etc. Nightwork to be but exceptionally permitted, in trades or branches of trades specified by law. The tendency must be to suppress all nightwork.

This paragraph refers only to adult persons, male or female, the latter, however, to be rigorously excluded from all *nightwork whatever*, and all sort of work hurtful to the delicacy of the sex, or

<sup>a</sup> The Minute Book of the General Council has "consumption".—Ed.

exposing their bodies to poisonous and otherwise deleterious agencies. By adult persons we understand all persons having reached or passed the age of 18 years.

#### 4.—JUVENILE AND CHILDREN'S LABOUR (BOTH SEXES)

We consider the tendency of modern industry to make children and juvenile persons of both sexes co-operate in the great work of social production, as a progressive, sound and legitimate tendency, although under capital it was distorted into an abomination. In a rational state of society *every child whatever*, from the age of 9 years, ought to become a productive labourer in the same way that no able-bodied adult person ought to be exempted from the general law of nature, viz.: to work in order to be able to eat, and work not only with the brain but with the hands too.

However, for the present, we have only to deal with the children and young persons of both sexes divided into *three classes*, to be treated differently<sup>a</sup>; the first class to range from 9 to 12; the second, from 13 to 15 years; and the third, to comprise the ages of 16 and 17 years. We propose that the employment of the first class in any workshop or housework be legally restricted to *two*; that of the second, to *four*; and that of the third, to *six* hours. For the third class, there must be a break of at least one hour for meals or relaxation.

It may be desirable to begin elementary school instruction before the age of 9 years; but we deal here only with the most indispensable antidotes against the tendencies of a social system which degrades the working man into a mere instrument for the accumulation of capital, and transforms parents by their necessities into slave-holders, sellers of their own children. The *right* of children and juvenile persons must be vindicated. They are unable to act for themselves. It is, therefore, the duty of society to act on their behalf.

If the middle and higher classes neglect their duties toward their offspring, it is their own fault. Sharing the privileges of

---

<sup>a</sup> Instead of this sentence the French and German texts have two sentences ending the preceding paragraph and beginning a new one: "However, for the present, we have only to deal with the children and young persons belonging to the working class.

"We deem it necessary, basing on physiology, to divide children and young persons of both sexes" and then as in the English text.—*Ed.*

these classes, the child is condemned to suffer from their prejudices.

The case of the working class stands quite different. The working man is no free agent. In too many cases, he is even too ignorant to understand the true interest of his child, or the normal conditions of human development. However, the more enlightened part of the working class fully understands that the future of its class, and, therefore, of mankind, altogether depends upon the formation of the rising working generation. They know that, before everything else, the children and juvenile workers must be saved from the crushing effects of the present system. This can only be effected by converting *social reason* into *social force*, and, under given circumstances, there exists no other method of doing so, than through *general laws*, enforced by the power of the state. In enforcing such laws, the working class do not fortify governmental power. On the contrary, they transform that power, now used against them, into their own agency. They effect by a general act what they would vainly attempt by a multitude of isolated individual efforts.

Proceeding from this standpoint, we say that no parent and no employer ought to be allowed to use juvenile labour, except when combined with education.

By education we understand three things.

Firstly: *Mental education*.

Secondly: *Bodily education*, such as is given in schools of gymnastics, and by military exercise.

Thirdly: *Technological<sup>a</sup> training*, which imparts the general principles of all processes of production, and, simultaneously initiates the child and young person in the practical use and handling of the elementary instruments of all trades.

A gradual and progressive course of mental, gymnastic, and technological training ought to correspond to the classification of the juvenile labourers. The costs of the technological<sup>a</sup> schools ought to be partly met by the sale of their products.

The combination of paid productive labour, mental education, bodily exercise and polytechnic training, will raise the working class far above the level of the higher and middle classes.

It is self-understood that the employment of all persons from 9 and to 17 years (inclusively) in nightwork and all health-injuring trades must be strictly prohibited by law.

---

<sup>a</sup> The German text has "polytechnical".—*Ed.*

## 5. CO-OPERATIVE LABOUR

It is the business of the International Working Men's Association to combine and generalise the *spontaneous movements* of the working classes, but not to dictate or impose any doctrinary system whatever. The Congress should, therefore, proclaim no *special system* of co-operation, but limit itself to the enunciation of a few general principles.

(a) We acknowledge the co-operative movement as one of the transforming forces of the present society based upon class antagonism. Its great merit is to practically show, that the present pauperising, and despotic system of the *subordination of labour* to capital can be superseded by the republican and beneficent system of *the association of free and equal producers*.

(b) Restricted, however, to the dwarfish forms into which individual wages slaves can elaborate it by their private efforts, the co-operative system will never transform capitalist society. To convert social production into one large and harmonious system of free and co-operative labour, *general social changes* are wanted, *changes of the general conditions of society*, never to be realised save by the transfer of the organised forces of society, viz., the state power, from capitalists and landlords to the producers themselves.

(c) We recommend to the working men to embark in *co-operative production* rather than in *co-operative stores*. The latter touch but the surface of the present economical system, the former attacks its groundwork.

(d) We recommend to all co-operative societies to convert one part of their joint income into a fund for propagating their principles by example as well as by precept, in other words, by promoting the establishment of new co-operative fabrics, as well as by teaching and preaching.

(e) In order to prevent co-operative societies from degenerating into ordinary middle-class joint stock companies (*sociétés par actions*), all workmen employed, whether shareholders or not, ought to share alike. As a mere temporary expedient, we are willing to allow shareholders a low rate of interest.

## 6. TRADES' UNIONS. THEIR PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

### (a) Their past.

Capital is concentrated social force, while the workman has only to dispose of his working force. The *contract* between capital and labour can therefore never be struck on equitable terms, equitable even in the sense of a society which places the ownership of the material means of life and labour on one side and the vital productive energies on the opposite side. The only social power of the workmen is their number. The force of numbers, however, is broken by disunion. The disunion of the workmen is created and perpetuated by their *unavoidable competition among themselves*.

Trades' Unions originally sprang up from the *spontaneous* attempts of workmen at removing or at least checking that competition, in order to conquer such terms of contract as might raise them at least above the condition of mere slaves. The immediate object of Trades' Unions was therefore confined to everyday necessities, to expediences for the obstruction of the incessant encroachments of capital, in one word, to questions of wages and time of labour. This activity of the Trades' Unions is not only legitimate, it is necessary. It cannot be dispensed with so long as the present system of production lasts. On the contrary, it must be generalised by the formation and the combination of Trades' Unions throughout all countries. On the other hand, unconsciously to themselves, the Trades' Unions were forming *centres of organisation* of the working class, as the mediaeval municipalities and communes did for the middle class. If the Trades' Unions are required for the guerilla fights between capital and labour, they are still more important as *organised agencies for superseding the very system of wages labour and capital rule*.

### (b) Their present.

Too exclusively bent upon the local and immediate struggles with capital, the Trades' Unions have not yet fully understood their power of acting against the system of wages slavery itself. They therefore kept too much aloof from general social and political movements. Of late, however, they seem to awaken to some sense of their great historical mission, as appears, for instance, from their participation, in England, in the recent political movement,<sup>141</sup> from the enlarged views taken of their function in the United States,<sup>142</sup> and from the following resolution passed at the recent great conference of Trades' delegates at Sheffield:

"That this Conference, fully appreciating the efforts made by the International Association to unite in one common bond of brotherhood the working men of all countries, most earnestly recommend to the various societies here represented, the advisability of becoming affiliated to that body, believing that it is essential to the progress and prosperity of the entire working community."<sup>143</sup>

(c) Their future.

Apart from their original purposes, they must now learn to act deliberately as organising centres of the working class in the broad interest of its *complete emancipation*. They must aid every social and political movement tending in that direction. Considering themselves and acting as the champions and representatives of the whole working class, they cannot fail to enlist the non-society men into their ranks. They must look carefully after the interests of the worst paid trades, such as the agricultural labourers, rendered powerless<sup>a</sup> by exceptional circumstances. They must convince the world at large<sup>b</sup> that their efforts, far from being narrow and selfish, aim at the emancipation of the downtrodden millions.

## 7. DIRECT AND INDIRECT TAXATION

(a) No modification of the form of taxation can produce any important change in the relations of labour and capital.

(b) Nevertheless, having to choose between two systems of taxation, we recommend the *total abolition of indirect taxes*, and the *general substitution of direct taxes*.<sup>c</sup>

Because indirect taxes enhance the prices of commodities, the tradesmen adding to those prices not only the amount of the indirect taxes, but the interest and profit upon the capital advanced in their payment;

Because indirect taxes conceal from an individual what he is paying to the state, whereas a direct tax is undisguised, unsophisticated, and not to be misunderstood by the meanest capacity. Direct taxation prompts therefore every individual to control the governing powers while indirect taxation destroys all tendency to self-government.

<sup>a</sup> The French text here reads: "incapable of organised resistance".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The French and German texts read: "convince the broad masses of workers".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> In Marx's rough manuscript, the French and German texts here follows: "because direct taxes are cheaper to collect and do not interfere with production".—*Ed.*

## 8. INTERNATIONAL CREDIT

Initiative to be left to the French.

9. POLISH QUESTION<sup>a</sup>

(a) Why do the workmen of Europe take up this question? In the first instance, because the middle-class writers and agitators conspire to suppress it, although they patronise all sorts of nationalities, on the Continent, even Ireland. Whence this reticence? Because both, aristocrats and bourgeois, look upon the dark Asiatic power in the background as a last resource against the advancing tide of working class ascendancy. That power can only be effectually put down by the restoration of Poland upon a democratic basis.

(b) In the present changed state of central Europe, and especially Germany, it is more than ever necessary to have a democratic Poland. Without it, Germany will become the outwork of the Holy Alliance,<sup>144</sup> with it, the co-operator with republican France. The working-class movement will continuously be interrupted, checked, and retarded, until this great European question be set at rest.

(c) It is especially the duty of the German working class to take the initiative in this matter, because Germany is one of the partitioners of Poland.

10. ARMIES<sup>b</sup>

(a) The deleterious influence of large standing armies upon *production*, has been sufficiently exposed at middle-class congresses of all denominations, at peace congresses, economical congresses, statistical congresses, philanthropical congresses, sociological congresses. We think it, therefore, quite superfluous to expatiate upon this point.

(b) We propose the general armament of the people and their general instruction in the use of arms.

---

<sup>a</sup> The French reads: "Necessity of annihilating Russian influence in Europe by implementing the right of nations to self-determination and restoring Poland on a democratic and social basis." The German has a similar subtitle in a somewhat altered wording.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The French and the German read: "Standing armies; their relation to production".—*Ed.*



(c) We accept as a transitory necessity small standing armies to form schools for the officers of the militia; every male citizen to serve for a very limited time in those armies.

## 11. RELIGIOUS QUESTION<sup>a</sup>

To be left to the initiative of the French.

Written at the end of August 1866

First published in *Der Vorbote*, Nos. 10 and 11, October and November 1866 and *The International Courier*, Nos. 6/7, February 20, and Nos. 8/10, March 13, 1867

Reproduced from *The International Courier* checked with Marx's partly extant rough manuscript, *Le Courier international* and *Der Vorbote*

---

<sup>a</sup> The French and the German read: "Religious ideas; their influence on the social, political and intellectual movement".—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[RESOLUTION OF GRATITUDE TO THE DELEGATES  
OF THE CENTRAL (GENERAL) COUNCIL  
TO THE GENEVA CONGRESS<sup>145</sup>]

Citizen *Marx* moved, and *Dell* seconded, a vote of thanks to the delegates for the able manner in which they had represented the Central Council at Geneva.

Adopted by the General Council on  
September 18, 1866

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published in *The Commonwealth*,  
No. 185, September 22, 1866

## Karl Marx

SPEECH AT THE POLISH MEETING  
IN LONDONJANUARY 22, 1867<sup>146</sup>Ladies and Gentlemen,<sup>a</sup>

Some 30 years ago, a Revolution broke out in France.<sup>b</sup> It was an event not foreseen by the St. Petersburg providence which had just concluded a secret treaty with Charles X for the better administration and geographical arrangement of Europe. On the arrival of the awkward news, the Czar Nicholas summoned the officers of his horseguard and addressed them a short, warlike speech, culminating in the words: *à cheval, Messieurs!*<sup>147</sup> This was no empty threat. Paskiewitch was despatched to Berlin there to settle the invasion of France. A few months later, all was ready. The Prussians were to concentrate on the Rhine, the Polish army to march into Prussia, and the Muscovites<sup>c</sup> to follow in the rear. But then, as Lafayette said in the French Chamber of Deputies—“*l'avant garde tournait contre le gros de l'armée*” (the advanced guard turned round upon the main body).<sup>d</sup> The insurrection of Warsaw saved Europe from a second Anti-Jacobin war.

Eighteen years later, there was another eruption of the revolutionary volcano, or rather an earthquake shaking the whole

---

<sup>a</sup> The *Głos Wolny* prefaces Marx's speech with the words: “At the beginning Dr. Marx, a German, presented a short, but extremely significant resolution: ‘That liberty cannot be established in Europe without the independence of Poland.’”—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Revolution of July 1830.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Here and below this word is used in the sense of “champions of the reactionary policy of Czarist autocracy”.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> From Lafayette's speech made in the French Chamber of Deputies on January 16, 1831 on the occasion of the Polish insurrection of November 1830 (*Le Moniteur universel*, January 17, 1831).—*Ed.*

continent. Even the Germans began to fidget, despite the maternal leading-strings in which Russia had kept them ever since their so-called war of independence.<sup>a</sup> Still more strange. Of all German cities, Vienna was the first to try its hands at barricade building, and successfully too. This time, and, perhaps, for the first time in his history, the Russ lost his temper. The Czar Nicholas did no longer address his horseguard. He issued a manifesto to his people, telling them that the French plague had infected even the Germans, that it approached the frontiers of the Empire and that Revolution, in its madness, casts its delirious eyes upon Holy Russia. No wonder! he exclaimed. This same Germany has been the hotbed of infidelity for many years past. The cancer of a sacrilegious philosophy has eaten into the vitals of that apparently solid people. And then, he winds up with the following apostrophe to the Germans:

“With us is God! Know that, ye heathens, and submit to us, for God is with us!”<sup>b</sup>

Very soon after, through the hands of his trusted servant Nesselrode, he sent another bull to the Germans, but quite overflowing with tenderness for that heathenish people.<sup>c</sup> Whence this change?

Why, the Berliners had not only made a Revolution, they had proclaimed the restoration of Poland, and the Prussian Poles deceived by the popular enthusiasm were forming military camps in Posnania. Hence the courtesies of the Czar. It was again Poland, the immortal Knight of Europe, that had warned off the Mongol! Only after the betrayal of the Poles by the Germans, especially the German National Assembly at Frankfurt,<sup>148</sup> Russia recovered her forces and waxed strong enough to stab the Revolution of 1848 in its last asylum, Hungary. And even here, the last man who bestrode the battlefield against her, was a Pole, General Bem.

Now there are many people silly enough to believe that all this has changed, that Poland has ceased to be “une nation nécessaire”, as a French writer calls it, and dwindled to a sentimental souvenir, and you know that sentiments and souvenirs are not quoted at the Stock Exchanges. When the last Russian ukases for

<sup>a</sup> A reference to the war of 1813-14 against Napoleonic rule.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Severnaya Pchela*, No. 59, March 15, 1848.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Nesselrode's circular to all Russian Embassies in “St. Petersburg, 6. Juli. Die russische Note”, *Frankfurter Oberpostamts-Zeitung*, No. 210 (second supplement), July 28, 1848. See also “The Russian Note”, present edition, Vol. 7 pp. 307-13.—*Ed.*

the abolition of Poland became known in this country,<sup>149</sup> the organ of the leading purses exhorted the Poles to turn into Muscovites.<sup>a</sup> Why should they not, if it were only to give further security for the six mill. l. st. just lent to the Czar by the English capitalists?<sup>150</sup> A mere *Times*-reading Englishman may tell me that, let the worst arrive to the worst, and Russia seize Constantinople, England will then appropriate Egypt and thus secure the road to her great Indian market.<sup>b</sup> Lastly, as to *The Times* saying that Russia may seize Constantinople, if she does not prevent England from seizing upon Egypt, what does it all mean? That England will surrender Constantinople to Russia, if Russia allows England to have a fight with France over Egypt. This is the comfortable vista opened to you by *The Times*. As to Russian love for England, fond as she is of British £.s.d., it suffices to quote the words of the *Gazette de Moscou*, d.d. Dec. 1831:

“Non, il faut que le tour de perfide Albion vienne, et dans quelque temps nous ne devons plus faire de traite avec ce peuple qu'à Calcutta.” (No, it is necessary that the turn of perfidious Albion come, and soon we shall conclude no more treaty with that people, save at Calcutta.)<sup>c</sup>

But I ask you, what has changed? Has the danger grown less? No. Only the judicial blindness of the governing classes of Europe has reached its climax.

In the first instance, the policy of Russia is unchangeable, as averred by her official historian, the Muscovite Karamzin.<sup>d</sup> Her methods, her tactics, her *manoeuvring* may change, but the leading star of her policy is a fixed star—the empire of the world. Only a civilised government<sup>e</sup> swaying barbarian masses can nowadays

<sup>a</sup> Here and below the reference is to the leading article in *The Times*, No. 25701, January 7, 1867. In Marx's rough manuscript this and the next phrase are at the beginning of the speech and crossed with a vertical line.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the rough manuscript this phrase is at the end of the paragraph beginning “A continental European” and crossed with a vertical line. In the *Glos Wolny* the beginning of the phrase reads: “If the worst comes to the worst, *The Times* wrote, let Russia take Constantinople after all, England...”—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Marx quotes from *Polonia*, No. IV, November 1832. In the rough manuscript the text from the words “Lastly, as to *The Times* saying ...” makes up the last paragraph but one and is crossed with a vertical line. The *Glos Wolny* reads: “In other words, let England hand Constantinople over to Russia, if Russia kindly allows England to dispute France's right to Egypt. The Muscovite, *The Times* writes, likes to raise loan in England, and is a good payer. He loves English money. He really does love it. But the extent to which he loves the English themselves you may best gauge from the *Gazette de Moscou* of December 1831:”—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Н. М. Карамзинъ, *Исторія Государства Россійскаго*, т. XI, Спб., 1835, стр. 23.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The *Glos Wolny* has “cunning government”.—*Ed.*

hatch such a plan, and execute it. As the greatest Russian diplomatist of modern times, Pozzo di Borgo, wrote to Alexander I, at the epoch of the Vienna Congress,<sup>151</sup> Poland is the great tool for the execution of the world-embracing schemes of Russia, but also her invincible obstacle, until the Pole, fatigued by the accumulated treacheries of Europe, becomes her scourge in the hand of the Muscovite.

Now, apart from the dispositions of the Polish people, has anything happened to thwart the plans of Russia or paralyse her action?

I need not tell you that in Asia, her progress of conquest is continuous. I need not tell you that the so-called Anglo-French war against Russia<sup>a</sup> handed over to her the mountain fortresses of Caucasus, the domination of the Black Sea, and the maritime rights which Catherine II, Paul and Alexander I had vainly tried to wrest from England. Railways are connecting and concentrating her vastly disseminated bonds. Her material resources in Congress Poland,<sup>152</sup> which forms her entrenched camp in Europe, have enormously increased. The fortifications of Warsaw, Modlin, Ivangorod—points singled out by the first Napoleon—domineer the whole course of the Vistula and constitute a formidable basis of attack to the North, West and South. The Panslavonian propaganda has kept pace with the enfeeblement of Austria and Turkey, and what that Panslavonian propaganda means, you had some foretaste in 1848-49, when Hungary was overrun, Vienna laid waste, Italy countered by the Slavs, fighting under the banners of Jellachich, Windischgrätz and Radetzky! And besides all this, England's wrongs against Ireland have raised a new powerful ally of Russia on the other side of the Atlantic.

The plan of Russian policy remains unchangeable, her means of action have wonderfully increased even since 1848, but as yet there is one thing out of reach, and Peter the First hit the weak point when he exclaimed that to conquer the world, the Muscovites wanted nothing but souls. Well, this living spirit, which Russia lacks, will be infused into her carcass the moment the Poles turn into Russian subjects. What then will you have to throw into the opposite balance?<sup>b</sup>

A continental European will, perhaps, answer that Russia, by the emancipation of the serfs, has entered the family of civilised

<sup>a</sup> The Crimean war of 1853-56.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the rough manuscript this paragraph is crossed with a vertical line. In the *Głos Wolny* the first sentence reads: "Peter I once said that in order to conquer the world the Muscovites lacked nothing but souls."—*Ed.*

nations, that the German power recently concentrated in Prussian hands can stand any Asiatic shock, and, lastly, that Social Revolution in Western Europe will do away with all "international" conflicts.<sup>a</sup>

In the first instance, the emancipation of the serfs has emancipated the supreme government from the impediments the nobles were able to oppose to its centralised action. It has created a vast recruiting place for its army, broken up the common property of the Russian peasants, insulated them, and, above all, strengthened their faith in their pope-autocrat. It has not *deodorised* their Asiatic barbarism, the slow growth of centuries.<sup>b</sup> Any attempt at raising their moral standard is punished as a crime. I remind you only of the official provocations against the temperance societies which had undertaken to wean the Muscovite from what Feuerbach calls the practical substance of his religion, namely brandy. However it may work in the future, for the present the serf emancipation has increased the disposable forces of the Czar.

Now, as to Prussia. Once a vassal of Poland, she has but grown into a first rate power under the auspices of Russia, and by the partition of Poland. If she lose to-morrow her Polish booty, she would merge into Germany instead of absorbing it. To maintain herself as a power distinct from Germany, she must fall back upon the Muscovite. Her recent access of domain, instead of loosening these ties, has rendered them indissoluble, because it has heightened her antagonism to France and Austria. At the same time Russia is the prop upon which the arbitrary rule of the Hohenzollern dynasty and its feudal retainers rest. This is their safeguard against popular disaffection. Prussia is, therefore, not a bulwark against the Muscovite but his predestined tool for the invasion of France and the enslavement of Germany.

As to social revolution, what does it mean if not a struggle of classes? It is possible that the struggle between the workmen and the capitalist will be less fierce and bloody than the struggles between the feudal lord and the capitalist proved in England and in France.

---

<sup>a</sup> In the rough manuscript this paragraph is crossed with a vertical line. The *Głos Wolny* here reads: "People reply to this question from different points of view. Some say that after the emancipation of the serfs, Russia has entered the family of civilised nations. German power, recently concentrated in the hands of the Prussians, could, claim others, defy all Asiatic attacks. Still others, more radical, place their hope in the internal social transformation in Western Europe".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The *Głos Wolny* has "for civilisation is created over centuries".—*Ed.*

We will hope so. But at all events, although such a social crisis may rouse the energies of the Western peoples, it will, like all internal feuds, also invite aggression from abroad. It will clothe anew Russia with the character she bore during the Anti-Jacobin war and since the Holy Alliance, that of the predestined saviour of order. It will enlist in her ranks all the privileged classes of Europe. Already during the revolution of February it was not only the Count of Montalembert, who laid his ear to the ground to listen whether there was a distant troop of Cossack horses.<sup>a</sup> It was not only Prussian squires who proclaimed in the midst of German representative bodies the Czar their "*Oberlandesvater*".<sup>b</sup> It was all the Stock Exchanges of Europe that rose with every Russian victory over the Magyars<sup>c</sup> and fell at every Russian defeat.

There is only one alternative left for Europe. Asiatic barbarism under Muscovite leadership will burst over her head like a lawine,<sup>d</sup> or she must restore Poland, thus placing between herself and Asia 20 millions of heroes, and gaining breathing time for the accomplishment of her social regeneration.

First published in Polish in the *Głos Wolny*, No. 130, February 10, 1867

Reproduced from the rough manuscript; arranged according to the text in the *Głos Wolny*

---

<sup>a</sup> An allusion to Victor Hugo's speech made in the French Legislative Assembly on July 17, 1851 and published in *Le Moniteur officiel*, July 18, 1851.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Supreme sovereign.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> In the *Głos Wolny* the words "over the Magyars" are omitted.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> An avalanche.—*Ed.*



Karl Marx

[A CORRECTION <sup>153</sup>]

I request the esteemed Editorial Board of the *Zeitung für Norddeutschland* to print the following correction:

Your obedient servant,

*Karl Marx*

TO THE EDITORIAL BOARD  
OF THE *ZEITUNG FÜR NORDDEUTSCHLAND*

It seems to me that the notice

“Dr. Marx, who is living in London ... seems to have been chosen to tour the continent to make propaganda for this affair” (“the next” Polish “insurrection”), which probably found its way into your paper No. 5522<sup>a</sup> by an oversight, must be a fabrication hatched by the police, I don’t know for what “affair”.

London, February 18, 1867

*Karl Marx*

First published in *Die Neue Zeit*, Bd. 2,  
No. 3, 1901

Printed according to Marx’s man-  
uscript as copied by Kugelmann

Published in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>a</sup> February 15, 1867.—*Ed.*

## Karl Marx

[RESOLUTIONS CONCERNING THE AGENDA  
OF THE LAUSANNE CONGRESS<sup>154</sup>]

## I

On the practical means by which to enable the International Working Men's Association to fulfil its function of a common centre of action for the working classes, female and male, in their struggle tending to their complete emancipation from the domination of capital.

## II

That our Congress programme be published in the *Courrier Français*, that no branch has a right to put forth a programme of its own, that the Council alone is empowered to draw up the Congress programme, and that the General Secretary be instructed to send the Council programme to the *Courrier* and communicate the foregoing resolution to the Paris Committee.

Adopted by the General Council on  
July 9 and 23, 1867

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

Resolution I first published as a leaflet  
and in *The Working Man*, No. 16, *The  
Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 300, and *The  
Commonwealth*, No. 75, July 13, 1867

Karl Marx

[RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S  
ASSOCIATION  
TO THE CONGRESS  
OF THE LEAGUE OF PEACE AND FREEDOM<sup>a]</sup>

That the delegates of the Council be instructed not to take any official part in the Peace Congress, and to resist any motion that might be brought forward at the Working Men's Congress tending to take an official part.<sup>155</sup>

Adopted by the General Council on  
August 13, 1867

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published in *The Bee-Hive News-  
paper*, No. 305, and *The Working Man*,  
No. 21, August 17, 1867

---

<sup>a</sup> The record of Marx's speech before proposing the resolution see on pp. 426-27 of this volume.—*Ed.*

ARTICLES AND REVIEWS  
WRITTEN IN CONNECTION WITH THE  
PUBLICATION  
OF VOLUME ONE OF *CAPITAL*

(October 1867-July 1868)



## Frederick Engels

### [REVIEW OF VOLUME ONE OF *CAPITAL* FOR THE *ZUKUNFT*<sup>156</sup>]

K. Marx. *Capital*. Volume One.  
Hamburg, Meissner, 1867. 784 pp., octavo

For every German it is a saddening fact that we, the nation of thinkers, have so far achieved so little in the field of political economy. Our famous men in this line are at best compilers like Rau and Roscher and, where anything original is produced, we have protectionists like List (who, however, is said to have copied a Frenchman<sup>a</sup>) or socialists like Rodbertus and Marx. Our standard political economy actually seems to have set itself the aim of driving into the arms of socialism all who treat the science of political economy seriously. Have we not seen the whole of official economics daring to oppose a Lassalle on the well-known and recognised<sup>b</sup> law on the determination of wages, and leaving it to Lassalle to defend people like Ricardo against Schulze-Delitzsch and others<sup>c</sup>! Alas, it is true that scientifically they could not even cope with Lassalle and, whatever recognition their practical endeavours may have won, had to endure the charge that their entire science consists in watering down a Bastiat's harmonies<sup>d</sup> which gloss over all contradictions and difficulties. Bastiat as an authority and Ricardo disowned—that is our official political economy in Germany today! But indeed, how could it be otherwise? Alas, with us political economy is a field in which nobody takes a scientific interest; it is

<sup>a</sup> A reference to F. L. Ferrier, a French economist, and his book *Du gouvernement considéré dans ses rapports avec le commerce*, propositions of which were widely used by F. List in his book *Das nationale System der politischen Oekonomie* (cf. present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 290-93).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Die Zukunft* has omitted the word "recognised".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> An allusion to F. Lassalle's *Herr Bastiat-Schulze von Delitzsch, der ökonomische Julian, oder: Capital und Arbeit*, Berlin, 1864.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> F. Bastiat, *Harmonies économiques*, Paris, 1850.—*Ed.*

either a breadwinning study for the examinations in cameralistics or an aid to political agitation for which the merest smattering is thought sufficient. Is that the fault of our political dismemberment, our unfortunately still so little developed industry, or our traditional dependence for this branch of science on foreign countries?

In these circumstances it is always a pleasure when a book like the above comes to hand, in which the author, indignantly referring the current watered down or, as he aptly terms it, "*vulgar political economy*" back to its classical models concluding with Ricardo and Sismondi, also takes a critical attitude to the classics, but always endeavours to retain the path of strictly scientific analysis. Marx's earlier writings, in particular the treatise on money published in 1859 by Duncker in Berlin,<sup>a</sup> were already distinguished by a strictly scientific spirit as much as by ruthless criticism, and to our knowledge our entire official political economy has not produced anything to refute them. But if it could not cope with the treatise of those days, how will it fare with the 49 sheets about capital now? Understand us rightly: we do not say that no objections can be made to the conclusions of this book, that Marx has brought forward proofs that are complete; we merely say: We do not believe that among all our political economists one can be found capable of refuting them. The studies made in this book are of the greatest scientific subtlety. We refer in particular to the masterly, dialectical arrangement of the whole, to the manner in which the concept of the commodity is already presented as implying money existing in itself and how capital is developed out of money. We acknowledge that we regard the newly introduced category of *surplus-value* as an advance; that we do not see what can be objected to the statement that not *labour* but *labour-power* appears on the market as a commodity; that we regard as quite in order the correction to Ricardo's law of the rate of profit, that surplus-value must be substituted for profit. We must confess that we are much impressed by the sense of history which pervades the whole book and forbids the author to take the laws of economics for eternal truths, for anything but the formulations of the conditions of existence of certain transitory states of society; we would, alas, look in vain among our official economists for that scholarship and acumen with which the various historical states of society and their conditions of existence are here presented.

---

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, see present edition, Vol. 30.—Ed.

Studies like that on the economic conditions and laws of slavery, the various forms of serfdom and bondage and the origin of free labour have hitherto remained quite alien to our economic specialists. We would also like to hear the opinion of these gentlemen on the expositions given here of co-operation, division of labour and manufacture, machinery and large-scale industry in their historical and economic connections and effects; at any rate, they could here learn much that is new. And what in particular will they say of the fact which runs counter to all traditional theories of free competition and which is here nevertheless substantiated from official material, namely that in England, the fatherland of free competition, there is almost no industry left in which the daily working hours are not strictly prescribed by government intervention and which is not supervised by factory inspectors? And that nevertheless, not only do the individual industries prosper, in line with the reduction in working hours, but the individual worker also produces more in the shorter hours than he did previously in the longer hours?

Alas, we cannot deny that the particularly bitter tone which the author uses against the *official German* economists is not without justification. They more or less all belong to the "vulgar economists"; they have prostituted their science for the sake of momentary popularity and denied its great classical exponents. They speak of "harmonies" and wallow in the most banal contradictions. May the severe lesson given them in this book serve to awaken them from their lethargy, to recall to them that political economy is not merely a milchcow providing us with butter but a science demanding serious and zealous application.

Written on October 12, 1867

First published in the supplement to *Die Zukunft*, No. 254, October 30, 1867

Printed according to the manuscript checked with the newspaper text

Published in English for the first time



## Frederick Engels

[REVIEW OF VOLUME ONE OF *CAPITAL*  
FOR THE *RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG*<sup>157</sup>]

Karl Marx. *Capital*. Critique of Political Economy.  
Volume I. The Process of Production of Capital.  
Hamburg, O. Meissner, 1867

Universal suffrage has added to our present parliamentary parties a new one, the *Social-Democratic* Party. At the last elections to the North German Imperial Diet it put up its own candidates in most big cities and in all factory districts, and succeeded in getting six or eight representatives elected.<sup>158</sup> Compared with the last but one election it deployed much greater strength and we can therefore assume that, at least for the time being, it is still growing. It would be foolish to continue to treat the existence, activity and doctrines of such a party with genteel silence in a country where universal suffrage has placed the final decision into the hands of the most numerous and poorest classes.

However much the few social-democratic parliamentarians may be at loggerheads with each other, we can be sure that all factions of this party will welcome the present book as their *theoretical bible*, as the armoury from which they will take their most telling arguments. For this reason alone it deserves special attention. But it is also bound to cause a stir by its own content. If *Lassalle's* main argumentation—and in political economy Lassalle was only a pupil of Marx—was confined to repeating again and again the Ricardo so-called law of wages, we here have before us a work which with undeniably rare scholarship presents the whole relationship of capital and labour in its connection with economic science as a whole, and which makes it its final goal “to reveal *the economic law of motion* of modern society”, and comes, after obviously sincere studies unmistakably conducted with expert knowledge, to the conclusion that the whole “capitalist mode of production” must be abolished. Moreover, we would like to draw particular attention to the fact that, in addition to the conclusions of the work, the author

in its course represents a whole series of major points of political economy in quite a new light, and comes in purely scientific questions to results which markedly depart from hitherto current political economy, and which orthodox economists will have to criticise seriously and refute scientifically if they do not wish to see their hitherto current doctrines founder. In the interest of science it is desirable that the polemic on these particular points should develop very soon in the specialist literature.

Marx begins with the presentation of the relationship between commodity and money, the essence of which was already published some time ago in a special work.<sup>a</sup> He then passes on to capital, and here we soon come to the crucial point of the whole work. What is capital? Money which changes into a commodity in order to change from a commodity into more money than the original amount. When I buy cotton for 100 talers and sell this for 110 talers, I establish my 100 talers as capital, self-expanding value. Now the question arises: whence do the ten talers come which I earn in this process, how does it happen that by two simple exchanges 100 talers become 110 talers? For political economy presupposes that in all exchanges equal value is exchanged for equal value. Marx now runs through all possible cases (variations in the price of commodities, etc.) to prove that under the presuppositions assumed by political economy the formation of 10 talers *surplus-value* from an original sum of 100 talers is *impossible*. Nevertheless, this process takes place daily, and the economists still owe us an explanation for this. Marx provides the explanation as follows: The riddle can only be solved if we find on the market a commodity of a very peculiar kind, a commodity the use-value of which consists in creating exchange-value. This commodity exists: it is *labour-power*. The capitalist buys labour-power on the market and makes it work for him so as to sell its product again. We must therefore in the first instance examine labour-power.

What is the value of labour-power? According to a well-known law it is the value of the means of subsistence necessary to maintain and reproduce the worker in the manner historically established in the given country and epoch. We assume that the worker's labour-power is paid for at its full value. We assume further that this value is represented in *six* hours' work a day, or *half* a working day. But the capitalist claims that he has bought the labour-power for a *whole* day and makes the worker work 12

---

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*.—Ed.

hours or more. Hence with 12 hours of work he has acquired the product of six hours working-time without payment. Marx concludes: *All surplus-value*, whichever way it may be distributed, as capitalist gain, rent, tax, etc., is *unpaid labour*.

The struggle for the length of the working day arises from the interest of the factory owner to gain every day as much unpaid labour as possible and the opposite interest of the worker. Marx describes the course of this struggle in an illustration well worth reading, which fills about a hundred pages, taken from English large-scale industry; in spite of the protest of the factory owner, who was a champion of free trade, this struggle ended last spring in not only all factory industry, but all the small-scale and even domestic industry being brought under the restraints of the factory act which limits the daily work of women and children under 18 years of age—and therewith indirectly also that of men—in the most important industries to at most 10½ hours.<sup>159</sup> He also explains why English industry has not suffered, but on the contrary, gained thereby: since the work of every individual worker became more intense as its duration was shortened.

Surplus-value can, however, also be raised by another method than that of extending working-time beyond that needed to produce the necessary means of subsistence or their value. According to our previous assumption, a given working day of, say, 12 hours, contains six hours of necessary work and six hours of work used to produce surplus-value. If by some means we succeed in reducing the necessary working-time to five hours, there remain seven hours during which surplus-value is produced. This can be achieved by shortening the working-time needed to produce the necessary means of subsistence, in other words, by reducing their cost, and this again only by improvements in production. On this point Marx gives again a detailed illustration, examining and describing the three main levers by which these improvements are brought about: 1. *co-operation*, or the multiplication of the forces which results from the simultaneous and planned working together of many individuals; 2. the *division of labour* as it was developed in the period of manufacture properly so-called, i.e. up to about 1770; and, lastly, 3. *machinery* with the aid of which large-scale industry has developed since then. These descriptions are also of great interest, and reveal amazing expert knowledge, up to technical details...<sup>a</sup>

We cannot go more deeply into the details of the studies on

<sup>a</sup> The following page, where evidently surplus-value and wages were analysed, is missing.— *Ed.*

surplus-value and wages; to avoid misunderstandings we merely remark that wages are less than the total product of labour, as Marx proved by a number of quotations, and which is a fact not unknown to orthodox economics either. We must hope that this book will provide the opportunity for the gentlemen of the orthodox tradition to give us more enlightenment on this really strange point. It is most commendable that all factual examples given by Marx are taken from the best sources, mostly official parliamentary reports. We take this opportunity to support the author's plea made indirectly in the preface: that in Germany, too, working conditions in the various industries should be thoroughly investigated by government commissioners—who, however, should not be biassed bureaucrats—and their reports submitted to the Imperial Diet and the public.

The first volume concludes with a discourse on the accumulation of capital. Much has already been written on this point, but we must confess that here too there is much given that is new, while the old is presented from new angles. Most original is the attempt to prove that the accumulation of a redundant population of workers goes hand in hand with the concentration and accumulation of capital, and that eventually both make a social revolution on the one hand necessary, on the other possible.

Whatever the reader may think of the author's socialist views, we believe to have shown above that he has here before him a work which stands way above the current social-democratic literature of the day. We add that except for the somewhat stark dialectical style on the first 40 pages and in spite of its scientific strictness, the work is very easy to follow and is made most interesting by the author's sarcastic manner of writing which spares no one.

Written on October 12, 1867

Printed according to the manuscript

First published in *Marx-Engels Archives*,  
Russian edition, Book II, Moscow, 1927

## Frederick Engels

### [REVIEW OF VOLUME ONE OF CAPITAL FOR THE *ELBERFELDER ZEITUNG*<sup>160</sup>]

Karl Marx on Capital  
(Hamburg, Otto Meissner, Volume I, 1867)

Fifty sheets of learned treatise to prove to us that the entire capital of our bankers, merchants, manufacturers and large landowners is nothing but the accumulated and unpaid labour of the working class! We recall that in 1849 the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* raised the demand for a "Silesian milliard" in the name of the Silesian peasants.<sup>a</sup> A thousand million talers, it was claimed, were illegally withdrawn from the Silesian peasants alone, to flow into the pockets of the large landowners when serfdom and feudal services were abolished, and this amount was demanded back. But the gentlemen of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* of old are like the late Sibyl with her books: the less they are offered, the more they ask. What are a thousand million talers compared with the colossal amount now demanded back in the name of the working class as a whole—for that is, surely, how we must understand it! If the entire accumulated capital of the propertied classes is nothing but "unpaid labour", it would appear to follow directly that this labour is to be paid later, that is, the entire capital in question is to be transferred to labour. That would indeed raise the question *who* in particular would be entitled to receive it. But joking apart! However radically socialist the present book is in its approach, however blunt and unsparing on all hands its treatment of people who as a rule are regarded as authorities, we must confess that it is a most scholarly work which has a claim to be regarded as most

---

<sup>a</sup> A reference to the series of articles *Die schlesische Milliarde* written by Wilhelm Wolff, an associate of Marx and Engels, and published in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Nos. 252, 255, 256, 258, 264, 270-72 and 281, from March 22 to April 25, 1849.—*Ed.*

strictly scientific. The press has already frequently mentioned Marx's intention to sum up the results of his many years' studies in a critique of the whole of political economy to date and thereby to provide the scientific basis for socialist aspirations which neither Fourier nor Proudhon nor even Lassalle had been able to do. This work has already long since and frequently been announced in the press. In 1859 a "first part"<sup>a</sup> appeared at Duncker's in Berlin, which, however, dealt only with matters without immediate practical interest and which therefore caused hardly a stir. The following parts did not appear and the new socialist science seemed destined not to survive its birthpangs. How many jokes were not made about this new revelation which was announced so often and yet never once seemed actually about to appear in public! Well and good, here is at last the "first volume"—fifty sheets as we have said—and nobody can maintain that it does not contain enough and more than enough that is new, bold and audacious and that this is not presented in thoroughly scientific form. This time Marx appeals with his unusual propositions not to the masses but to the men of science. It is up to them to defend their economic theories which are here attacked at their foundations, and give proof that capital is indeed accumulated labour but not accumulated *unpaid* labour. Lassalle was a practical agitator, and it could suffice to oppose him in practical agitation, in the daily press and at meetings. But here we have a systematic scientific theory, and here the daily press cannot help to decide, here only science can speak the last word. It is to be hoped that people like Roscher, Rau, Max Wirth, etc., will seize the opportunity to defend the up till now generally recognised political economy against this new and certainly not contemptible attack. The social-democratic seed has sprouted among the younger generation and the working population of many a place—through this book it will in any case find plenty of new nourishment.

Written on October 22, 1867

First published in the *Elberfelder Zeitung*,  
No. 302, November 2, 1867

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> A reference to Marx's *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*.—Ed.

## Frederick Engels

### [REVIEW OF VOLUME ONE OF *CAPITAL* FOR THE *DÜSSELDORFER ZEITUNG*<sup>161</sup>]

Karl Marx. *Capital*. Critique of Political Economy.  
Volume One. Hamburg, Meissner, 1867

This book will disappoint many a reader. In certain circles its appearance had been anticipated for years. Here the true secret socialist teaching and panacea was at last to be revealed, and many may have imagined, when at last they saw it announced, that they would now learn what the communist Millennium would actually be like. Anyone who had keenly awaited this pleasure made a great mistake. Indeed, he learns here how things should not be, and this he is told in detail with very outspoken bluntness on 784 pages, and he who has eyes to see will find here the demand for a social revolution clearly enough presented. Here it is not a question of workers' associations with state capital, as with Lassalle of old; here it is a question of *abolishing capital* altogether.

Marx is and remains the same revolutionary he has always been, and in a scientific work he would assuredly be the last to hide his views in this respect. But as for what is going to happen after the social revolution—on that he gives us only *very* dark hints. We learn that large-scale industry “matures the contradictions and antagonisms of the capitalist form of the production process and thereby at the same time the elements for the formation of a new society and the elements for exploding the old one”,<sup>a</sup> and further that the abolition of the capitalist form of production “restores individual property but on the basis of the acquisitions of the capitalist era: i.e., of co-operation of free workers and the

---

<sup>a</sup> Quoted from the first German edition of Volume One of *Capital*, pp. 492-93. Cf. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, translated by S. Moore and E. Aveling and edited by F. Engels, London, 1887, Chapter XV, “Machinery and Modern Industry”, Section 9, p. 512.—*Ed.*

common ownership of the land and the means of production produced by labour itself".<sup>a</sup>

With this we must rest content, and to judge by the present volume the promised second and third will also tell us little on this interesting point. For the present we must be contented with the "Critique of Political Economy", and there we get into a very wide field indeed. Here, of course, we cannot enter into the scientific consideration of the detailed conclusions presented in this voluminous book, we cannot even briefly repeat the main propositions put forward there. The more or less well-known principles of the socialist theory can all be reduced to the fact that in modern society the worker does not obtain the full value of the product of his labour. This proposition is also the red thread which runs through the present work, but it is made more acutely precise followed more consistently in all its implications, and knitted more closely into the main propositions of political economy or more directly placed in opposition to them than hitherto. This part of the work is distinguished to great advantage from all similar earlier writings we know by its attempt to be strictly scientific, and we see that the author takes seriously not only his own theory but science as a whole.

We found particularly striking in this book the author's conception of the propositions of political economy not, as is usual, as eternally valid truths but as the results of certain historical developments. While even the natural sciences are being transformed more and more into historical sciences—compare Laplace's astronomical theory, the whole of geology and the works of Darwin—political economy has hitherto been just as abstract and universally valid a science as mathematics. Whatever may be the fate of the remaining propositions of this book, we regard it as a lasting merit of Marx to have put an end to this narrow-minded concept. After this work it will no longer be possible to treat slave labour, serf labour and free wage labour, for example, as economically alike, or to apply laws which are valid for modern large-scale industry, conditioned by free competition, without further ado to the conditions of antiquity or the guilds of the Middle Ages, or, when these modern laws do not fit ancient conditions, simply to declare the ancient conditions as heretical. The Germans of all nations have the

---

<sup>a</sup> Quoted from the first German edition of Volume One of *Capital*, p. 745. Cf. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, London, 1887, Chapter XXXII, "Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation", p. 789.—*Ed.*



greatest, nay, even a unique historical sense, and thus it is quite natural that it is again a German who traces the historical connections also in the sphere of political economy.

Written between November 3 and 8,  
1867

First published in the *Düsseldorfer Zeitung*,  
No. 316, November 17, 1867

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Published in English for the first  
time

## Karl Marx

PLAGIARISM <sup>162</sup>

*Social-Demokrat* of November 29. General Meeting of the General Association of German Workers

Karl Marx: *Capital*. Critique of Political Economy, 1867. Section: "The Working Day"

*Debate on the Working Day*

Speaker: v. Hofstetten  
(Owner of the *Social-Demokrat*):

1) "*Labour-power* is today a commodity. [...] The purchase price" (read: *the value*) "of a thing" (read: *commodity*) "is determined by the working-time necessary to its production. The worker must work a certain number of hours to reproduce the value he has received for his labour-power: that is the *necessary part of the working day*, but by no means the *working day itself*. To reproduce this, an indetermined part must" (why?) "be added; although it is *indetermined*, it has its *necessary limits*."

1) "We started with the supposition that *labour-power* is bought and sold at its *value*. Its value, like that of all other commodities, is determined by the working-time necessary to its production. If the production of the average daily means of subsistence of the labourer takes up six hours, he must work, on the average, six hours every day, to produce his daily labour-power, or to reproduce the *value* received as the result of its sale. The *necessary part of his working day* amounts to six hours, and is, therefore, *caeteris paribus*, a *given quantity*. But with this, *the extent of the work-*

*ing day* itself is not yet given... One of its parts, certainly, is determined by the working-time required for the continual reproduction of the labourer himself. But its total amount varies with the length or the duration of the *surplus-labour*... Although the working day is not a fixed, but a fluent quantity, it can, on the other hand, only vary *within certain limits*" (pp. 198, 199 [214-15]).

2) "One of these" (limits), "the *maximum limit*, rests in the physical possibility" (how can a limit rest in a possibility!) "of how long a man is able at all to work, as in order to keep alive he must also sleep, rest, dress and wash himself. The *minimum limit* is given by the demands of the prevailing *level of culture* of an epoch. The duration of the working day and of the surplus-labour also differ in accordance with this level and with the existing legislation. Accordingly, there are eight, twelve, sixteen, yes even 18-hour working days."

2) "The *minimum limit*" (of the working day) "is, however, not determinable; of course, if we make the surplus-labour=0, we have a minimum limit, i. e., the part of the day which the labourer must necessarily work for his own maintenance. On the basis of the capitalist mode of production, however, this necessary labour can form a part only of his working day; the working day itself can never be reduced to this minimum. On the other hand, the working day has a *maximum limit*. It cannot be prolonged beyond a certain point. This maximum limit is determined by two things. First, by the *physical bounds of labour-power*. Within the 24 hours of the natural day a man can expend only a definite quantity of his vital force and the extent of this expenditure of force is a measure for his physically possible working-time. A horse, in

like manner, can only work from day to day for 8 hours. During part of the day this force must rest, sleep; during another part the man has to satisfy other physical needs, to feed, wash and clothe himself, etc. Besides these *purely physical limitations*, the extension of the working day encounters *moral ones*. The labourer needs time for satisfying his intellectual and social wants, the extent and number of which are determined by the general *level of culture...* But both these limits" (the physical and moral maximum limits) "are of a very elastic nature, and allow the greatest latitude. So we find working days of 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 hours" (p. 199 [215]).

Herr v. Hofstetten makes nonsense of the passage he plagiarises. Thus, for example, he lets the *maximum limit* of the working day be determined by purely *physical*, and the *minimum limit* by *moral* limitations, although he himself has earlier mechanically repeated that the *necessary part of the working day*, i.e., its absolute minimum limit, is determined by the *working-time necessary* to maintain the labour-power!

3) "Experience in England has shown that with a shorter working day the same surplus-labour is achieved, as in that case labour is greatly intensified."

4) "The *endeavour* of the capitalists therefore is to *aim* at the longest possible working day." (What nonsense! The endeavour to aim!) "But the worker possesses as sole commodity only his labour-power, and if in that a

3) On the intensification of labour and the achievement of equal or greater "surplus-labour" by the enforced legal restriction of the working day in England see pp. 401-09 [407-17].

4) "The capitalist maintains his rights as a purchaser when he tries to make the working day as long as possible, and to make, whenever possible, two

certain point is overstepped" (what does that mean: *a point is overstepped in the labour-power?*) "he must say *I am used up* (!), *I have been killed.*" (Well done! He is still supposed to say that after he has already been killed!) "Hence," (because he must say that!) "the extent of his labour must be fixed in the interest of the labourer, so that his commodity, labour-power, is maintained and can be *exploited* as long as possible. Therewith he demands only his due." (He has just complained that he has been *used up*; now he demands as his due to be exploited!)

5) "In England this measure" (for the working day) "is fixed by law at 10 hours(!) and there are factory inspectors who report on the observance of this law to the Home Secretary. In many countries there are also laws limiting the labour of children: in Austria, in Switzerland, in America and in *Belgium* (!) similar laws are in *preparation* (!). In *Prussia* there are also the same laws, but there they exist only on paper and have never been put into practice. In America, since the end of the Civil War which led to the emancipation of the slaves, an eight-hour day has even been demanded. The International Working Men's Congress' also proposed an eight-hour day, in 1866."

working days out of one. On the other hand, the peculiar nature of the commodity sold implies a limit to its consumption by the purchaser, and the labourer maintains his right as seller when he wishes to reduce the working day to a definite normal duration... I will" (he says) "husband my sole wealth, labour-power... The *use* of my labour-power and the *spoliation* of it are quite different things... You pay me for one day's labour-power, whilst you use that of three days. That is against our contract and the law of commodity exchange. I demand, therefore, a working day of *normal* length, etc." (pp. 202, 201 [218, 217]).

5) "The Factory Act of 1850 now in force" (not *in England*, but in *specific* industries of the United Kingdom named by Marx) "allows for the average working day of 10 hours... Certain guardians of the law are appointed, *Factory Inspectors*, directly under the Home Secretary, whose reports are published half-yearly by order of Parliament" (p. 207 [223]).

...Limitations of the working day for minors exist in certain States of North America in reality, not just in preparation (p. 244 [256]), limitation of the working day in general in France (p. 251 [262]), for children in some cantons of Switzerland (p. 251 [262-63]), in

Austria (p. 252 [263]), in Belgium *nothing* of the kind (ibid.). The ordinances of Messrs. v. d. Heydt and Manteuffel, etc., would be praiseworthy if they were put into practice (ibid.). "In the United States of North America, every independent movement of the workers was paralysed so long as slavery disfigured a part of the Republic... But out of the death of slavery a new young life at once arose. The first fruit of the Civil War was the *eight hours agitation*. At the same time the "*The International Working Men's Congress*", made the following resolution: "...We propose eight hours work as the legal limit of the working day"<sup>163</sup> (pp. 279, 280 [287]).

In the same manner as Herr v. Hofstetten, the speaker who followed him, Herr *Geib* of Hamburg, bowdlerised the history of the English factory legislation given by Marx. Both gentlemen take the same care not to divulge the source of their wisdom.

Written on December 6, 1867

First published in the supplement to *Die Zukunft*, No. 291, December 12, 1867

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

## Frederick Engels

### [REVIEW OF VOLUME ONE OF *CAPITAL* FOR THE *BEOBACHTER*<sup>164</sup>]

Karl Marx. *Capital*. Critique of Political Economy.  
Volume One. Hamburg, Meissner, 1867

Whatever one may think of the tendency of the book before us, we believe we may say that it is one of those achievements which do honour to the German spirit. It is indicative that while the author is a Prussian, he is one of the Rhenish Prussians, who until recently liked to describe themselves as “compulsory Prussians”, and, moreover, a Prussian who has spent the last few decades far from Prussia, in exile. Prussia itself has long ceased to be a country of any scientific initiative whatsoever, and especially in historical, political or social subjects such an initiative would be impossible there. One could say of it that it represents the Russian rather than the German spirit.

As for the book itself, one must distinguish clearly between two very disparate aspects of it: between, firstly, its solid, positive expositions and, secondly, the tendential conclusions the author draws from them. The first are to a great extent a direct enrichment of science. The author there treats economic relations with a quite new, materialistic, natural-historic method. In this way he represents money and very expertly traces in detail the various successive forms of industrial production: co-operation, the division of labour and with it manufacture in the narrower sense, and lastly machinery, large-scale industry and the corresponding social combinations and relations which naturally grow one from the other.

As for the author’s tendencies, we can here, too, discern again a two-fold trend. In so far as he endeavours to show that present-day society, economically considered, is pregnant with

another, higher form of society, he merely strives to present as law in the social sphere the same process which Darwin traced in natural history, a process of gradual evolution. Up to now such a gradual transformation has indeed taken place in social relations from antiquity through the Middle Ages to the present; and as far as we know it has never been seriously claimed from any scientific quarters that Adam Smith and Ricardo have said the last word on the future development of present-day society. On the contrary, liberal teaching on progress also includes progress in the social sphere, and it is one of the arrogant paradoxes of so-called socialists to pretend that they alone have a lien on social progress. By contrast to the run-of-the-mill socialists we must recognise it as a merit of Marx that he also traces progress where the extremely one-sided development of present-day conditions is accompanied by directly abhorrent consequences, as everywhere in the presentation of the great extremes of wealth and poverty resulting from the factory system as a whole, etc. Just by this critical conception of the subject the author has brought forward—certainly against his will—the strongest arguments against all socialism by the book.

It is quite a different matter with the other tendency, the author's subjective conclusions, with the manner in which he represents to himself and others the ultimate result of the present course of social developments. These have nothing to do with what we have called the positive part of the book; nay, if space permitted we could perhaps show that his *subjective* whims are refuted by his own *objective* exposition.

If Lassalle's entire socialism consisted in abusing the capitalists and flattering the Prussian rural squires, here we find the diametrical opposite. Herr Marx explicitly proves the historical necessity of the capitalist mode of production, as he calls the present social phase, and equally the superfluous nature of the merely consuming land-holding squirearchy. If Lassalle had big ideas about Bismarck's fitness to introduce the socialist Millennium, Herr Marx refutes his wayward pupil loudly enough. He not only explicitly declares that he will have nothing to do with any "Royal Prussian government socialism",<sup>a</sup> he says straight out on p. 762 ff. that the system now prevailing in France and Prussia would shortly bring about the rule of the Russian knout over Europe if it were not stopped in time.<sup>165</sup>

Finally, we remark that above we have only been able to con-

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 80.—*Ed.*



sider the main features of this big volume; in detail there is still much that could be said about it, but here we must pass it by. For this purpose there exist enough specialist journals, which will doubtless enter into this most remarkable phenomenon.

Written on December 12-13, 1867

First published in *Der Beobachter*,  
No. 303, December 27, 1867

Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time

## Frederick Engels

### [REVIEW OF VOLUME ONE OF *CAPITAL* FOR THE *STAATS-ANZEIGER FÜR WÜRTTEMBERG*<sup>166</sup>]

Karl Marx. *Capital*. Critique of Political Economy.  
Volume One. Hamburg, Meissner, 1867

When we take the above work into consideration we certainly do not do so on account of the specifically socialist tendency which the author openly displays already in the preface.

We do so because, apart from this tendency, the work contains scientific expositions and factual material which deserve every consideration. We shall not enter into the scientific part either, since this is far from our purpose, and confine ourselves to the factual matters alone.

We do not believe that any work exists—either in German or a foreign language—in which the analytical fundamentals of more recent industrial history from the Middle Ages to the modern day are so clearly and completely summed up as on pages 302-495 of the present book in the three chapters: Co-operation, Manufacture and Large-scale Industry. Every single aspect of industrial progress is here emphasised in its proper place, according to merit, and even if the specific tendency comes through here and there, one must do the author justice for never moulding the facts to suit his theory but, on the contrary, seeking to present his theory as the result of the facts. He takes these facts always from the best sources, and where the latest state of affairs is concerned, from sources which are as authentic as they are at present unknown in Germany: the English Parliamentary Reports. German businessmen who consider their industry not merely from the standpoint of day-to-day business but regard it as an essential link in the whole development of large-scale modern industry in all countries and hence also take an interest in matters not directly concerning their own industry, will here find a copious source of instruction and will thank us for having directed their attention to it. For the time when every trade existed singly and quietly for itself alone has indeed long passed, now they all depend on one another and on the progress being made in distant lands as well as in the closest neighbourhood and on the changing economic

situation of the world market. And if, as may well be, the new Customs Union agreements<sup>167</sup> lead to a reduction in the present protective tariffs, all our manufacturers are likely to ask to be made better acquainted with the history of modern industry in general, so as to learn in advance how best to conduct themselves when such changes occur. Higher education, which up to now has saved us Germans again and again, in spite of the political dismemberment, would also in this case be the best weapon we could use against the crude materialism of the English.

This leads us to another point. With the new Customs Union legislation the moment may soon arrive when a uniform regulation of the working hours in the factories of the Union states will be demanded by the manufacturers themselves. It would be obviously unfair if in one state the working hours, especially of women and children, were entirely at the discretion of the manufacturer, while in another they were subject to considerable limitations. It will be difficult to avoid coming to an understanding on common regulations in this respect, and the more so if the protective tariffs were actually lowered. In this respect, however, we Germans have greatly insufficient, one could even say, no experience at all, and are entirely dependent on the lessons to be drawn from the legislation of other countries, particularly England, and from its fruits. And here the author has done a great service to German industry by giving the history of English factory legislation and its results in the greatest detail from official documents. (Cf. pp. 207-81 and 399-496,<sup>a</sup> and *passim*.) This whole aspect of English industrial history is as good as unknown in Germany, and one will be surprised to learn that since a Parliamentary Act of the current year placed no fewer than a million and a half workers under government control, not only almost all industrial but even most of domestic and part of agricultural labour in England are now subjected to the supervision of officials and direct or indirect time limits. We ask our manufacturers not to be deterred by the tendency of this book from seriously studying particularly this part of it; sooner or later the same question will surely be put before them!

Written on December 12-13, 1867

First published in the *Staats-Anzeiger für Württemberg*, No. 306, December 27, 1867

Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> See 1887 English edition, pp. 223-88 and 407-515.—*Ed.*

## Frederick Engels

[REVIEW OF VOLUME ONE OF *CAPITAL*  
FOR THE *NEUE BADISCHE LANDESZEITUNG*<sup>168</sup>]

Karl Marx. *Capital*. Critique of Political Economy.  
Volume One. Hamburg, Meissner, 1867

We must leave it to others to deal with the theoretical and strictly scientific part of this work and criticise the new view the author gives of the origin of capital. But we cannot fail to draw attention to the great mass of most valuable historical and statistical material with which the author at the same time presents us and which almost without exception is taken from the official Commission Reports which have been put before the English Parliament. He is quite right to emphasise the importance of such commissions of inquiry for the study of the internal social conditions of a country. Provided the right people are found for them, they are the best means for a nation to learn to know itself; and Herr Marx is surely not wrong in saying that similar investigations conducted in Germany would lead to results which would definitely horrify us. Before they were introduced, there was not an Englishman either who knew how the poorer classes of his country lived!

It stands to reason, moreover, that without such investigations all social legislation will be made with only half the knowledge of facts available and often quite in the dark, as they now say in Bavaria. The so-called "inquiries" and "investigations" of German authorities have not remotely the same value. We know the bureaucratic routine only too well: forms are sent round, one is glad if they are returned filled in some way or another; the information thus supplied is all too often sought precisely among those who are interested in hushing up the truth. Compare with that the investigations of English commissions on working conditions in individual industries, for example. Not only the manufacturers and masters, but also the workers down to the little girls are interviewed, and not only these, but doctors, Justices of the Peace, clergymen, teachers, and moreover anyone

who can give any kind of information on the matter. Every question and every answer is taken down in shorthand and printed word for word, and is attached to the whole material on which the commission report with its conclusions and proposals is based. The report and its material at the same time proves in detail whether and how the commissioners have fulfilled their duty and makes things very difficult for individual bias. The details as well as innumerable examples can be read in the above book itself. Here we want only to emphasise the one point, that in England the expansion of the freedom of trade and business has gone hand in hand with the expansion of the legal limitation of the working hours for women and children, and therewith the placing of almost all industries under the supervision of the government. Herr Marx gives us a detailed historical presentation of this development, showing how first, since 1833, spinning and weaving mills were in this way limited to a 12-hour working day; how after a long struggle between manufacturers and workers the working hours were at long last fixed at  $10\frac{1}{2}$ — $6\frac{1}{2}$  for children—and then, beginning in 1850, one industry after another became subject to this factory law. First the cotton printers (already in 1845), then in 1860 the dyeing and bleaching works, in 1861 the lace and hosiery manufactures, in 1863 the potteries, wallpaper factories, etc., and eventually in 1867 almost all the remaining industries of any importance. One can form a picture of the significance of this last Act of 1867 when one learns that it places no fewer than *a million and a half* women and children under the protection and the control of the law. We emphasise this point particularly because in this respect things are, alas, bad indeed with us in Germany, and we must thank the author for having dealt with it in such detail and made the facts accessible to the German public for the first time. This will be the view of every friend of humanity, whatever he may think of the theoretical propositions of Herr Marx.

Space does not permit us to enter into other valuable materials from the history of industry and agriculture, but we are of the opinion that no one interested in political economy, industry, workers' condition, the history of culture and social legislation, whatever standpoint he may hold, should leave this book unread.

Written in the first half of January 1868

First published in the *Neue Badische Landeszeitung*, No. 20, January 21, 1868

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

# Demokratisches Wochenblatt.

Organ der deutschen Volkspartei.

No. 12.

Beipzig, den 21. März.

1868.

Frederick Engels

[REVIEW OF VOLUME ONE OF *CAPITAL*  
FOR THE *DEMOKRATISCHES WOCHENBLATT*<sup>169]</sup>

Marx's *Capital* \*

## I

[*Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 12, March 21, 1868]

As long as there have been capitalists and workers on earth no book has appeared which is of as much importance for the workers as the one before us. The relation between capital and labour, the axis on which our entire present system of society turns, is here treated scientifically for the first time, and at that with a thoroughness and acuity such as was possible only for a German. Valuable as the writings of an Owen, Saint-Simon or Fourier are and will remain—it was reserved for a German first to reach the height from which the whole field of modern social relations can be seen clearly and in full view just as the lower mountain scenery is seen by an observer standing on the top-most peak.

Political economy up to now has taught us that labour is the source of all wealth and the measure of all values, so that two objects whose production has cost the same labour time possess the same value and must also be exchanged for each other, since on the average only equal values are exchangeable for one another. At the same time, however, it teaches that there exists a kind of stored-up labour, which it calls capital; that this capital, owing to the auxiliary sources contained in it, raises the productivity of living labour a hundred and a thousandfold, and in return claims a certain compensation which is termed profit or gain. As we all know, this occurs in reality in such a way that the profits of stored-up, dead labour become ever more massive, the capitals of the capitalists become ever more colossal, while the

\* *Das Kapital*. Kritik der politischen Oekonomie, von Karl Marx. Erster Band. Der Produktionsprozess des Kapitals. Hamburg, O. Meissner, 1867.

wages of living labour become ever smaller and the mass of the workers living solely on wages becomes ever more numerous and poverty-stricken. How is this contradiction to be solved? How can there remain a profit for the capitalist if the worker receives in compensation the full value of the labour he adds to his product? Yet this ought to be the case, since only equal values are exchanged. On the other hand, how can equal values be exchanged, how can the worker receive the full value of his product, if, as is admitted by many economists, this product is divided between him and the capitalist? Political economy up to now has been helpless in the face of this contradiction, and writes or stutters embarrassed meaningless phrases. Even the previous socialist critics of political economy have not been able to do more than to emphasise the contradiction; no one resolved it, until now at last Marx has traced the process by which this profit arises right to its birthplace and has thereby made everything clear.

In tracing the development of capital, Marx starts out from the simple, notoriously obvious fact that the capitalists increase the value of their capital through exchange: they buy commodities for their money and afterwards sell them for more money than they cost them. For example, a capitalist buys cotton for 1,000 talers and resells it for 1,100, thus "earning" 100 talers. This excess of 100 talers over the original capital Marx calls *surplus-value*. Where does this surplus-value come from? According to the economists' assumption, only equal values are exchanged and in the sphere of abstract theory this, of course, is correct. Hence the purchase of cotton and its resale can just as little yield surplus-value as the exchange of a silver taler for thirty silver groschen and the re-exchange of the small coins for a silver taler,<sup>a</sup> a process by which one becomes neither richer nor poorer. But surplus-value can just as little arise from sellers selling commodities above their value, or purchasers buying them below their value, because each one is in turn buyer and seller and things would therefore again balance. Just as little can it arise from buyers and sellers reciprocally overreaching each other, for this would create no new or surplus-value, but only divide the existing capital differently among the capitalists. In spite of the fact that the capitalist buys the commodities at their value and sells them at their value, he gets more value out than he puts in. How does this happen?

The capitalist finds on the commodity market under present social conditions a *commodity* which has the peculiar property that

---

<sup>a</sup> One silver taler equals 30 silver groschen.—Ed.

*its use is a source of new value, is a creation of new value, and this commodity is labour-power.*

What is the value of labour-power? The value of every commodity is measured by the labour required for its production. Labour-power exists in the form of the living worker who requires a definite amount of means of subsistence for his existence as well as for the maintenance of his family, which ensures the continuance of labour-power also after his death. The labour-time necessary for producing these means of subsistence represents, therefore, the value of the labour-power. The capitalist pays for it weekly and purchases thereby the use of one week's labour of the worker. So far messieurs the economists will be pretty well in agreement with us as to the value of labour-power.

The capitalist now sets his worker to work. In a certain period of time the worker will have performed as much labour as was represented by his weekly wages. Supposing that the weekly wages of a worker represent three workdays, then, if the worker begins on Monday, he has by Wednesday evening *replaced* to the capitalist the *full value of the wages paid*. But does he then stop working? Not at all. The capitalist has bought his *week's* labour and the worker must go on working during the last three days of the week too. This *surplus-labour* of the worker, over and above the time necessary to replace his wages, is the *source of surplus-value*, of profit, of the steadily growing increase of capital.

Do not say it is an arbitrary assumption that the worker works off in three days the wages he has received, and works the remaining three days for the capitalist. Whether he takes exactly three days to replace his wages, or two or four, is to be sure quite immaterial here and hence varies according to circumstances; the main point is that the capitalist, besides the labour he pays for, also extracts labour that he *does not pay for*, and this is no arbitrary assumption, for the day the capitalist were to extract from the worker in the long run only as much labour as he paid him in wages, on that day he would shut down his workshop, since indeed his whole profit would come to nought.

Here we have the solution of all those contradictions. The origin of surplus-value (of which the capitalists' profit forms an important part) is now quite clear and natural. The value of the labour-power is paid for, but this value is far smaller than that which the capitalist manages to extract from the labour-power, and it is precisely the difference, the *unpaid labour*, that constitutes the share of the capitalist, or, more accurately, of the capitalist class. For even the profit that the cotton dealer made on his cotton



in the above example must consist of unpaid labour, if cotton prices did not rise. The trader must have sold [it] to a cotton manufacturer, who is able to extract a profit for himself from his product besides the 100 talers, and therefore shares with him the unpaid labour he has pocketed. In general it is this unpaid labour which maintains all the non-working members of society. The state and municipal taxes, as far as they affect the capitalist class, as also the rent of the landowners, etc., are paid from it. On it rests the whole existing social system.

It would, however, be absurd to assume that unpaid labour arose only under present conditions where production is carried on by capitalists on the one hand and wage-workers on the other. On the contrary, the oppressed class at all times has had to perform unpaid labour. During the whole long period when slavery was the prevailing form of the organisation of labour, the slaves had to perform much more labour than was returned to them in the form of means of subsistence. The same was the case under the rule of serfdom and right up to the abolition of peasant *corvée* labour; here in fact the difference stands out palpably between the time during which the peasant works for his own maintenance and the surplus-labour for the feudal lord, precisely because the latter is carried out separately from the former. The form has now been changed, but the substance remains and as long as "a part of society possesses the monopoly of the means of production, the labourer, free or not free, must add to the working-time necessary for his own maintenance an extra working-time in order to produce the means of subsistence for the owners of the means of production" (Marx, p. 202 [218]).

## II

[*Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 13, March 28, 1868]

In the previous article we saw that every worker employed by a capitalist performs two kinds of labour: during one part of his working-time he replaces the wages advanced to him by the capitalist, and this part of his labour Marx terms the *necessary labour*. But afterwards he has to go on working and during that time he produces *surplus-value* for the capitalist, an important part of which constitutes profit. That part of the labour is called surplus-labour.

Let us assume that the worker works three days of the week to replace his wages and three days to produce surplus-value for the

capitalist. In other words, it means that, with a twelve-hour working day, he works six hours daily for his wages and six hours for the production of surplus-value. One can get only six days out of the week, and even by including Sunday only seven at the most, but one can extract six, eight, ten, twelve, fifteen or even more hours of work out of every single day. The worker sells the capitalist a working day for his day's wages. But, *what is a working day?* Eight hours or eighteen?

It is in the capitalist's interest to make the working day as long as possible. The longer it is, the more surplus-value it produces. The worker correctly feels that every hour of labour which he performs over and above the replacement of his wages is unjustly taken from him; he learns from bitter personal experience what it means to work excessive hours. The capitalist fights for his profit, the worker for his health, for a few hours of daily rest, to be able to engage in other human activities as well, besides working, sleeping and eating. It may be remarked in passing that it does not depend at all upon the good will of the individual capitalists whether they desire to embark on this struggle or not, since competition compels even the most philanthropic among them to join his colleagues and to fix working hours to be as long as theirs.

The struggle for the fixing of the working day has lasted from the first appearance of free workers in the arena of history down to the present day. In various trades various traditional working days prevail; but in reality they are seldom observed. Only where the law fixes the working day and supervises its observance can one really say that there exists a normal working day. And up to now this is the case virtually solely in the factory districts of England. Here the ten-hour working day (ten and a half hours on five days, seven and a half hours on Saturday) has been fixed for all women and for youths of thirteen to eighteen, and since the men cannot work without them, they also come under the ten-hour working day.<sup>170</sup> This law has been won by English factory workers by years of endurance, by the most persistent, stubborn struggle with the factory owners, by freedom of the press, the right of association and assembly, as well as by adroit utilisation of the divisions in the ruling class itself. It has become the palladium of the English workers, it has gradually been extended to all important branches of industry and last year *to almost all trades*, at least to all those employing women and children. The present work contains most exhaustive material on the history of this legislative regulation of the working day in England. The next "North German Imperial Diet" will also have

factory regulations to discuss and in connection therewith the regulation of factory labour. We expect that none of the deputies that have been elected by German workers will proceed to discuss this bill without previously making themselves thoroughly conversant with *Marx's* book. *There is much to be achieved here.* The divisions within the ruling classes are more favourable to the workers than they ever were in England, because *universal suffrage compels the ruling classes to court the favour of the workers.* Under these circumstances, four or five representatives of the proletariat<sup>171</sup> are a power, if they know how to use their position, if above all they know what is at issue, which the bourgeois do not know. And for this purpose, *Marx's* book gives them all the material in ready form.

We will pass over a number of further excellent investigations of more theoretical interest and will pause only at the final chapter which deals with the accumulation or amassing of capital. Here it is first shown that the capitalist mode of production, i.e. that inaugurated by capitalists on the one hand and wage-workers on the other, not only continually regenerates capital for the capitalist, but at the same time also continually produces the poverty of the workers; thereby it is provided for a constant regeneration of, on the one hand, capitalists who are the owners of all means of subsistence, all raw materials and all instruments of labour, and, on the other hand, the great mass of the workers, who are compelled to sell their labour-power to these capitalists for a quantum of the means of subsistence which at best just suffices to keep them able-bodied and to bring up a new generation of able-bodied proletarians. But capital does not merely reproduce itself: it is continually increased and multiplied—and thereby its power over the propertyless class of workers. And just as it itself is reproduced on an ever greater scale, so the modern capitalist mode of production reproduces the class of propertyless workers also on an ever greater scale, in ever greater numbers. “...Accumulation of capital reproduces the capital-relation on a progressive scale, more capitalists or larger capitalists at this pole, more wage-workers at that.... *Accumulation of capital is, therefore, increase of the proletariat*” (p. 600 [627]). Since, however, owing to the progress of machinery, owing to improved agriculture, etc., fewer and fewer workers are necessary in order to produce the same quantity of products, since this perfecting, that is, this making the workers superfluous, is more rapid than even the growth of capital, what becomes of this ever-increasing number of workers? They form an industrial reserve army, which, when

business is bad or middling, is paid *below* the value of its labour and is irregularly employed or is left to be cared for by public charity, but which is indispensable to the capitalist class at times when business is especially lively, as is palpably evident in England—but which *under all circumstances* serves to break the power of resistance of the regularly employed workers and to keep their wages down. “The greater the social wealth ... the greater is the relative surplus-population, or industrial reserve-army. But the greater this reserve-army in proportion to the active (regularly employed) labour-army, the greater is the mass of a consolidated (permanent) surplus-population, or strata of workers, whose misery is in inverse ratio<sup>a</sup> to its torment of labour. The more extensive, finally, the lazarus-layers of the working class, and the industrial reserve-army, the greater is official pauperism. *This is the absolute general law of capitalist accumulation*” (p. 631 [659-60]).

These, strictly scientifically-proved—and the official economists are taking great care not to make even an attempt at a refutation—are some of the chief laws of the modern, capitalist, social system. But does this tell the whole story? By no means. Marx sharply stresses the bad sides of capitalist production but with equal emphasis clearly proves that this social form was necessary to develop the productive forces of society to a level which will make possible an equal development worthy of human beings for *all* members of society. All earlier forms of society were too poor for this. Capitalist production is the first to create the wealth and the productive forces necessary for this, but at the same time it also creates, in the numerous and oppressed workers, the social class which is compelled more and more to claim the utilisation of this wealth and these productive forces for the whole of society—instead of their being utilised, as they are today, for a monopolist class.

Written between March 2 and 13, 1868

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*; Nos. 12 and 13, March 21 and 28, 1868

---

<sup>a</sup> Should be “in direct proportion”. Marx made this change in the French edition of Volume One of *Capital*.—Ed.

## Frederick Engels

### [REVIEW OF VOLUME ONE OF CAPITAL FOR THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW<sup>172</sup>]

*Karl Marx on Capital.\**

#### I.

Mr. Thomas Tooke, in his inquiries on currency, points out the fact that money, in its function as capital, undergoes a reflux to its point of issue, while this is not the case with money performing the function of mere currency.<sup>a</sup> This distinction (which, however, had been established long before by Sir James Steuart)<sup>b</sup> is used by Mr. Tooke merely as a link in his argumentation against the "Currency men" and their assertions as to the influence of the issue of paper-money on the prices of commodities.<sup>173</sup> Our author, on the contrary, makes this distinction the starting point of his inquiry into the nature of capital itself, and especially as regards the question: How is money, this independent form of existence of value, converted into capital?

All sorts of businessmen—says Turgot—have this in common, that they *buy in order to sell*; their purchases are an advance which afterwards is returned to them.<sup>c</sup>

*To buy in order to sell*, such is indeed the transaction in which money functions as capital, and which necessitates its return to its point of issue, in contradistinction to *selling in order to buy*, in which process money may function as currency only. Thus it is seen that the different order in which the acts of selling and buying follow upon each other, impress upon money two different motions of

\* *Das Kapital*. Von Karl Marx. Erster Band, Hamburg, Meissner, 1867.

<sup>a</sup> Th. Tooke, *An Inquiry into the Currency Principle*, London, 1844, pp. 69-70.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. Steuart, *An Inquiry into the Principles of Political Oeconomy*.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Turgot, "Réflexions sur la formation et la distribution des richesses" in *Oeuvres*, Tome premier, Paris, 1844, p. 43.—*Ed.*

circulation. In order to illustrate these two processes, our author gives the following formulae:

To sell in order to buy: a commodity  $C$  is exchanged for money  $M$ , which is again exchanged for another commodity  $C$ ; or:  $C—M—C$ .

To buy in order to sell: money is exchanged for a commodity and this is again exchanged for money:  $M—C—M$ .

The formula  $C—M—C$  represents the simple circulation of commodities, in which money functions as means of circulation, as currency. This formula is analysed in the first chapter of our book<sup>174</sup> which contains a new and very simple theory of value and of money, extremely interesting scientifically, but which we here leave out of consideration as, on the whole, immaterial to what we consider the vital points of Mr. Marx's views on capital.

The formula  $M—C—M$ , on the other hand, represents that form of circulation in which money resolves itself into capital.

The process of buying in order to sell:  $M—C—M$ , may evidently be resolved into  $M—M$ ; it is an indirect exchange of money against money. Suppose I buy cotton for £1,000.—and sell it for £1,100.—; then, *in fine*, I have exchanged £1,000 for £1,100, money for money.

Now, if this process were always to result in returning to me the same sum of money which I had advanced, it would be absurd. But, whether the merchant, who [had] advanced £1,000, realises £1,100, or £1,000, or even £900 only, his money has gone through a phase essentially different from that of the formula  $C—M—C$ ; which formula means, to sell in order to buy, to sell what you do not want in order to be able to buy that what you do want. Let me compare the two formulae.

Each process is composed of two phases or acts, and these two acts are identical in both formulae; but there is a great difference between the two processes themselves. In  $C—M—C$ , money is merely the mediator; the Commodity, useful value, forms the starting and the concluding point. In  $M—C—M$ , the commodity is the intermediate link, while money is the beginning and the end. In  $C—M—C$  the money is spent once for all; in  $M—C—M$  it is merely advanced, with the intention to recover it; it returns to its point of issue, and in this we have a first palpable difference between the circulation of money as *currency* and of money as *capital*.

In the process of selling in order to buy,  $C—M—C$ , the money can return to its point of issue on the condition only that the whole process be repeated, that a fresh quantity of commodity be

sold. The reflux, therefore, is independent of the process itself. But in  $M—C—M$ , this reflux is a necessity and intended from the beginning; if it does not take place, there is a hitch somewhere and the process remains incomplete.

To sell in order to buy, has for its object the acquisition of *useful* value; to buy in order to sell, that of *exchangeable* value.

In the formula  $C—M—C$ , the two extremes are, economically speaking, identical. They are both commodities; they are, moreover, of the same quantitative value, for the whole theory of value implies the supposition that, normally, equivalents only are exchanged. At the same time, these two extremes  $C—C$  are two useful values different in quality, and they are exchanged on that very account.—In the process of  $M—C—M$ , the whole operation, at the first glance, appears meaningless. To exchange £100 for £100, and that by a roundabout process, appears absurd. A sum of money can differ from another sum of money by its quantity only.  $M—C—M$ , therefore, can only have any meaning by the quantitative difference of its extremes. There must be more money drawn out from circulation than had been thrown into it. The cotton bought for £1,000 is sold for £1,100=£1,000+£100; the formula representing the process, thus, changes to  $M—C—M'$ , in which  $M' = M + \Delta M$ ,  $M$  plus an increment. This  $\Delta M$ , this increment, Mr. Marx calls *surplus-value*.\* The value originally advanced not only maintains itself, it also adds to itself an increment, it *begets value*, and *it is this process which changes money into capital*.

In the form of circulation  $C—M—C$ , the extremes *may*, certainly, also differ in value, but such a circumstance would here be perfectly indifferent; the formula does not become absurd if both extremes are equivalents. On the contrary, it is a condition of its normal character that they should be so.

The repetition of  $C—M—C$  is limited by circumstances entirely extraneous to the process of exchange itself: by the requirements of consumption. But in  $M—C—M$ , beginning and end are identical as to quality, and by that very fact the motion is, or may be, perpetual. No doubt,  $M + \Delta M$  is different in quantity from  $M$ ; but still it is a mere limited sum of money. If you spend it, it will cease to be capital; if you withdraw it from circulation, it will be a stationary hoard. The inducement once admitted for the process of making value beget value, this inducement exists as much for  $M'$  as it existed for  $M$ ; the motion of capital becomes

\* Wherever "value" is here used without qualification, it always means *value in exchange*.

perpetual and endless, because at the close of each separate transaction its end is no more attained than before. The performance of this endless process transforms the owner of money into a *capitalist*.

Apparently, the formula  $M—C—M$  is applicable to merchants' capital alone. But the manufacturer's capital, too, is money which is exchanged for commodities and re-exchanged for more money. No doubt, in this case, a number of operations intervene between purchase and sale, operations which are performed outside of the sphere of mere circulation; but they do not change anything in the nature of the process. On the other hand, we see the same process in its most abbreviated form in capital lent on interest. Here the formula dwindles down to  $M—M'$ , value which is, so to say, greater than itself.

But whence does this increment of  $M$ , this surplus-value arise? Our previous inquiries into the nature of commodities, of value, of money, and of circulation itself, not only leave it unexplained, but appear even to exclude any form of circulation which results in such a thing as a surplus-value. The whole difference between the circulation of commodities ( $C—M—C$ ) and the circulation of money as capital ( $M—C—M$ ) appears to consist in a simple reversion of the process; how should this reversion be capable of producing such a strange result?

Moreover: this reversion exists for *one* only of the three parties to the process. I, as a capitalist, buy a commodity from A, and sell it again to B. A and B appear as mere sellers and buyers of commodities. I myself appear, in buying from A, merely as an owner of money, and in selling to B, as owner of a commodity; but in neither transaction do I appear as a capitalist, as the representative of something which is *more* than either money or commodity. For A the transaction began with a sale, for B it began with a purchase. If from my point of view there is a reversion of the formula  $C—M—C$ , there is none from theirs. Besides, there is nothing to prevent A from selling his commodity to B without my intervention, and then there would be no occasion for any surplus-value.

Suppose A and B buy their respective requirements from each other directly. As far as useful value is concerned they may both be gainers. A may even be able to produce more of his particular commodity than B could produce in the same time, and *vice versa*, in which case they both would gain. But it is different with regard to value in exchange. In this latter case equal quantities of value are exchanged, whether money serves as the medium or not.



Considered in the abstract, that is to say excluding all circumstances which are not deducible from the inherent laws of the simple circulation of commodities, there is in this simple circulation, besides the fact of one useful value being replaced by another, a mere change of form of the commodity. The *same* value in exchange, the same quantity of social labour fixed in an object, remains in the hands of the owner of the commodity, be it in the shape of this commodity itself, or in that of the money it is sold for, or in that of the second commodity bought for the money. This change of form does not in any way involve any change in the quantity of the value, as little as the exchange of a five pound note for five sovereigns. Inasmuch as there is merely a change in the *form* of the value in exchange, there must be exchange of equivalents, at least whenever the process takes place in its purity and under normal conditions. Commodities *may* be sold at prices above or below their values, but if they are, the law of the exchange of commodities is always violated. In its pure and normal form, therefore, the exchange of commodities is not a means of creating surplus-value. Hence arises the error of all economists who attempt to derive surplus-value from the exchange of commodities, such as Condillac.<sup>a</sup>

We will, however, suppose that the process does not take place under normal conditions, and that non-equivalents are exchanged. Let every seller, for instance, sell his commodity 10 per cent above its value. *Caeteris paribus*,<sup>b</sup> everybody loses again as a buyer what he had gained as a seller. It would be exactly the same as if the value of money had fallen 10 per cent. The reverse, with the same effect, would take place if all buyers bought their goods 10 per cent below their value. We do not get an inch nearer to a solution by supposing that every owner of commodities sells them above their value in his quality as a producer, and buys them above their value in his quality as a consumer.

The consistent representatives of the delusion that surplus-value arises from a nominal addition to the price of commodities presuppose always the existence of a class which buys without ever selling, which consumes without producing. At this stage of our inquiry, the existence of such a class is as yet inexplicable. But admit it. Whence does that class receive the money with which it keeps buying? Evidently from the producers of commodities—on the strength of no matter what legal or compulsory titles, without

<sup>a</sup> E. B. Condillac, "Le commerce et le gouvernement" in *Mélanges d'économie politique*, Paris, 1847, pp. 267 and 290-91.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Other things being equal.—*Ed.*

exchange. To sell, to such a class, commodities above their value, means nothing but to recover a portion of the money which had been given away gratuitously. Thus the cities of Asia Minor, while paying a tribute to the Romans, recovered part of this money by cheating the Romans in trade; but after all, these cities were the greatest losers of the two. This, then, is no method of creating surplus-value.

Let us suppose the case of cheating. A sells to B wine of the value of £40 for corn of the value of £50. A has gained £10 and B has lost £10, but betwixt them, they have only £90 just as before. Value has been transferred but not created. The whole capitalist class of a country cannot, by cheating one another, increase their collective wealth.

Therefore: If equivalents are exchanged, there arises no surplus-value, and if non-equivalents are exchanged, there arises no surplus-value either. The circulation of commodities creates no new value. This is the reason why the two oldest and most popular forms of capital, commercial capital and interest-bearing capital, are here left entirely out of consideration. To explain the surplus-value appropriated by these two forms of capital otherwise than as the result of mere cheating, a number of intermediate links are required which are still wanting at this stage of the inquiry. Later on we shall see that they both are secondary forms only and shall also trace the cause why both appear in history long before modern capital.

Surplus-value, then, cannot originate from the circulation of commodities. But can it originate outside of it? Outside of it, the owner of a commodity is simply the producer of that commodity, the value of which is established by the amount of his labour contained in it and measured by a fixed social law. This value is expressed in money of account, say, in a price of £10. But this price of £10 is not at the same time a price of £11; this labour contained in the commodity creates value, but no value which begets new value; it can add new value to existing value, but merely by adding new labour. How, then, should the owner of a commodity, outside the sphere of circulation, without coming into contact with other owners of commodities—how should he be able to produce surplus-value, or in other words, to change commodities or money into capital?

“Capital, then, cannot originate from the circulation of commodities, and no more can it *not* originate from it. It has to find its source in it, and yet *not* in it. The change of money into capital has to be explained on the basis of the laws inherent to the

exchange of commodities, *the exchange of equivalents forming the starting-point*. Our owner of money, as yet the mere chrysalis of a capitalist, has to buy his commodities at their value, to sell them at their value, and yet to extract more money from this process than he had invested in it. His development into the capitalist butterfly has to take place within the sphere of the circulation of commodities, and yet *not* within it. These are the terms of the problem. *Hic Rhodus, hic salta*"<sup>a</sup> [144-45].

And now for the solution:

"The change in the value of the money, which is to be transformed into capital, cannot take place in that money itself; for, as means of purchase and means of payment, it merely *realises* the price of the commodity which it buys or pays for, while if it remained in its money-form, without being exchanged, it could never change its value at all. No more can the change arise from the second act of the process, the re-sale of the commodity; because this merely changes the commodity from its natural form into the form of money. *The change must take place with the commodity* which is bought in the first act  $M-C$ ; but it cannot take place in its value in exchange, because we exchange equivalents; the commodity is bought at its value. *The change can only arise from its value in use*, that is *from the use which is made of it*. In order to extract value in exchange from the use of a commodity, our owner of money must have the good luck to discover, within the sphere of circulation, in the market, a commodity, *the useful value of which is endowed with the peculiar quality of being a source of exchangeable value, the using-up of which is the realisation of labour and therefore the creation of value*. And the owner of money finds, in the market, such a specific commodity: the power to work, *the labour-power*.

"By power to work, or labour-power, we understand the sum total of the physical and mental faculties which exist in the living person of a human being and which he puts into motion when he produces useful values.

"But in order to enable the owner of money to meet the labour-power as a commodity in the market, several conditions have to be fulfilled. In itself, the exchange of commodities does not include any other relations of dependence except such as arise from its own nature. On this supposition, labour-power can

<sup>a</sup> "Here is Rhodes, leap here!"—words addressed to a Swaggerer (in a fable by Aesop, "The Boasting Traveller") who claimed that he had made tremendous leaps in Rhodes. Figuratively means: "Here is the main point, now show us what you can do."—*Ed.*

appear as a commodity, in the market, so far only as it is offered for sale, or sold, by its own owner, the person whose labour-power it is. In order to enable its owner to sell it as a commodity, he must be able to dispose of it, he must be the free proprietor of his labour-power, of his person. He and the owner of money meet in the market, and transact business, as each other's peers, as free and independent owners of commodities, so far different only, that the one is the buyer and the other the seller. This relation of equality before the law must continue; the owner of the labour-power can, therefore, sell it for a limited time only. If he were to sell it in a lump, once for all, he would sell himself, he would from a free man change into a slave, from an owner of a commodity into a commodity... The second essential condition to enable the money-owner to meet labour-power as a commodity in the market, is this: that the owner of the labour-power, instead of selling commodities in which his labour has been embodied, be compelled to sell this, his labour-power itself, such as it exists in his own personality.

"No producer can sell commodities different from his own labour-power, unless possessed of means of production, raw materials, instruments of labour, etc. He can make no boots without leather. Moreover, he requires the means of subsistence. Nobody can feed upon future products, upon useful values the production of which he has not yet completed; as on the first day of his appearance on the stage of the world, man is compelled to consume before and while he produces. If his products are produced as *commodities*, they must be sold *after* production, and can satisfy his wants after the sale only. The time of production is lengthened by the time required for sale.

"The change of money into capital, thus, requires that the money-owner meet in the market the *free labourer*, free in that double sense, that he, as a free person, can dispose of his labour-power; and that, on the other hand, he have no other commodities to sell; that he be entirely unencumbered with, perfectly free from, all the things necessary for putting his labour-power into action.

"The question why this free labourer meets him in the market, has no interest for the money-owner. For him, the labour-market is only one of the various departments of the general market for commodities. And, for the moment, it has no interest for us either. We stick to the fact theoretically, as he sticks to it practically. One thing, however, is clear. It is not nature which produces, on the one hand, owners of money and of commodities,

and on the other, owners of nothing but their own labour-power. This relation does not belong to natural history; nor is it a social relation common to all historical periods. It is evidently the result of a long historical process, the product of a number of economical revolutions, of the destruction of a whole series of older [...] strata of social production.

“The economical categories which we have previously analysed bear in the same manner the impress of their historical origin. The existence of a product in the form of a commodity involves certain historical conditions. In order to become a commodity, the product must not be produced as the immediate means of subsistence of the producer. Now, if we had inquired: How and under what circumstances do all, or at least the great majority of products adopt the form of commodities?—we should have found that this occurs exclusively on the basis of a specific system of production, the *capitalistic* mode of production. But this inquiry was entirely foreign to the analysis of commodity. The production and circulation of commodities may take place, while the overwhelming mass of products—produced for immediate domestic self-use—is never changed into commodities; while, thus, the process of social production, in all its breadth and depth, is, as yet, far from being ruled by value in exchange... or, in analysing money, we find that the existence of money presupposes a certain development of the circulation of commodities. The peculiar forms of existence of money, such as the form of simple equivalent, or of means of circulation, means of payment, hoard, or universal money, as either one or the other may prevail, point to very different stages of the process of social production. Still, experience shows that a relatively crude state of the circulation of commodities suffices to produce all these forms. But with capital it is quite different. The historical conditions necessary for its existence are far from being created simultaneously with the mere circulation of commodities and money. Capital can originate when the owner of the means of production and subsistence meets, in the market, the free labourer offering for sale his labour-power, and this one condition implies ages of historical development. Thus capital at once heralds itself as a specific epoch of the process of social production.” [145-149]

We have now to examine this peculiar commodity, the labour-power. It has a value in exchange, as all other commodities; this value is determined in the same way as that of all other

---

<sup>a</sup> Here the word “formations” is deleted in the manuscript.—*Ed.*

commodities: by the time of labour required for its production, which includes reproduction. The value of labour-power is the value of the means of subsistence necessary for the maintenance of its owner in a normal state of fitness for work. These means of subsistence are regulated by climate and other natural conditions, and by a standard historically established in every country. They vary, but for a given country and a given epoch they are also given. Moreover, they include the means of subsistence for the substitutes of worn-out labourers, for their children, so as to enable this peculiar species of owners of a commodity to perpetuate itself. They include, finally, for skilled labour, the expense of education.

The minimal limit of the value of labour-power is the value of the physically absolute necessities of life. If its price falls to this limit, it falls below its value, as the latter involves labour-power of normal, not of inferior quality.

The nature of labour makes it evident that labour-power is used *after* the conclusion of the sale only;—and in all countries with capitalist mode of production, labour is paid after having been performed. Thus everywhere the labourer gives credit to the capitalist. Of the practical consequences of this credit given by the labourer, Mr. Marx gives some interesting examples from Parliamentary papers, for which we refer to the book itself.—

In consuming labour-power, its purchaser produces at once commodities and surplus-value; and in order to examine this, we have to leave the sphere of circulation for that of production.

Here we find at once that the process of labour is of a double nature. On the one hand it is the simple process of production of useful value; as such, it can and must exist under all historical forms of social existence; on the other hand, it is this process carried on under the specific conditions of capitalistic production, as before stated. These we have now to inquire into.

The process of labour, on a capitalistic basis, has two peculiarities. Firstly, the labourer works under the control of the capitalist who takes care that no waste is made and that no more than the socially indispensable amount of labour is spent upon each individual piece of work. Secondly, the product is the property of the capitalist, the process itself being carried on between two things belonging to him: the labour-power and the means of work.

The capitalist does not care for the useful value, except so far as it is the incorporation of exchangeable value, and above all, of

surplus-value. His object is to produce a commodity of a value higher than the sum of value invested in its production. How can this be done?

Let us take a given commodity, say cotton yarn, and analyse the quantity of labour embodied in it. Suppose that for the production of 10 lbs of yarn we require 10 lbs of cotton, value 10/- (leaving waste out of consideration). There are further required certain means of work, a steam-engine, carding-engines and other machinery, coal, lubricants, etc. To simplify matters, we call all these "spindle" and suppose that the share of wear and tear, coal, etc., required for spinning 10 lbs of yarn, is represented by 2/-. Thus we have 10/- cotton+2/- spindle=12/-. If 12/- represent the product of 24 working hours or two working days, then the cotton and spindle in the yarn incorporate two days' labour. Now, how much is added in the spinning?

We will suppose the value, *per diem*,<sup>a</sup> of labour-power to be 3/-, and these 3/- to represent the labour of six hours. Further, that six hours are required to spin 10 lbs of yarn by one labourer. In this case 3/- have been added to the product by labour, the value of the 10 lbs yarn is 15/- or 1/6d. per lb.

This process is very simple, but it does not result in any surplus-value. Nor can it, as in capitalistic production things are not carried on in this simple way.

"We supposed the value of labour-power was 3/- *per diem* and that 6 hours' labour was represented by that sum. But if *half-a-day's* labour is required to maintain a labourer for 24 hours, there is nothing in that to prevent the same labourer from working a *whole* day. The exchangeable value of labour-power, and the value which it may produce, are two entirely different quantities, and it was this difference which the capitalist had in his eye when he invested his money in that commodity. That it has the quality of producing useful value, was a mere *conditio sine qua non* inasmuch as labour must be invested in a useful form in order to produce value. But our capitalist looked beyond that; what attracted him was the specific circumstance that this labour-power is the source of exchangeable value, and of more exchangeable value than is contained in itself. This is the peculiar 'service' which he expects from it. And in doing so, he acts in accordance with the eternal laws of the exchange of commodities. The seller of the labour-power realises its exchangeable, and parts with its useful value. He cannot obtain the one without giving away the other.

<sup>a</sup> Daily.—Ed.

The useful value of the labour-power, labour itself, no more belongs to its seller, than the useful value of sold oil to an oil-merchant. The capitalist has paid the value *per diem* of the labour-power; to him, therefore, belongs its use during the day, a day's labour. The circumstance that the maintenance of the labour-power for one day costs half a day's labour only, although this labour-power can be made to work a whole day; that, therefore, the value created by its use during a day, is twice as great as its own daily value—this circumstance is a peculiar piece of good luck for the buyer, but not at all a wrong inflicted upon the seller.

“The labourer, then, works 12 hours, spins 20 lbs of yarn representing 20/- in cotton, 4/- in spindle, etc., and his labour costs 3/-,—total, 27/-. But if 10 lbs of cotton absorbed 6 hours of labour, 20 lbs of cotton have absorbed 12 hours of labour, equal to 6/-. The 20lbs of yarn now represent 5 days of labour; 4 in the shape of cotton and spindle, etc., 1 in the shape of spinning labour; the expression, in money, for 5 days' labour, is 30/-; consequently the price of the 20 lbs yarn is 30/-, or 1/6d. per lb. as before. But the sum total of the value of the commodities invested in this process was 27/-. The value of the product has increased beyond the value of the commodities invested in its production by one-ninth. Thus 27/- have been transformed into 30/-. They have produced a surplus-value of 3/-. The trick has, at last, succeeded. Money has been converted into capital.

“All the conditions of the problem have been solved, and the laws of the exchange of commodities have in no way been violated. Equivalent has been exchanged against equivalent. The capitalist, as purchaser, has paid every commodity at its value: cotton, spindles, etc., labour-power. After which, he did what every buyer of commodities does. He consumed their useful value. The process of consumption of the labour-power, at the same time process of production of the commodity, resulted in a product of 20 lbs of yarn, value 30/-. Our capitalist returns to the market and sells the yarn at 1/6 d. per lb., not a fraction above or below its value, and yet he extracts 3/- more from circulation than he originally invested in it. The whole of this process, the transformation of his money into capital, passes within the sphere of circulation, and at the same time *not* within it. By the intervention of circulation, because the purchase, in the market, of the labour-power was its indispensable condition. Not within the sphere of circulation, because this merely initiates the process of value begetting value, which is performed in the sphere of



production. And thus *tout est pour le mieux dans le meilleur des mondes possibles.*"<sup>a</sup> [174-176]

From the demonstration of the mode in which surplus-value is produced, Mr. Marx passes to its analysis. It is evident, from what precedes, that only one portion of the capital invested in any productive undertaking directly contributes to the production of surplus-value, and that is the capital laid out in the purchase of labour-power. This portion only produces *new* value; the capital invested in machinery, raw material, coal, etc., does indeed re-appear in the value of the product *pro tanto*,<sup>b</sup> it is maintained and reproduced, but no surplus-value can proceed from it. This induces Mr. Marx to propose a new subdivision of capital into *constant* capital, that which is merely reproduced—the portion invested in machinery, raw materials and all other accessories to labour;—and *variable* capital, that which is not only reproduced, but is, at the same time, the direct source of surplus-value—that portion which is invested in the purchase of labour-power, in wages. From this it is clear, that however necessary constant capital may be to the production of surplus-value, yet it does not directly contribute to it; and, moreover, the amount of constant capital invested in any trade has not the slightest influence upon the amount of surplus-value produced in that trade.\* Consequently, it ought not to be taken into consideration in fixing the *rate* of surplus-value. That can be determined only by comparing the amount of surplus-value to the amount of capital directly engaged in creating it, that is to say, the amount of *variable* capital. Mr. Marx, therefore, determines the rate of surplus-value by its proportion to variable capital only: if the daily price of labour be 3/-, and the surplus-value created daily be also 3/-, then he calls the rate of surplus-value 100 per cent. What curious blunders may result from reckoning, according to usual practice, constant capital as an active factor in the production of surplus-value, is shown in an example from Mr. N. W. Senior,<sup>c</sup> “when that Oxford professor, noted for his scientific attainments and his beautiful diction, was invited, in 1836, to Manchester, in order to learn political economy there (from the cotton spinners) instead of teaching it in Oxford.”—[207]<sup>175</sup>

The working-time in which the labourer reproduces the value of

\* We must observe here, that *surplus-value* is not at all identical with *profit*.

<sup>a</sup> “All is for the best in the best of possible worlds” (Voltaire, *Candide*).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> For so much.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> N. W. Senior, *Letters on the Factory Act*, London, 1837.—*Ed.*

his labour-power, Mr. Marx calls “*necessary labour*”; the time worked beyond that, and during which surplus-value is produced, he calls “*surplus-labour*”. Necessary labour and surplus-labour combined form the “*working day*”.—

In a working day, the time required for necessary labour is given; but the time employed in surplus-labour is not fixed by any economical law, it may be longer or shorter, within certain limits. It can never be zero, as then the inducement for the capitalist to employ labour would have ceased; nor can the total length of the working day ever attain 24 hours, for physiological reasons. Between a working day of, say, six hours, and one of 24, there are, however, many intermediate stages. The laws of the exchange of commodities demand that the working day have a length not exceeding that which is compatible with the normal wear and tear of the labourer. But what is this normal wear and tear? How many hours of daily labour are compatible with it? Here the opinions of the capitalist and those of the labourer differ widely, and, as there is no higher authority, the question is solved by *force*. The history of the determination of the length of the working day is the history of a struggle about its limits, between the collective capitalist and the collective labourer, between the two classes of capitalists and working men.

“Capital, as has been stated before, has not invented surplus-labour. Wherever a portion of society holds the exclusive monopoly of the means of production, there the labourer, slave, serf, or free, has to add, to the labour necessary for his own subsistence, an increment of labour in order to produce the means of subsistence for the owner of the means of production, be that owner an Athenian *καλὸς καγαθός*,<sup>a</sup> an Etruscan theocrat, a *civis Romanus*,<sup>b</sup> a Norman baron, an American slave-owner, a Wallachian boyar, a modern landlord or capitalist.” [218].

It is, however, evident that in any form of society where the value in use of the product is more important than its value in exchange, surplus-labour is restrained by the narrower or wider range of social wants; and that under these circumstances there does not exist necessarily a desire for surplus-labour for its own sake. Thus we find that in the classical period surplus-labour in its extremist form, the working to death of people, existed almost exclusively in gold and silver mines, where value in exchange was produced in its independent form of existence: money.

<sup>a</sup> Aristocrat.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Roman citizen.—*Ed.*

“But wherever a nation whose production is carried on in the more rudimentary forms of slavery or serfage, lives in the midst of a universal market dominated by capitalist production, and where therefore the sale of its products for exports forms its chief purpose—there to the barbarous infamies of slavery or serfdom are superadded the civilised infamies of over-working. Thus in the Southern States of America slave-labour preserved a moderate and patriarchal character while production was directed to immediate domestic consumption chiefly. But in the same measure as the export of cotton became a vital interest to those states, the over-working of the negro, in some instances even the wearing-out of his life in seven working years, became an element in a calculated and calculating system... Similar with the *corvées* of the serfs in the Danubian principalities.” [219]

Here the comparison with capitalist production becomes particularly interesting, because, in the *corvée*, surplus-labour has an independent, palpable form.

“Suppose the working day counts six hours of necessary and six hours of surplus-labour; then the labourer furnishes the capitalist with 36 hours of surplus-labour a week. He might as well have worked three days for himself and three days for the capitalist. But this is not at once visible. Surplus-labour and necessary labour are more or less mixed together. I might express the same relation thus, that, in every minute, the labourer works 30 seconds for himself and 30 more for the capitalist. But with the serfs' *corvée* it is different. The two kinds of labour are separated in space. The labour, which, for instance, a Wallachian peasant performs for himself, he performs on his own field, his surplus-labour for the boyar he performs on the boyar's estate. The two portions of his labour exist independent of each other, surplus-labour, in the shape of *corvée*, is completely separated from necessary labour.” [219-220]

We must refrain from quoting the further interesting illustrations from the modern social history of the Danubian principalities, by which Mr. Marx proves the boyars there, aided by Russian intervention, to be quite as clever extractors of surplus-labour as any capitalist employers. But what the *Règlement organique*,<sup>176</sup> by which the Russian General Kisseleff presented the boyars with almost unlimited command over the peasants' labour, expresses positively, the English Factory Acts express negatively.

“These acts oppose the inherent tendency of capital to an unlimited exploitation—we ask pardon for introducing this

French term, but there does not exist any English equivalent<sup>a</sup>—of the labour-power, by forcibly putting a limit to the length of the working day by the power of the State, and that a State ruled by landlords and capitalists. Not to speak of the working class movement which was daily gaining greater dimensions, this limitation of factory labour was dictated by the same necessity which brought Peruvian guano on the fields of England. That same blind rapacity which in the one case had exhausted the soil, in the other case had attacked the vitality of the nation at its root. Periodical epidemics here spoke as plainly, as in France and Germany, the necessity for constantly reducing the standard of height for soldiers.” [229]

To prove the tendency of capital to extend the working day beyond all reasonable limits Mr. Marx quotes amply from the Reports of the Factory Inspectors, of the Children’s Employment Commission, the Reports on Public Health<sup>b</sup> and other Parliamentary Papers, and sums up in the following conclusions:

“What is a working day? How long is the time during which capital may be allowed to consume the working power on paying for its value *per diem*? How far may the working day be extended beyond the time necessary for reproducing the working power itself? Capital, as we have seen, replies: the working day counts full 24 hours, excepting those few hours of rest without which the labour-power absolutely refuses to renew its services. It is a matter of course that the labourer during the whole of the live-long day is nothing but labour-power; that all his disposable time is working-time and belongs to value-begetting capital... But in this madly blind race after surplus-labour, capital outruns not only the moral, but also the purely physical maximum limits of the working day... Capital does not care for the duration of life of the working power... it produces its premature exhaustion and death, it effects the prolongation of the working-time during a given period by shortening the labourer’s life.” [249-251]

But is not this against the interest of capital itself? Has capital, in the long run, not to replace the cost of this excessive wear and tear? That may be the case theoretically. Practically, the organised slave trade in the interior of the Southern States had raised the practice of using up the working power of the slave in seven years

<sup>a</sup> This is Engels’ addition to the quotation.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Reports of the Inspectors of Factories to Her Majesty’s Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department* (for the 1840s-60s); *Children’s Employment Commission* (1862). *Reports* (I-VI); *Public Health. Reports of the Medical Officer of the Privy Council* (for the 1860s).—*Ed.*

to an acknowledged economical principle; practically, the English capitalist relies upon the supply of labourers from the agricultural districts.

“He sees a constant over-population, that is, an over-population as compared with the capacity of capital to absorb living labour, though this over-population be formed by a constant current of crippled, quickly fading generations of men, pressing upon their successors and plucked before maturity. Certainly, to an uninterested observer, experience would show on the other hand how soon capitalist production, though dating, historically speaking, from yesterday only, has attacked the vital root of national strength, how the degeneration of the industrial population is retarded only by the constant absorption of agricultural elements, and how even these agricultural labourers, in spite of fresh air and that principle of natural selection which is so specially powerful amongst them, have already begun to decline. Capital, which has such capital motives to deny the sufferings of the working classes in the midst of which it exists, capital will be disturbed in its practical activity as little and as much by the prospect of future degeneracy of the human race and of inevitable ultimate depopulation, as by the possible fall of the earth into the sun. In every joint-stock ‘limited’ swindle, every participator knows that the thunderstorm will come sooner or later, but every one expects that the lightning will fall on the head of his neighbour, after he himself shall have had time to collect the golden rain and store it up safely. *Après moi le déluge!*<sup>a</sup> is the battle-cry of every capitalist and of every capitalist nation. Capital, therefore, is reckless of the health and life of the labourer, unless society compels it to act otherwise [...] And, upon the whole, this disregard of the labourer does not depend upon the good or bad will of the individual capitalist. Free competition imposes the immanent laws of capitalist production upon every individual capitalist in the shape of extraneous compulsory laws.” [254-255]

The determination of the normal working day is the result of many centuries of struggle between employer and labourer. And it is curious to observe the two opposing currents in this struggle. At first, the laws have for their end to compel the labourers to work longer hours; from the first statute of labourers 23rd Edward III (1349) up to the eighteenth century, the ruling classes never succeeded in extorting from the labourer the full amount of

---

<sup>a</sup> After me the deluge—the words attributed to Louis XV and Mme. de Pompadour.—*Ed.*

possible labour. But with the introduction of steam and modern machinery, the tables were turned. So rapidly did the introduction of the labour of women and children break down all traditional bounds to working hours, that the nineteenth century began with a system of overworking which is unparalleled in the history of the world, and which, as early as 1803, compelled the legislation to enact limitations of working hours. Mr. Marx gives a full account of the history of English factory legislation up to the Workshops Act of 1867, and draws from it these conclusions:

1) Machinery and steam cause overwork, at first, in those branches of industry where they are applied, and legislative restrictions are, therefore, first applied to these branches; but in the sequel we find that this system of overwork has spread also to almost all trades even where no machinery is used, or where the most primitive modes of production continue in existence. (*Vide* Children's Employment Commission's Reports.)

2) With the introduction of the labour of women and children in the factories, the individual "free" labourer loses his power of resistance to the encroachments of capital and has to submit unconditionally. Thus he is reduced to collective resistance; the struggle of class against class, of the collective workmen against the collective capitalists begins.

If we now look back to the moment when we supposed our "free" and "equal" labourer to enter into a contract with the capitalist, we find that, under the process of production, a good many things have changed considerably. That contract, on the part of the labourer, is not a free contract. The daily time during which he is at liberty to sell his working power is the time during which he is compelled to sell it; and it is merely the opposition of the labourers, as a mass, which forcibly obtains the enactment of a public law to prevent them from selling themselves and their children, by a "free" contract, into death and slavery. "In the place of the grandiloquent catalogue of the inalienable rights of man, he has now nothing but the modest *Magna Charta* of the Factory Act."—[288]

We have next to analyse the *rate* of surplus-value and its relation to the *total quantity* of surplus-value produced. In this inquiry, as we have done hitherto, we suppose the value of labour-power to be a determinate constant quantity.

Under this supposition, the rate of surplus-value determines at the same time the quantity furnished to the capitalist by a single labourer in a given time. If the value of our labour-power be 3/- a day representing six hours' labour, and the rate of surplus-value

be 100 per cent, then the variable capital of 3/- produces every day a surplus-value of 3/-, or the workman furnishes six hours of surplus-labour every day.

Variable capital being the expression in money of all the labour-power employed simultaneously by a capitalist, the sum total of the surplus-value produced by the labour-power is found by multiplying that variable capital by the rate of surplus-value; in other words it is determined by the proportion between the number of working powers simultaneously employed, and the degree of exploitation. Either of these factors may vary, so that the decrease in the one may be compensated by the increase of the other. A variable capital required to employ 100 labourers with a rate of surplus-value of 50 per cent (say 3 hours of daily surplus-labour) will produce no more surplus-value than half that variable capital, employing 50 labourers at a rate of surplus-value of 100 per cent (say six hours of daily surplus-labour). Thus, under certain circumstances and within certain limits, the supply of labour at the command of capital may become independent of the actual supply of labourers.

There is, however, an absolute limit to this increase of surplus-value by increasing its rate. Whatever may be the value of labour, whether it be represented by two or by ten hours of necessary labour, the total value of the work performed, day after day, by any labourer, can never attain the value representing 24 hours' labour. In order to obtain equal quantities of surplus-value, variable capital may be replaced by prolongation of the working day within this limit only. This will be an important element in explaining, hereafter, various phenomena arising from the two contradictory tendencies of capital: 1) to reduce the number of labourers employed, i.e. the amount of variable capital, and 2) yet to produce the greatest possible quantity of surplus-labour.

It follows further: "The value of labour being given, and the rate of surplus-value being equal, the quantities of surplus-value produced by two different capitals are in direct proportion to the quantities of variable capital contained in them. [...] This law flatly contradicts all experience founded upon the *appearance* of facts. Everybody knows that a cotton spinner who [...] works with a relatively large constant, and a relatively small variable capital, does not, on that account, obtain a lesser ratio of profit than a baker who puts in motion relatively little constant and relatively much variable capital. To solve this apparent contradiction, a good many intermediate links are required, just as, starting from elementary algebra, a great number of intermediate links are

required in order to understand that  $\frac{z}{y}$  may represent a real quantity." [293]

For a given country and a given length of working day, surplus-value can be increased only by increasing the number of labourers, i.e. by an increase of population; this increase forms the mathematical limit for the production of surplus-value by the collective capital of that country. On the other hand, if the number of labourers be determined, this limit is fixed by the possible prolongation of the working day. It will be seen hereafter that this law is valid for that form only of surplus-value which has been hitherto analysed.

We find, at this stage of our inquiry, that not every amount of money is capable of being converted into capital; that there is an extreme minimum for it: the cost of a unit of labouring power and of the means of labour necessary to keep it going. Suppose the rate of surplus-value to be 50 per cent, our infant-capitalist would be required to be able to employ two workmen in order to live, himself, as a workman lives. But this would prevent him from saving anything; and the end of capitalist production is not merely preservation, but also and chiefly increase of wealth.

"To live twice as well as a common labourer, and to re-transform one half of the surplus-value produced into capital, he would have to be able to employ eight workmen. He might certainly take his share of the work, along with his workmen, but he would still remain a small master, a hybrid between capitalist and labourer. Now, a certain development of capitalist production renders it necessary that the capitalist should devote the whole of the time during which he acts as a capitalist, as capital personified, to the appropriation and control of other people's labour, and to the sale of its products. The restrictive guilds of the Middle Ages attempted to check the transformation of the small master into a capitalist by fixing a very low maximum to the number of workmen which each was allowed to employ. The owner of money or commodities changes into a real capitalist only then, when he is able to advance, for the purpose of production, a minimum sum far higher than this mediæval maximum. Here, just as in the natural sciences, the correctness is proved of the law discovered by Hegel that mere quantitative changes, at a certain point, imply a qualitative difference." <sup>a</sup> [295-296]

The minimum amount of value required to change an owner of money or commodities into a capitalist varies for different stages

---

<sup>a</sup> G. W. F. Hegel, *Wissenschaft der Logik*.—Ed.



of the development of capitalist production, and for a given stage of development, it varies for different branches of industry.

“During the process of production detailed above, the relation of capitalist and labourer has changed considerably. First of all, capital has been developed into command of labour, i.e. into command over the labourer himself. Personified capital, the capitalist, takes care that the labourer performs his work regularly, carefully and with the required degree of intensity.

“Further, capital has been developed into a compulsory relation which obliges the working class to perform more labour than is prescribed by the narrow circle of their own requirements. And as a producer of other people’s industry, as an extortioner of surplus-labour and exploiter of labour-power, capital far exceeds in energy, recklessness, and efficiency all former systems of production, though they were based upon direct forced labour.

“Capital, at first, takes the command of labour under such technological conditions as it finds historically established. It does not, therefore, necessarily at once change the mode of production. The production of surplus-value, in the form hitherto analysed, that is to say by mere prolongation of the working day, appeared independent of every change in the mode of production itself. It was quite as efficient in the primitive baking trade as in modern cotton-spinning.

“In the process of production considered as a mere process of labour, the relation between the labourer and his means of production is not that of labour and capital, but that of labour and the mere instrument and raw material of productive action. In a tannery, for instance, he treats the skins as a mere object for labour. It is not the capitalists whose skin he tans. But things change as soon as we look upon the process of production as a process of creating surplus-value. The means of production at once change into means of absorbing other people’s labour. It is no longer the workman who employs the means of production, it is the means of production which employ the workman. It is not he who consumes *them* as material elements of his productive action; it is they which consume *him* as the ferment of their own vital process; and the vital process of capital consists in nothing but its progressive motion as value begetting value. Furnaces and workshops which have to stand idle at night, without absorbing labour, are a pure loss to the capitalist. Therefore furnaces and workshops constitute a ‘title upon the night-work of the hands’. (See Reports of Children’s Employment Commission, 4th Report,

1865, pages 79 to 85.)<sup>a</sup> The mere change of money into means of production changes the latter into legal and compulsory titles upon other people's labour and surplus-labour." [296-297]

There is, however, another form of surplus-value. Arrived at the utmost limit of the working day, another means remains to the capitalist for increasing surplus-labour: by increasing the productivity of labour, by thereby reducing the value of labour, and thus shortening the period of necessary labour. This form of surplus-value will be examined in a second article.

Written on about May 22-June 28,  
1868

Reproduced from the manuscript

Signed: *Samuel Moore*

First published, in Russian, in *Letopisi  
marksizma*, No. 1, 1926

---

<sup>a</sup> The reference is given by Engels.—*Ed.*

## Karl Marx

MY PLAGIARISM OF F. BASTIAT<sup>177</sup>

In . . . . .<sup>a</sup> a Bastiatite discovers that I have pinched the definition of the *magnitude of value* of commodities as being the “*socially necessary labour-time*” required for their production from F. Bastiat, and in bowdlerised form to boot. I could easily put up with this quid pro quo. For if that Bastiatite No. I finds Bastiat’s definition of value and my own to be basically identical, Bastiatite No. II declares almost simultaneously in the *Leipzig Literarisches Centralblatt* of . . . . . : “ . . . . . ”<sup>b</sup>

The sum total of Bastiatite No. I added to Bastiatite No. II would be that the whole army of Bastiatites would have forthwith to transfer to my camp and accept wholesale my exposition on capital. One will understand that it is only after much mental strife that I deny myself the pleasure of such an annexation.

The definition of value contained in my work *Capital*, published in 1867, is to be found two decades earlier in my work attacking Proudhon: *Misère de la Philosophie*, Paris 1847 (p. 49

---

<sup>a</sup> This space is left in the manuscript for the title *Vierteljahrschrift für Volkswirtschaft und Kulturgeschichte*.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> This space is left in the manuscript for the date—July 4, 1868—and the following quotation: “Rejecting the theory of value is the only task facing anyone who opposes Marx; for if one concedes this axiom, then one must grant Marx nearly all the conclusions based on it, which he reaches by applying the strictest logic.”—*Ed.*

seqq.<sup>a</sup>). Bastiat's words of wisdom on value did not see the light of day until some years later.<sup>b</sup> I could not therefore have copied from Bastiat, though Bastiat could well have copied from me.

However, in fact Bastiat gives absolutely no analysis of value. He only dilates upon empty notions as consoling proof that "the world abounds in great and excellent daily services".<sup>c</sup> It is well known that the German Bastiatites are all national liberals.<sup>178</sup> I shall therefore do them also a "great and excellent service" by pointing out the *specifically Prussian origin* of Bastiat's store of wisdom. Old *Schmalz* was in fact a councillor to the Prussian government, if I am not mistaken, even a Prussian privy councillor. In addition he was a Demagogue hunter.<sup>179</sup> In 1818 in Berlin this old *Schmalz* published a *Handbuch der Staatswirtschaftslehre*. The French edition of his handbook appeared in 1826 in Paris under the title of *Économie politique*. The translator, Henri Jouffroy, appeared on the title as "conseiller au service de Prusse".<sup>d</sup> In the following quotation one will find Bastiat's notion of value in its essentials, not only as far as its content is concerned but even as regards its wording:

"Le travail d'autrui en général ne produit jamais pour nous qu'une *économie de temps*, et [que] cette économie de temps est tout ce qui constitue sa valeur et son prix. Le menuisier, par exemple, qui me fait une table, et le domestique qui me porte mes lettres à la poste, qui me bat mes habits, ou qui cherche pour moi les choses qui me sont nécessaires, me rendent l'un et l'autre un *service* absolument de même nature; l'un et l'autre m'*épargne* et le temps que je serais obligé d'employer moi-même à ces occupations, et celui qu'il m'aurait fallu consacrer à acquérir l'aptitude et les talents qu'elles exigent"<sup>e</sup> (*Schmalz*, l.c., t. I, p. 304).

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 138 et seqq.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> A reference to Bastiat's *Harmonies économiques* (1850).—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> From Martin Luther's *An die Pharrherrn Wider den Wucher zu predigen*. Vermanung, Wittemberg, 1540, p. 9.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Adviser to the Prussian Government.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> "The work of others only serves to *save us time*, and this time-saving is all that constitutes *its value*, and *its price*. The carpenter, for example, who makes me a table, and the servant who posts my letters, cleans my clothes or brings me the things I need, both render me the same *service*; they *save* me both the time which I would otherwise have to use to do those things myself, and the time I would otherwise have had to devote to acquiring the necessary skills."—*Ed.*

Now we know where Bastiat learnt his lesson,<sup>a</sup> I nearly said his “Schmalz”.

Written on about July 11, 1868

First published in: Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, First Russian Edition, Vol. XIII,  
Part I, Moscow, 1936

Printed according to the manu-  
script

Published in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>a</sup> The German phrase used by Marx here contains the word *Fett* (English, fat), making a word play with the name Schmalz (fat or grease).— *Ed.*

FREDERICK ENGELS

[SYNOPSIS OF VOLUME ONE  
OF *CAPITAL* BY KARL MARX<sup>180</sup>]

Written in spring-summer 1868

First published in *Marx-Engels Archives*,  
Russian Edition, Book IV, Moscow, 1929,  
and in German in the pamphlet *Konzept  
über "Das Kapital"*, Moscow-Leningrad,  
1933

Printed according to the manu-  
script

CAPITAL BY KARL MARX, VOL. I.  
BOOK ONE—THE PROCESS  
OF CAPITALIST PRODUCTION<sup>181</sup>

Chapter I

COMMODITIES AND MONEY<sup>a</sup>

1. COMMODITIES AS SUCH

The wealth of societies in which capitalist production prevails consists of *commodities*. A commodity is a thing that has *use-value*; the latter exists in all forms of society, but in capitalist society, use-value is, in addition, the material depository of *exchange-value*.

Exchange-value presupposes a *tertium comparationis*<sup>b</sup> by which it is measured: labour, the common social substance of exchange-values, to be precise, the *socially necessary labour-time* embodied in it.

Just as a commodity is something twofold: use-value and exchange-value, so the labour contained in it is twofold determined: on the one hand, as *definite productive activity*, weaving labour, tailoring labour, etc.—*useful labour*; on the other, as the *simple expenditure of human labour-power, precipitated abstract labour*. The former produces use-value, the latter exchange-value; only the latter is quantitatively comparable (the differences between SKILLED and UNSKILLED, complex and simple labour *confirm* this).

Hence the substance of exchange-value is abstract labour and its magnitude is the measure of time of abstract labour. Now to consider the form of exchange-value.

(1)  $x$  commodity  $a = y$  commodity  $b$ ; value of a commodity expressed in the use-value of another is its *relative value*. The expression of the equivalence of two commodities is the simple form of relative value. In the above equation  $y$  commodity  $b$  is the

---

<sup>a</sup> This chapter corresponds to Part I of the 1887 English edition (Chapter I.—Commodities, Chapter II.—Exchange, Chapter III.—Money, or the Circulation of Commodities).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Literally: a third something for comparison; here a standard.—*Ed.*



*equivalent*. In it *x commodity a* acquires its value-form in contrast to its [the commodity's] natural form, while *y commodity b* acquires at the same time the property of direct exchangeability, even in its natural form. Exchange-value is impressed upon the use-value of a commodity by definite historical relations. Hence the commodity cannot express its exchange-value in its own use-value, but only in the use-value of another commodity. Only in the equation of two concrete products of labour does the property of the concrete labour contained in both come to light as abstract human labour, i.e., a commodity cannot be related to the concrete labour contained in itself, as the mere form of realisation of abstract labour, but it can be so related to the concrete labour contained in other kinds of commodities.

The equation *x commodity a = y commodity b* necessarily implies that *x commodity a* can also be expressed in other commodities, thus:

(2) *x commodity a = y commodity b = z commodity c = v commodity d = u commodity e =*, etc., etc. This is the *expanded* relative form of value. Here *x commodity a* no longer refers to one, but to *all* commodities as the mere forms of manifestation of the labour represented in it. But through simple reversal it leads to

(3) the converse second form of relative value:

$$\begin{aligned} y \text{ commodity } b &= x \text{ commodity } a \\ v \text{ commodity } c &= x \text{ commodity } a \\ u \text{ commodity } d &= x \text{ commodity } a \\ t \text{ commodity } e &= x \text{ commodity } a \end{aligned}$$

etc., etc.

Here the commodities are given the *general relative form of value*, in which all of them are abstracted from their use-values and equated to *x commodity a* as the materialisation of abstract labour; *x commodity a* is the generic form of the equivalent for all other commodities; it is their *universal equivalent*; the labour materialised in it at once represents in itself the realisation of abstract labour, general labour. Now, however,

(4) *every* commodity of the series can take over the role of universal equivalent, but only one of them can do so *at a time*, since if *all* commodities were universal equivalents, each of them would in turn exclude the others from that role. Form 3 is not obtained by *x commodity a*, but by the other commodities, objectively. Hence a definite commodity must take over the role—for a time, it can change—and only in this way does a commodity become a commodity completely. This special com-

modity, with whose natural form the universal equivalent form becomes identified, is *money*.

The *difficulty* with a *commodity* is that, like all categories of the capitalist mode of production, it represents a personal relationship under a material wrapping. The producers relate their different kinds of labour to one another as general human labour by relating their products to one another as *commodities*—they cannot accomplish it without this mediation of things. The relation of *persons* thus *appears* as the relation of *things*.

For a society in which commodity production prevails, Christianity, particularly Protestantism, is the fitting religion.

## 2. THE PROCESS OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE

A commodity proves that it is a commodity in exchange. The owners of two commodities must be willing to exchange their respective commodities and therefore to recognise each other as *private owners*. This legal relation, the *form* of which is the contract, is only a relation of wills, reflecting the economic relation. Its *content* is given by the economic relation itself. (P. 45.)

A commodity is a use-value for its non-owner, a non-use-value for its owner. Hence the need for exchange. But every commodity owner wants to get in exchange specific use-values that he needs—to that extent the exchange is an individual process. On the other hand, he wants to realise his commodity as value, that is, in any suitable commodity, whether or not *his* commodity is use-value to the owner of the other commodity. To that extent the exchange is for him a generally social process. But one and the same process cannot be simultaneously both individual and generally social for all commodity owners. Every commodity owner regards *his own* commodity as the universal equivalent, while all other commodities are so many particular equivalents of his own. Since *all* commodity owners do the same, *no* commodity is the universal equivalent, and hence *no* commodity possesses a general relative form of value, in which they are equated as values and compared as magnitudes of value. Therefore they do not confront each other at all as commodities, but only as products. (P. 47.)

Commodities can be related as values and hence as commodities only by comparison with some other commodity as the universal equivalent. But only the *social act can make a particular commodity the universal equivalent—money*.

The immanent contradiction in a commodity as the direct unity of use-value and exchange-value, as the product of useful private

labour ... and as the direct social materialisation of abstract human labour—this contradiction finds no rest until it results in duplicating the commodity into commodity and money. (P. 48.)

Since all other commodities are merely particular equivalents of money, and money is their universal equivalent, they are related to money as *particular* commodities to the universal commodity. (P. 51.) The process of exchange gives the commodity which it converts into money, not its *value*, but its *value-form*. (P. 51.) Fetishism: a commodity does not seem to become money only because the other commodities all express their values in it, but conversely, they seem to express their values in it because it is *money*.

### 3. MONEY, OR THE CIRCULATION OF COMMODITIES

#### A. *The Measure of Values (Assuming Gold=Money)*

Money, as the measure of value, is the necessary *form of manifestation* of the measure of value *immanent* in commodities, i.e., *labour-time*. The simple, relative expression of the value of commodities in money,  $x$  commodity  $a = y$  money, is their price. (P. 55.)

The price of a commodity, its money-form, is expressed in *imaginary money*; hence money is the *measure of values* only ideally. (P. 57.)

Once the change from value to price is effected, it becomes technically necessary to develop the measure of values further, into the *standard of prices*; i.e., a quantity of gold is fixed, *by which different quantities of gold are measured*. This is quite different from the measure of values, which itself depends upon the value of gold, while the latter is immaterial for the standard of prices. (P. 59.)

Once prices are expressed in accounting names of gold, money serves as *money of account*.

If price, as the exponent of the magnitude of a commodity's value, is the exponent of its exchange ratio with money it does *not* follow conversely that the exponent of its exchange ratio with money is *necessarily* the exponent of the magnitude of its value. Assuming that circumstances permit or compel the sale of a commodity above or below its value, these selling prices do not correspond to its value, but they are none the less *prices* of the commodity, for they are (1) its value-form, money, and (2) exponents of its exchange ratio with money.

The possibility, therefore, of quantitative incongruity between price and magnitude of value is *given in the price-form itself*. That is no defect of this form, but on the contrary makes it the adequate form of a mode of production in which the rule can impose itself only as a blindly-acting law of averages of irregularity. The price-form, however, can also ... harbour a qualitative contradiction, so that price ceases altogether to be an expression of value... Conscience, honour, etc., can ... acquire the form of commodities through their price. (P. 61.)

Measurement of values in money, the price-form, implies the necessity of alienation, the ideal pricing implies the actual. Hence circulation.

### B. *The Medium of Circulation*

#### a. The Metamorphosis of Commodities

Simple form:  $C—M—C$ . Its material content =  $C—C$ . Exchange-value is alienated and use-value appropriated.

α) First phase:  $C—M$  = sale, for which two persons are required, hence the possibility of failure, i.e., of sale below value, or even below the cost of production, if the social value of the commodity changes. "The division of labour converts the product of labour into a commodity, and thereby makes *necessary* its further conversion into money."<sup>a</sup> At the same time it also makes the accomplishment of this transubstantiation quite *accidental*. (P. 67.) But, considering the phenomenon in its *pure* form,  $C—M$  presupposes that the possessor of the money (unless he is a producer of gold) previously got his money through exchange for another commodity; hence it is not only conversely  $M—C$  for the *buyer*, but it presupposes that he made a previous sale, etc., so that we have an endless series of purchases and sales.

β) The same takes place in the second phase,  $M—C$ , i.e., *purchase*, which is, at the same time, a sale for the other party.

γ) The total process hence is a circuit of purchases and sales. *The circulation of commodities*. This is quite different from the direct exchange of products; first, the individual and local bounds of the direct exchange of products are broken through, and the interchange of matter of human labour is effected; on the other hand, here it already appears that the whole process depends upon

<sup>a</sup> See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, London, 1887, p. 81.—Ed.

social relations spontaneous in their growth and independent of the actors. (P. 72.) Simple exchange was extinguished in the one act of exchange, where each exchanges non-use-value for use-value; circulation proceeds indefinitely.

(P. 73.) Here the false economic dogma: *the circulation of commodities involves a necessary equilibrium of purchases and sales, because every purchase is also a sale and vice versa—which is to say that every seller also brings his buyer to market with him.* (1) Purchase and sale are, on the one hand, an identical act of two polarly opposite persons; on the other hand, they are two polarly opposite acts of one and the same person. Hence the identity of purchase and sale implies that the commodity is useless unless it is sold, and likewise that this case *can* occur. (2)  $C—M$ , as a partial process, is similarly an independent process and implies that the acquirer of money can choose the time when he again converts this money into a commodity. He can *wait*. The inner unity of the independent processes  $C—M$  and  $M—C$  moves in external antitheses precisely because of the independence of these processes; and when these dependent processes reach a certain limit of independence, *their unity asserts itself in a crisis*. Hence the *possibility* of the latter is already given here.

Being the intermediary in commodity circulation, money is the *medium of circulation*.

#### b. The Currency of Money

Money is the medium by which each individual commodity goes into, and out of, circulation; it always remains therein itself. Hence, although the circulation of money is merely the *expression* of commodity circulation, the circulation of commodities *appears* to be the result of money circulation. Since money always remains within the sphere of circulation, the question is: *how much* money is present in it?

The quantity of money in circulation is determined by the *sum of the prices of commodities* (money-value remaining the same), and the latter by the *quantity of commodities* in circulation. Assuming that this quantity of commodities is given, the circulating quantity of money fluctuates with the *fluctuations* in the prices of commodities. Now, since one and the same piece of money always mediates a number of transactions in succession in a given time, for a given interval of time we have:

Sum of the prices of commodities  
 Number of moves made by a piece of money

$$= \text{Quantity of money functioning as the circulation medium. (P. 80.)}$$

Hence paper money can displace gold money if it is thrown into a saturated circulation.

Since the currency of money only *reflects* the process of commodity circulation, its rapidity reflects that of the change in the form of the commodities, its stagnation, the separation of purchase from sale, the stagnation of social interchange of matter. The origin of this stagnation cannot, of course, be seen from circulation itself, which merely puts in evidence the phenomenon itself. The philistines attribute it to a deficient quantity of the circulation medium. (P. 81.)

*Ergo*: (1) If the prices of commodities remain constant, the quantity of money circulating rises when the quantity of circulating commodities increases or the circulation of money is retarded; and drops *vice versa*.

(2) With a general rise in the prices of commodities, the quantity of money circulating remains constant if the quantity of commodities decreases or the velocity of circulation increases in the same proportion.

(3) With a general drop in the prices of commodities, the converse of (2).

In general, there is a fairly constant average from which significant deviations occur almost exclusively as a result of *crises*.

### c. Coin: Symbol of Value

The standard of prices is fixed by the state, as are also the denomination of the particular piece of gold—the coin, and its coining. In the world market the respective national uniforms are doffed again (seigniorage is disregarded here), so that coin and bullion differ only in form. But *a coin wears away* during circulation; gold as a circulation medium differs from gold as a standard of prices. The coin becomes more and more a *symbol* of its official content.

Herewith the latent possibility is given of replacing metallic money by tokens or symbols. Hence: (1) small coinage of copper and silver tokens, the permanent establishment of which in place of real gold money is prevented by limiting the quantity in which they are LEGAL TENDER. Their metallic content is determined purely

arbitrarily by law, and thus their function as coinage becomes independent of their *value*. Hence the further step to *quite worthless* symbols is possible. (2) *Paper money*, i.e., *paper money issued by the state, having compulsory rate* (credit money not to be discussed here as yet). So far as this paper money actually circulates in place of gold money, it is subject to the laws of gold circulation. Only the proportion in which paper replaces gold can be the object of a special law, which is that the issue of paper money is to be limited to the quantity in which the gold represented by it would actually have to circulate. The degree of saturation of the circulation fluctuates, to be sure, but everywhere experience determines a minimum below which it never falls. This minimum can be issued. If more than the minimum is issued, a portion becomes superfluous as soon as the degree of saturation drops to the minimum. In that case the total amount of paper money within the commodity world still represents only the quantity of gold fixed by that world's immanent laws, and hence alone representable.

Thus, if the amount of paper money represents twice the absorbable amount of gold, each piece of paper money is depreciated to half its nominal value. Just as if gold were changed in its function as the measure of prices, in its value. (P. 89.)

### C. Money

#### a. Hoarding

With the earliest development of commodity circulation there develops the need, and the passionate desire, to hold fast the product of  $C-M$ , money. From a mere agency of interchange of matter, this change of form becomes an *end in itself*. Money petrifies into a *hoard*; the commodity seller becomes a *money hoarder*. (P. 91.)

This form was dominant precisely in the beginnings of commodity circulation. *Asia*. With further development of commodity circulation every producer of commodities must secure for himself the *nexus rerum*,<sup>a</sup> the social pledge—money. Thus *HOARDS* accumulate everywhere. The development of commodity circulation increases the power of money, the absolutely social form of wealth always ready for use. (P. 92.) The urge for hoarding is by

<sup>a</sup> The bond between things.—*Ed.*

nature boundless. *Qualitatively*, or with respect to its form, money is unrestricted, i.e., the universal representative of material wealth, because it is directly convertible into any other commodity. But *quantitatively*, every actual sum of money is limited, and therefore of only limited efficacy as a means of purchasing. This contradiction always drives the hoarder back, again and again, to the Sisypheus-like labour of accumulation.

Besides, the accumulation of gold and silver IN PLATE creates both a new market for these metals and a latent source of money.

Hoarding serves as a *conduit for supplying or withdrawing circulating money* with the continuous fluctuations in the degree of saturation of the circulation. (P. 95.)

#### b. Means of Payment

With the development of commodity circulation new relations appear: the alienation of a commodity can be separated in time from the realisation of its price. Commodities require different periods of time for their production; they are produced in different seasons; some must be sent to distant markets, etc. Hence *A* can be a seller before *B*, the buyer, is able to pay. Practice regulates the conditions of payment in this way: *A* becomes a *creditor*, *B* a *debtor*; money becomes a *means of payment*. Thus the relation of *creditor and debtor* already becomes *more antagonistic*. (This can also occur independently of commodity circulation, e.g., in antiquity and the Middle Ages.) (P. 97.)

In this relation, money functions: (1) as the measure of value in the determination of the price of the commodity sold; (2) as an ideal means of purchase. In the hoard, money was *withdrawn* from circulation; here, being a means of payment, money enters circulation, but only after the commodity has left it. The indebted buyer sells in order to be able to *pay*, or he will be put up for auction. Therefore, money now becomes *the sale's end in itself* through a social necessity arising out of the relations of the very circulation process. (Pp. 97-98.)

The lack of simultaneity of purchases and sales, which gives rise to the function of money as a means of payment, at the same time effects an economy of the circulation media, payments being concentrated at a definite place. The *virements*<sup>a</sup> in Lyons in the Middle Ages—a sort of CLEARING-HOUSE, where only the net balance of the mutual claims is paid. (P. 98.)

In so far as the payments balance one another, money functions

<sup>a</sup> Remittance by draft from own account to another.—*Ed.*



only ideally, as *money of account* or measure of values. In so far as actual payments have to be made, it does not appear as a circulation medium, as only the vanishing and mediating form of interchange of matter, but as the individual embodiment of social labour, as the independent existence of exchange-value, as the *absolute commodity*. This *direct contradiction* breaks out in that moment of production and commercial crises that is called a *monetary crisis*. It occurs only where the progressing chain of payments, and an artificial system of settling them, are fully developed. With more general disturbances of this mechanism, no matter what their origin, money changes suddenly and immediately from its merely ideal shape of *money of account into hard cash*; profane commodities can no longer replace it. (P. 99.)

*Credit money* originates in the function of money as a means of payment; certificates of debt themselves circulate in turn to transfer these debts to others. With the system of credit the function of money as a means of payment again expands; in that capacity money acquires its own forms of existence, in which it occupies the sphere of large-scale commercial transactions, while coin is largely relegated to the sphere of retail trade. (P. 101.)

At a certain stage and volume of commodity production the function of money as a means of payment spreads beyond the sphere of circulation of commodities; it becomes the *universal commodity of contracts*. *Rents, taxes, and the like are transformed from payments in kind into money payments*. Cf. France under Louis XIV. (Boisguillebert<sup>a</sup> and Vauban)<sup>182</sup>; on the other hand, Asia, Turkey, Japan, etc. (P. 102.)

The development of money into a means of payment necessitates the accumulation of money against the date when payment is due. Hoarding which, as a distinct form of acquiring riches, vanished as society further developed, again appears as a reserve fund of the means of payment. (P. 103.)

### c. World Money

In world trade the local forms of coin, small coinage, and tokens of value are discarded and only the bullion form of money is valid as *world money*. *Only in the world market does money function to the full extent as the commodity whose natural form is at the same time the immediate social materialisation of human labour in the abstract*. Its mode of existence becomes adequate to its concept. (P. 104; details p. 105.)

<sup>a</sup> A reference to P. Boisguillebert, "Dissertation sur la nature..." in *Économistes financiers du XVIII-e siècle*, Paris, 1843, pp. 413, 419 and 417.—Ed.

## Chapter II

### THE TRANSFORMATION OF MONEY INTO CAPITAL<sup>a</sup>

#### 1. THE GENERAL FORMULA FOR CAPITAL

Commodity circulation is the starting point of capital. Hence commodity production, commodity circulation and the latter's developed form, commerce, are always the historical groundwork from which capital arises. The modern history of capital dates from the creation of modern world trade and the world market in the sixteenth century. (P. 106.)

If we consider only the economic forms produced by commodity circulation, we find that its final product is money, and the latter is the *first form in which capital appears*. Historically, capital invariably confronts landed property at first as *moneyed wealth*, merchant capital or usurer's capital, and even today all new capital first comes on the stage in the shape of *money* that by definite processes has to be transformed into capital.

Money as money and money as capital differ, to begin with, only in their **form** of circulation. Alongside  $C—M—C$ , the form  $M—C—M$ , buying in order to sell, also occurs. Money that describes this form of circulation in its movement *becomes* capital, is already capital in itself (i.e., by its destination).

The result of  $M—C—M$  is  $M—M$ , the indirect exchange of money for money. I buy cotton for £100 and sell it for £110; ultimately I have exchanged £100 for £110, money for money.

If this process yielded at its outcome the same money-value that was originally put into it, £100 out of £100, it would be absurd. Yet whether the merchant realises £100, £110, or merely £50 for

<sup>a</sup> This chapter corresponds to Part II of the 1887 English edition (Chapter IV.—The General Formula for Capital, Chapter V.—Contradictions in the General Formula of Capital, Chapter VI.—The Buying and Selling of Labour-Power).—Ed.

his £100, his money has described a specific movement quite different from that of commodity circulation,  $C—M—C$ . From the examination of the differences in form between this movement and  $C—M—C$  the difference in content will also be found.

The two phases of the process taken separately are the same as in  $C—M—C$ . But there is a great difference in the process as a whole. In  $C—M—C$  money constitutes the intermediary, the commodity the starting point and the finish; in this case the commodity is the intermediary, with money the starting point and the finish. In  $C—M—C$  the money is spent once for all; in  $M—C—M$  it is merely *advanced*, it is to be got back again. *It flows back to its starting point*. Here, therefore, is already a palpable difference between the circulation of money as money and money as capital.

In  $C—M—C$  money can return to its starting point only through the *repetition of the whole process*, through the sale of *fresh* commodities. Hence the reflux is independent of the process itself. In  $M—C—M$ , on the other hand, it is conditioned from the outset by the structure of the process itself, which is incomplete if the reflux fails. (P. 110.)

The ultimate object of  $C—M—C$  is use-value, that of  $M—C—M$  *exchange-value itself*.

In  $C—M—C$  both extremes possess the same definiteness of economic form. Both are *commodities*, and of *equal value*. But at the same time they are qualitatively different use-values, and the process has social interchange of matter as its content. In  $M—C—M$  the operation, at first glance, seems tautological, meaningless. To exchange £100 for £100, and in a roundabout way to boot, seems absurd. One sum of money is distinguishable from another only by its *size*;  $M—C—M$  acquires its meaning, therefore, only through the *quantitative difference* in the extremes. More money is withdrawn from circulation than has been thrown into it. The cotton bought for £100 is sold, say, for £100+£10; the process thus follows the formula  $M—C—M'$ , where  $M'=M+\Delta M$ . This  $\Delta M$ , *this increment is surplus-value*. The value originally advanced not only *remains intact* in circulation, but adds to itself a surplus-value, *expands itself*—and *this movement converts money into capital*.

In  $C—M—C$  there may also be a difference in the value of the extremes, but it is purely accidental in this form of circulation, and  $C—M—C$  does not become absurd when the extremes are equivalent—on the contrary, this is rather the necessary condition for the normal process.

The repetition of  $C—M—C$  is regulated by an ultimate object outside itself: consumption, the satisfaction of definite needs. In  $M—C—M$ , on the other hand, the beginning and the end are the same, money, and that already makes the movement endless. Granted,  $M+\Delta M$  differs quantitatively from  $M$ , but it too is merely a *limited* sum of money; if it were spent, it would no longer be capital; if it were withdrawn from circulation, it would remain stationary as a hoard. Once the need for expansion of value is given, it exists for  $M'$  as well as for  $M$ , and the movement of capital is boundless, because its goal is as much unattained at the end of the process as at the beginning. (Pp. 111-13.) As the representative of this process, the owner of money becomes a *capitalist*.

If in commodity circulation the exchange-value attains at most a form independent of the use-value of a commodity, *it suddenly manifests itself here as a substance in process, endowed with motion of its own, for which commodity and money are mere forms. More than that, as original value it is differentiated from itself as surplus-value.* It becomes money in process, and as such, capital. (P. 116.)

$M—C—M'$  appears indeed to be a form peculiar to merchant capital alone. But industrial capital, too, is money which is converted into commodities, and by the latter's sale reconverted into more money. Acts that take place *between purchase and sale, outside the sphere of circulation*, effect no change in this. Lastly, in interest-bearing capital, the process appears directly as  $M—M'$ , value that is, as it were, greater than itself. (P. 117.)

## 2. CONTRADICTIONS IN THE GENERAL FORMULA

The form of circulation by which money becomes capital contradicts all previous laws bearing on the nature of commodities, of value, of money and of circulation itself. Can the purely formal difference of inverted sequence cause this?

What is more, this inversion exists only for one of the three transacting persons. As a capitalist I buy commodities from  $A$  and sell them in turn to  $B$ .  $A$  and  $B$  appear merely as simple buyer and seller of commodities. In each of the two cases I confront them merely as a simple owner of money or owner of commodities, confronting one as buyer or money, the other as seller or commodity, but neither of them as a capitalist or a representative of something that is more than money or commodity. For  $A$  the transaction began with a *sale*; for  $B$  it ended with a

*purchase*, hence, just as in commodity circulation. Moreover, if I base the right to surplus-value upon the inverted sequence, A could sell to B *directly* and the chance of surplus-value would be eliminated.

Assume that A and B buy commodities from each other directly. As far as *use-value* is concerned, *both* may profit; A may even produce more of his commodity than B could produce in the same time, and *vice versa*, whereby both would profit again. But otherwise with *exchange-value*. Here *equal values* are exchanged for each other, even if money, as the medium of circulation, intervenes. (P. 119.)

Abstractly considered, only a *change in form* of the commodity takes place in simple commodity circulation, if we except the substitution of one use-value for another. So far as it involves only a change in form of its exchange-value, it involves the *exchange of equivalents*, if the phenomenon proceeds in a *pure* form. Commodities can, indeed, be sold at prices differing from their values, but only when the law of commodity exchange is violated. In its pure form it is an exchange of equivalents, hence no medium for enriching oneself. (P. 120.)

Hence the error of all endeavours to derive surplus-value from commodity circulation. Condillac<sup>a</sup> (p. 121), Newman<sup>b</sup> (p. 122).

But let us assume that the exchange does not take place in a pure form, that *non-equivalents are exchanged*. Let us assume that each seller sells his commodity at 10 per cent above its value. Everything remains the same; what each one gains as a seller, he loses in turn as a buyer. Just as if the value of money had changed by 10 per cent. Likewise if the *buyers* bought everything at 10 per cent *below* value. (P. 123, Torrens.<sup>c</sup>)

The assumption that surplus-value arises from a rise in prices presupposes that a class exists which *buys and does not sell*, i.e., **consumes and does not produce**, which constantly receives money *gratis*. To sell commodities above their value to this class means merely to get back, by cheating, part of the money given away *gratis* (Asia Minor and Rome). Yet the seller always remains the cheated one and cannot grow richer, cannot form surplus-value thereby.

<sup>a</sup> E. B. Condillac, "Le commerce et le gouvernement" (1776) in *Mélanges d'économie politique*, Paris, 1847, pp. 267 and 290-91.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> S. P. Newman, *Elements of Political Economy*, Andover and New York, 1835, p. 175.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> R. Torrens, *An Essay on the Production of Wealth*, London, 1821, p. 349.—Ed.

Let us take the case of **cheating**. *A* sells to *B* wine worth £40 in exchange for grain worth £50. *A* has gained £10. But *A* and *B* together have only 90. *A* has 50 and *B* only 40; value has been transferred but not *created*. The capitalist class, as a whole, in any country cannot cheat itself. (P. 126.)

Hence: if equivalents are exchanged, no surplus-value results; and if non-equivalents are exchanged, still no surplus-value results. Commodity circulation creates no new value.

That is why the oldest and most popular forms of capital, merchant capital and usurers' capital, are not considered here. If the expansion of merchant capital is not to be explained by mere *cheating*, many intermediate factors, lacking here as yet, are required. Even more so for usurers' and interest-bearing capital. It will later be seen that both are derived forms, and why they occur historically *before* modern capital.

Hence surplus-value cannot originate in circulation. But outside it? Outside it the commodity owner is the simple producer of his commodity, the value of which depends upon the quantity of his own labour contained in it, measured according to a definite social law; this value is expressed in money of account, e.g., in a price of £10. But this value is not at the same time a value of £11; his labour creates values, but not self-expanding values. It can add more value to existing value, but this occurs only through the addition of *more labour*. Thus the commodity producer *cannot produce surplus-value outside the sphere of circulation* without coming in contact with other commodity owners.

Hence capital must originate **in** commodity circulation and yet **not in** it. (P. 128.)

Thus: the transformation of money into capital has to be explained on the basis of the laws inherent in the exchange of commodities, the exchange of equivalents forming the starting point. Our owner of money as yet the mere chrysalis of a capitalist, has to buy his commodities at their value, to sell them at their value, and yet at the end of this process to extract more value than he put into it. His development into a butterfly must take place in the sphere of circulation and yet not in it. These are the conditions of the problem. *Hic Rhodus, hic salta!*<sup>a</sup> (P. 129.)

---

<sup>a</sup> "Here is Rhodes, leap here!" (figuratively meaning: here is the main point, now show us what you can do!)—words addressed to a Swaggerer in a fable by Aesop, "The Boasting Traveller" who claimed that he had made tremendous leaps in Rhodes.—*Ed.*

## 3. THE BUYING AND SELLING OF LABOUR-POWER

The change in value of money that is to be converted into capital cannot take place in money itself, for in buying, it merely realises the price of the commodity, and on the other hand, as long as it *remains money*, it does not change the magnitude of its value; and in selling, too, it merely converts the commodity from its natural form into its money-form. The change must, therefore, take place in the *commodity* of  $M-C-M$ ; but not in its *exchange-value*, since equivalents are exchanged; it can only arise from its *use-value as such*, that is, from its *consumption*. For that purpose a commodity is required *whose use-value possesses the property of being the source of exchange-value*—and this does exist—**labour-power**. (P. 130.)

But for the owner of money to find labour-power in the market as a *commodity*, it must be sold by its own possessor, that is, it must be **free** labour-power. Since buyer and seller as contracting parties are both *juridically equal* persons, labour-power must be sold only *temporarily*, since in a sale *en bloc* the seller no longer remains the seller, but becomes a commodity himself. But then the owner, instead of being able to sell *commodities* in which his labour is embodied, must rather be in a position where he has to sell **his labour-power itself as a commodity**. (P. 131.)

For the conversion of his money into capital, therefore, the owner of money must find in the commodity market the *free* labourer, free in the double sense that as a free man he can dispose of his labour-power as *his* commodity and that, on the other hand, he has no *other* commodities to sell, has got rid of, is free of all *things* necessary for the realisation of his labour-power. (P. 132.)

Parenthetically, the relation between money owner and labour-power owner is not a natural one, or a social one common to all ages, but a *historical* one, the product of many economic revolutions. So, too, do the economic categories considered up to now bear their historical stamp. To become a commodity, a product must no longer be produced as the immediate means of subsistence. The mass of products can assume commodity-form only *within a specific mode of production*, the *capitalist mode*, although commodity production and circulation can take place even where the mass of products never become commodities. Likewise, money can exist in all periods that have attained a certain level of commodity circulation; the specific money-forms, from mere equivalent to world money, presuppose various stages of develop-

ment; nevertheless, a very slightly developed circulation of commodities can give rise to all of them. *Capital*, on the other hand, arises only under the above condition, and this one condition comprises a world's history. (P. 133.)

Labour-power has an exchange-value which is determined, like that of all other commodities, by the labour-time required for its production, and hence for its reproduction as well. The value of labour-power is the value of the means of subsistence necessary for the maintenance of its owner, that is, his maintenance in a state of normal capacity for work. This depends upon *climate, natural conditions, etc.*, and also on the given *historical STANDARD OF LIFE* in each country. These vary, but they are *given* for each particular country and for each particular epoch. Moreover, his maintenance includes the means of subsistence for his *substitutes*, i.e., his *children*, in order that the race of these peculiar commodity owners may perpetuate itself. Furthermore, for skilled labour, the cost of *education*. (P. 135.)

The minimum limit of the value of labour-power is the value of *the physically indispensable means of subsistence*. If the price of labour-power falls to this minimum, it falls below its *value*, since the latter presupposes *normal*, not stunted, quality of labour-power. (P. 136.)

The nature of labour implies that labour-power is consumed only *after* conclusion of the contract, and, as money is usually the *means of payment* for such commodities in all countries with the capitalist mode of production, the labour-power is paid for only after it is *consumed*. Everywhere, therefore, *the labourer gives credit to the capitalist*. (Pp. 137, 138.)

The process of consuming labour-power is at the same time *the process of producing commodities and surplus-value* and this consumption takes place outside *the sphere of circulation*. (P. 140.)



## Chapter III

THE PRODUCTION OF ABSOLUTE SURPLUS-VALUE<sup>a</sup>I. THE LABOUR PROCESS AND THE PROCESS  
OF PRODUCING SURPLUS-VALUE

The purchaser of labour-power consumes it by setting its seller to work. This labour to produce commodities at first turns out use-values, and in this property it is independent of the specific relation between capitalist and labourer... Description of the labour process as such. (Pp. 141-49.)

The labour process, on a capitalist basis, has two peculiarities. 1. The labourer works under the capitalist's control. 2. The product is the capitalist's property, since the labour process is now only a process between two *things* purchased by the capitalist: labour-power and means of production. (P. 150.)

But the capitalist does not want the use-value produced *for its own sake*, but only as the depository of exchange-value and especially of *surplus-value*. Labour under this condition—where the commodity was a unity of use-value and exchange-value—becomes

---

<sup>a</sup> This chapter corresponds to Part III of the 1887 English edition (Chapter VII.—The Labour-Process and the Process of Producing Surplus-Value, Chapter VIII.—Constant Capital and Variable Capital, Chapter IX.—The Rate of Surplus-Value, Chapter X.—The Working-Day, Chapter XI.—Rate and Mass of Surplus-Value).—*Ed.*

the *unity of the production process and of the process of creating value.* (P. 151.)

Thus the quantity of labour objectified in the product is to be investigated.

Yarn, for example. Let 10 lbs. of cotton be necessary for making it, say 10 shillings, and instruments of labour, whose wear and tear are inevitable in the spinning—here denoted in brief as spindle share—say 2 shillings. Thus, there are 12 shillings' worth of means of production in the product, i.e., inasmuch as 1) the product has become *an actual use-value*, in this case yarn; and 2) *only* the socially necessary labour-time was represented in these instruments of labour. How much is added to it by the labour of spinning?

Thus, the labour process is here viewed from an altogether different angle. In the value of the product the labours of the cotton-planter, of the spindle-maker, etc., and of the spinner, are commensurable, qualitatively equal parts of general, human, necessary *value-creating* labour, and therefore distinguishable only quantitatively, and for that very reason *quantitatively comparable* by the length of time, presupposing that it is *socially necessary* labour-time, for only the latter is value-creating.

Assumed the value of a day's labour-power is 3 shillings, and that it represents 6 hours of labour, that  $1\frac{2}{3}$  lbs. of yarn are made per hour, hence in 6 hours: 10 lbs. of yarn from 10 lbs. of cotton (as above); then 3 shillings of value have been added in 6 hours, and the value of the product is 15 shillings (10+2+3 shillings) or a shilling and a half per pound of yarn.

But in this case there is no surplus-value. This is of no use to the capitalist. (Vulgar-economic humbug,<sup>183</sup> p. 157.)

We assumed that the value of a day's labour-power was 3 shillings, because  $\frac{1}{2}$  working-day, or 6 hours, is incorporated in it. *But the fact that only  $\frac{1}{2}$  working-day is required to maintain the worker for 24 hours does not in any way prevent him from working a whole day.* The *value* of labour-power and the *value it creates* are two different quantities. Its *useful* property was only a *conditio sine qua non*; but what was decisive was the *specific* use-value of labour-power *in being the source of more exchange-value than it has itself.* (P. 159.)

Hence, the labourer works 12 hours, spins 20 lbs. of cotton worth 20 shillings and 4 shillings' worth of spindles, and his labour costs 3 shillings: total—27 shillings. But in the product there are embodied: four days' labour in the shape of spindles and cotton, and one day's labour of the spinner, in all five days at 6 shillings

totalling 30 shillings' value of product. We have a surplus-value of 3 shillings: money has been converted into capital. (P. 160.) All the conditions of the problem are fulfilled. (Details p. 160.)

As a value-creating process, the labour process becomes a *process of producing surplus-value* the moment it is *prolonged beyond* the point where it delivers a simple *equivalent* for the paid-for value of labour-power.

The value-creating process differs from the simple labour process in that the latter is considered *qualitatively*, the former *quantitatively*, and only to the extent that it comprises socially necessary labour-time. (P. 161, details p. 162.)

As the unity of labour process and *value-creating* process, the production process is the *production of commodities*; as the unity of labour process and the process of *producing surplus-value* it is the *process of capitalist production of commodities*. (P. 163.)

Reduction of complex labour to simple labour. (Pp. 163-65.)

## 2. CONSTANT AND VARIABLE CAPITAL

The labour process adds *new* value to the object of labour, but at the same time it *transfers* the value of the object of labour to the product, thus *preserving* it by merely adding new value. This double result is attained in this manner: the *specifically useful qualitative character* of labour converts one use-value into another use-value and thus *preserves value*; the *value-creating, abstractly general, quantitative character* of labour, however, *adds value*. (P. 166.)

E.g., let the productivity of spinning labour multiply sixfold. As *useful* (qualitative) labour it *preserves* in the same period of time six times as many instruments of labour. But it adds only the same *new* value as before, i.e., in each pound of yarn there is only  $\frac{1}{6}$  of the new value previously added. As *value-creating* labour it accomplishes no more than before. (P. 167.) Conversely, if the productivity of spinning labour remains the same, but the value of the instruments of labour rises. (P. 168.)

The instruments of labour transfer to the product only *that* value which they *lose themselves*. (P. 169.) This is the case in differing degree. Coal, LUBRICANTS, etc., are consumed completely, raw materials take on a new form. Instruments, machinery, etc., transmit value only slowly and by parts, and the wear and tear are calculated by experience. (Pp. 169-70.) But the instrument remains

continually *as a whole* in the labour process. Therefore, the same instrument counts *as a whole in the labour process* but only partly in the *process of producing surplus-value*, so that the difference between the two processes is reflected here in material factors. (P. 171.) Conversely, the raw material, which forms waste, enters wholly into the process of producing surplus-value, and only [partly] into the labour process, since it appears in the product minus the waste. (P. 171.)

But in no case can an instrument of labour transfer *more* exchange-value than it possessed itself—in the labour process it acts only as a use-value and hence can give only the exchange-value that it possessed previously. (P. 172.)

This preserving of value is very advantageous to the capitalist but costs him nothing. (Pp. 173, 174.)

Yet the preserved value *only reappears*, it was already present, and only the labour process *adds new value*. That is, in capitalist production, *surplus-value, the excess of the product's value over the value of the consumed elements of the product* (means of production and labour-power). (Pp. 175, 176.)

Herewith have been described the forms of existence which the original capital value takes on in dropping its money-form, in being converted into factors of the labour process: (1) in the purchase of *instruments of labour*; (2) in the purchase of *labour-power*.

The capital invested in *instruments* of labour does *not* therefore alter the magnitude of its value in the production process. We call it *constant capital*.

The portion invested in *labour-power* *does change* its value; it produces: 1) its *own* value, and 2) *surplus-value*—it is *variable capital*. (P. 176.)

(Capital is *constant* only in relation to the production process specifically given, in which it does not change; it can consist sometimes of more, sometimes of fewer instruments of labour, and the purchased instruments of labour may rise or fall in value, but that does not affect their relationship to the production process. P. 177. Likewise, the percentage in which a given capital is subdivided into constant and variable capital may change, but in any given case the *c* remains constant and the *v* variable. P. 178.)

## 3. THE RATE OF SURPLUS-VALUE

$C = \overset{c}{\pounds}500 = 410 + 90$ . At the end of the labour process in which  $v$  is turned into labour-power we get  $\overset{c}{410} + \overset{v}{90} + \overset{s}{90} = 590$ . Let us assume  $c$  consists of 312 raw material, 44 auxiliary material, and 54 wear and tear of machinery, in all 410. Let the value of *all* the machinery be 1,054. If this were entered as a *whole*, we would get 1,410 for  $c$  on both sides of our calculation; the surplus-value would remain 90 as before. (P. 179.)

Since the value of  $c$  merely *re-appears* in the product, the *value of the product* we get differs from the *value* created in the process; the latter, therefore, equals not  $c + v + s$ , but  $v + s$ . Hence the magnitude of  $c$  is immaterial to the process of producing surplus-value, i.e.,  $c = o$ . (P. 180.) This also takes place in practice in commercial accounting, e.g., in calculating a country's profit from its industry, imported raw material is deducted. (P. 181.) Cf. Vol. III<sup>184</sup> for the ratio of surplus-value to total capital.

Hence: the rate of surplus-value is  $s : v$ , in the above case  $90 : 90 = 100\%$ .

The labour-time during which the labourer reproduces the value of his labour-power—under capitalist or other conditions—is the *necessary* labour; what goes beyond that, producing surplus-value for the capitalist, *surplus-labour*. (Pp. 183, 184.) Surplus-value is congealed surplus-labour, and only the *form of extorting* it differentiates the various social formations.

Examples of the incorrectness of including  $c$ , pp. 185-96. (*Senior*.)<sup>a</sup>

The sum of the necessary labour and the surplus-labour equals the *working day*.

## 4. THE WORKING DAY

The *necessary* labour-time is *given*. The *surplus-labour* is *variable*, but within certain limits. It can never be reduced to nil, since then capitalist production ceases. It can never go as high as 24 hours for physical reasons, and, moreover, the maximum limit is always affected by moral grounds as well. But these limits are very elastic. The economic demand is that the working-day should be no

<sup>a</sup> N. W. Senior, *Letters on the Factory Act*, London, 1837, pp. 12 and 13.—Ed.

longer than for normal wear and tear of the worker. But what is *normal*? An antinomy results and only force can decide. Hence the struggle between the working class and the capitalist class for the *normal working day*. (Pp. 198-202.)

Surplus-labour in earlier social epochs. As long as the exchange-value is not more important than the use-value, surplus-labour is milder, e.g., among the ancients; only where direct exchange-value—gold and silver—was produced, surplus-labour was terrible. (P. 203.) Likewise in the slave states of America until the mass production of cotton for export. Likewise *corvée* labour, e.g., in Rumania.

*Corvée* labour is the best means of comparison with capitalist exploitation, because the former fixes and shows the surplus-labour as a specific labour-time to be performed—*Règlement organique*<sup>185</sup> of Wallachia. (Pp. 204-06.)

The English *FACTORY ACTS* are negative expression of the greed for surplus-labour, just as the foregoing was its positive expression.

*The FACTORY ACTS*. That of 1850—(p. 207). 10<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> hours and 7<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> on Saturdays=60 hours per week. Millowners' profit through evasion. (Pp. 208-11.)

*Exploitation in unrestricted or only later restricted branches: lace industry* (p. 212), *POTTERIES* (p. 213), *lucifer matches* (p. 215), *wall-paper* (pp. 215-17), *baking* (pp. 217-22), *railway employees* (p. 223), *seamstresses* (pp. 223-25), *blacksmiths* (p. 226), *day and night workers IN SHIFTS*: (a) *metallurgy and the metal industry* (pp. 227-36).

These facts prove that capital regards the labourer as nothing else than *labour-power*, all of whose time is labour-time as far as this is at all possible at a given moment, and that the length of life of labour-power is immaterial to the capitalist. (Pp. 236-38.) But is this not against the interests of the capitalist? What about the replacement of what is rapidly worn out? The organised slave trade in the interior of the United States has raised the rapid wearing out of slaves to an economic principle, exactly like the supply of labourers from the rural districts in Europe, etc. (P. 239.) *POORHOUSE SUPPLY*. (P. 240.) The capitalist sees only the continuously available surplus-population and wears it out. Whether the race perishes—*après moi le déluge*.<sup>a</sup> *Capital is reckless of the health and length of life of the labourer, unless it is forced by society to*

<sup>a</sup> After me the deluge—the words attributed to Louis XV of France and Mme. de Pompadour.—*Ed.*

*show consideration ... and free competition makes the inherent laws of capitalist production hold good as external coercive laws for every individual capitalist.* (P. 243.)

Establishment of a normal working day—the result of centuries of struggle between capitalist and worker.

At the beginning laws were made to raise working-time; now to lower it. (P. 244.) The first STATUTE OF LABOURERS, 23rd Edward III, 1349, was passed under the pretext that the plague had so decimated the population that everyone had to do more work. Hence maximum wages and limit of the working day were fixed by law. In 1496, under Henry VII, the working day of agricultural labourers and all ARTIFICERS continued from 5 a.m. to between 7 and 8 p.m. in summer—March to September, with 1 hour, 1½ hours and ½ hour, in all 3 hours' break. In winter it was from 5 a.m. to dark. This statute was never strictly enforced. In the 18th century the *whole* week's labour was not yet available to capital (with the exception of agricultural labour). Cf. controversies of that time. (Pp. 248-51.) Only with modern large-scale industry was this, and more, achieved; it broke down *all* bounds and exploited the workers most shamelessly. The proletariat resisted as soon as it recovered consciousness. The five acts of 1802-33 were only nominal, since there were no inspectors. Only the Act of 1833 created a normal working day in the four textile industries: from 5.30 a.m. to 8.30 p.m., during which time YOUNG PERSONS from 13 to 18 years of age could be employed only 12 hours with 1½ hours' pause, children from 9 to 13 years of age only 8 hours, while night work of children and YOUNG PERSONS was prohibited. (Pp. 253-55.)

The *relay system* and its abuse for purposes of evasion. (P. 256.) Finally, the Act of 1844 which put *women of all ages* on the same basis as YOUNG PERSONS. Children limited to 6½ hours; the relay system curbed. On the other hand, children permitted from 8 years on. At last in 1847 the *ten-hour bill* forced through for women and YOUNG PERSONS. (P. 259.) The capitalists' efforts against it. (Pp. 260-68.) A FLAW in the Act of 1847 led to the compromise Act of 1850 (p. 269), which fixed the working day for YOUNG PERSONS and WOMEN—5 days of 10½, 1 day of 7½=60 hours per week, and that *between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m.* Otherwise the Act of 1847 in force for children. The exception for the silk industry. (P. 270.) In 1853 the working-time *for children* also limited to between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m. (P. 272.)

PRINTWORKS ACT in 1845 limits almost nothing—children and women can work 16 hours!

Bleaching and dyeing works 1860. Lace factories 1861; potteries and many other branches 1863 (under the Factory Act, special acts passed the same year for bleaching in the open air and baking). (P. 274.)

Large-scale industry thus at first creates the need for limiting working-time, but it is later found that the same overwork has gradually taken possession of all other branches as well. (P. 277.)

History further shows that the *individual* "free" labourer is defenceless against the capitalist and succumbs, especially with the introduction of women's and children's labour, so that it is here that the class struggle develops between the workers and the capitalists. (P. 277.)

In France, the twelve-hour day law for all ages and branches of work was passed only in 1848. (*Cf.*, however, p. 253, footnote on the French child labour law of 1841, which was really enforced only in 1853, and then only in the *Département du Nord*.) Complete "freedom of labour" in Belgium. The eight-hour movement in America. (P. 279.)

Thus, the labourer comes out of the production process quite different than he entered. The labour contract was not the act of a *free agent*; the time for which he *is free* to sell his labour[-power] is the time for which he *is forced* to sell it, and only the *mass* opposition of the workers wins for them *the passing of a law* that shall prevent the workers from selling, by voluntary contract with capital, themselves and their generation into slavery and death. In place of the pompous catalogue of the inalienable rights of man comes the modest *Magna Charta* of the Factory Act. (Pp. 280, 281.)

##### 5. RATE AND MASS OF SURPLUS-VALUE

With the *rate*, the *mass* is also given. If the daily value of *one* labour-power is 3 shillings, and the rate of surplus-value is 100 per cent, its daily mass=3 shillings for one labourer.

I. Since the *variable capital* is the money expression of the value of *all* the labour-powers simultaneously employed by one capitalist, the *mass* of the surplus-value produced by them is equal to the variable capital multiplied by the rate of surplus-value. Both factors can vary, different combinations thus arising. The *mass* of surplus-value can grow, even with decreasing variable capital, if the rate rises, that is, if the working day is *lengthened*. (P. 282.)



II. This increase in the rate of surplus-value has its *absolute limit* in that the working day can never be prolonged to the full 24 hours; hence the total value of *one* worker's daily production can *never* equal the value of 24 working hours. Thus, in order to obtain the *same* mass of surplus-value, variable capital can be replaced by increased exploitation of labour only *within these limits*. This is important for the explanation of various phenomena arising from the contradictory tendency of capital: (1) to *reduce* the variable capital and the number of workers employed; and (2) to produce the greatest possible mass of surplus-value nonetheless. (Pp. 283, 284.)

III. The masses of value and surplus-value produced by different capitals, with the given value and equally high degree of exploitation of labour-power, *are related directly as the magnitudes of the variable components of these capitals*. (P. 285.) This seems to contradict all facts.

For a given society and a given working day, surplus-value can be increased only by increasing the number of workers, i.e., the population; with a given number of workers, only by lengthening the working day. This is important, however, only for *absolute* surplus-value.

It now turns out that not *every* sum of money can be transformed into capital—that a minimum exists: the cost price of *a single* labour-power and of the necessary instruments of labour. In order to be able to live *himself* like a worker, the capitalist would have to have two workers, with a rate of surplus-value of 50 per cent, and yet save nothing. Even with eight he is still a small master. Hence, in the Middle Ages people were forcibly hampered in transformation from craftsmen into capitalists by limitation of the number of journeymen to be employed by one master. The minimum of wealth required to form a real capitalist varies in different periods and branches of business. (P. 288.)

Capital has evolved into *command over labour*, and sees to it that work is done regularly and intensively. Moreover, it *compels* the workers to do more work than is necessary for their sustenance; and in pumping out surplus-value it surpasses all earlier production systems based upon *direct* compulsory labour.

Capital took over labour with the given technical conditions, and at first does not change them. Hence, with the production process considered as a *labour process*, the worker stands in relation to the means of production not as to capital, but as to the means of his own appropriate activity. But, considered as a process of *creating surplus-value*, otherwise. The means of production become means

of absorbing the labour of others. It is no longer the worker who employs the means of production, but the means of production that employ the worker. (P. 289.) Instead of being consumed by him ... they consume him as the leaven necessary to their own life-process, and the life-process of capital consists only in its movement as value constantly multiplying itself.... The simple transformation of money into means of production transforms the latter into a right by law and a right by coercion to the labour and surplus-labour of others.

## Chapter IV

PRODUCTION OF RELATIVE SURPLUS-VALUE<sup>a</sup>

## 1. THE CONCEPT OF RELATIVE SURPLUS-VALUE

For a given working day, surplus-labour can be increased only by reducing the *necessary* labour; this can in turn be obtained—apart from lowering wages below value—only by reducing the value of labour[-power], that is, by reducing the price of the necessary means of subsistence. (Pp. 291-93.) This, in turn, is to be attained only by *increasing the productive power of labour, by revolutionising the mode of production itself*.

The surplus-value produced by lengthening the working day is *absolute*, that produced by shortening the necessary labour-time is *relative* surplus-value. (P. 295.)

In order to lower the value of labour[-power], the increase in productive power must seize upon those branches of industry whose products determine the value of labour-power—ordinary means of subsistence, substitutes for the same, and their raw materials, etc. Proof of how competition makes the increased productive power manifest in a lower commodity price. (Pp. 296-99.)

The *value* of commodities is in *inverse ratio* to the productive power of labour, as is also *the value of labour-power*, because it is determined by the value of commodities. *Relative surplus-value*, on the contrary, is *directly proportional* to the productive power of labour. (P. 299.)

The capitalist is not interested in the *absolute* value of commodities, but only in the *surplus-value* incorporated in them.

<sup>a</sup> This chapter corresponds to Part IV of the 1887 English edition (Chapter XII.—The Concept of Relative Surplus-Value, Chapter XIII.—Co-operation, Chapter XIV.—Division of Labour and Manufacture, Chapter XV.—Machinery and Modern Industry).—*Ed.*

Realisation of surplus-value implies refunding of the value advanced. Since, according to p. 299, the same process of increasing productive power lowers the value of commodities and increases the surplus-value contained in them, it is clear why the capitalist, whose sole concern is the production of exchange-value, continually strives to depress the exchange-value of commodities. (Cf. Quesnav,<sup>a</sup> p. 300.)

Hence in capitalist production, economising labour, through developing productive power by no means aims at shortening the working day—the latter may even be *lengthened*. We may read, therefore, in economists of the stamp of McCulloch, Ure, Senior and *tutti quanti*, on one page *that the labourer owes a debt of gratitude to capital for developing the productive forces*, and on the next page that he *must prove his gratitude by working in future for 15 hours instead of 10*. The object of this development of productive forces is only to shorten the *necessary labour* and to lengthen the labour for the capitalist. (P. 301.)

## 2. CO-OPERATION

According to p. 288, capitalist production requires an individual capital big enough to employ a fairly large number of workers at a time; only when he himself is wholly released from labour does the employer of labour become a full-grown capitalist. The activity of a large number of workers, at the same time, in the same field of work, for the production of the same kind of commodity, under the command of the same capitalist, constitutes, *historically and logically, the starting point of capitalist production*. (P. 302.)

At first, therefore, there is only a *quantitative* difference compared to the past, when *fewer* labourers were employed by one employer. But a modification takes place at once. The large number of labourers already guarantees that the employer gets *real average labour*, which is not the case with the small master, who must pay the average value of labour[-power] none the less; in the case of small shops, the inequalities are compensated for society at large, but not for the individual master. Thus the *law of the production of surplus-value* is fully realised for the individual producer only when he produces *as a capitalist*, and sets many labourers to work at the same time—hence *from the outset average social labour*. (Pp. 303-04.)

<sup>a</sup> F. Quesnay, *Dialogues sur le commerce et sur les travaux des artisans*.—Ed.

Moreover: economy in means of production is achieved through large-scale operation alone, less transfer of value to the product by constant capital components arises solely from their joint consumption in the labour process of many workmen. That is how the *instruments* of labour acquire a social character before the labour *process* itself acquires it (up to this time merely similar processes side by side). (P. 305.)

The economy in the means of production is to be considered here only in so far as it cheapens commodities and thus *lowers the value* of labour [-power]. The extent to which it alters the ratio of surplus-value to the *total capital* advanced ( $c+v$ ) will not be considered until Book III.<sup>186</sup> This splitting up is quite in keeping with the spirit of capitalist production; since it makes the working conditions confront the worker independently, economy in the means of production appears to be a distinct operation, which does not concern him and is therefore detached from the methods by which the productivity of the labour-power consumed by the capital is increased.

The form of labour of many persons, methodically working together and alongside one another in the same production process or in related production processes, is called co-operation. (P. 306.) (*Concours de forces*. Destutt de Tracy.<sup>a</sup>)

The sum-total of the mechanical forces of individual workers differs substantially from the *potential* mechanical force developed when many hands *act together* at one time in the same undivided operation (lifting of weight, etc.). Co-operation, from the very start, creates a productive power that is, in and of itself, a *mass power*.

Furthermore, in most productive work, *mere social contact* creates a *spirit of emulation* which raises the individual efficiency of each, so that 12 workers turn out more work in a joint working day of 144 hours than 12 workers in 12 distinct working days, or one worker in 12 successive days. (P. 307.)

Although many may be doing the same or similar things, the individual labour of each may still represent a different phase of the labour process (chain of persons passing something along), whereby co-operation again saves labour. Likewise, when a building is started from several sides at once. The combined worker, or collective worker, has hands and eyes before and behind and is, to a certain degree, omnipresent. (P. 308.)

<sup>a</sup> A. L. C. Destutt de Tracy, *Traité de la volonté et de ses effets*, Paris, 1826, p. 80.—Ed.

In complicated labour processes co-operation permits the special processes to be distributed and to be done simultaneously, thus shortening the labour-time for manufacturing the whole product. (P. 308.)

In many spheres of production there are *critical periods* when many workers are needed (harvesting, herring catches, etc.). Here only co-operation can be of aid. (P. 309.)

On the one hand, co-operation *extends* the field of production and thus becomes a necessity for work requiring great spatial continuity of the working arena (drainage, roadbuilding, dam construction, etc.); on the other hand, it *contracts* the arena by concentrating the workers in one work-place, thus cutting down costs. (P. 310.)

In all these forms, co-operation is the specific productive power of the combined working-day, social productive power of labour. The latter arises from co-operation itself. In systematic joint work with others, the worker sheds his individual limitations and develops the capacities of his species.

Now, wage-labourers cannot co-operate unless *the same capitalist* employs them simultaneously, pays them and provides them with instruments of labour. Hence the scale of co-operation depends upon *how much capital a capitalist has*. The requirement that a certain amount of capital be present to make its owner a capitalist now becomes the *material* condition for the conversion of the numerous fragmented and independent individual operations into one combined social labour process.

In a like manner, capital's *command* over labour was up to now only the formal result of the relation between capitalist and labourer; now it is the *necessary prerequisite* for the labour process itself; the capitalist represents precisely combination in the labour process. In co-operation, *control* of the labour process becomes the *function of capital*, and as such it acquires specific characteristics. (P. 312.)

In accordance with the aim of capitalist production (the greatest possible self-expansion of capital), this control is at the same time the function of the greatest possible exploitation of a social labour process, and hence involves the inevitable antagonism between exploiter and exploited. Moreover, control of proper utilisation of the instruments of labour. Finally, the connection between the various workers' functions lies *outside them*, in capital, so that their own unity confronts them as the *capitalist's authority*, as an outside will. Capitalist control is thus *twofold* (1. a social labour process for producing a product; 2. a process of expansion of capital), and in its

form *despotic*. This despotism now evolves its own peculiar forms: the capitalist, just relieved from actual labour himself, now hands over immediate supervision to an organised band of officers and non-coms, who themselves are wage-labourers of capital. In *slavery*, the economists count these supervision expenses as *faux frais*,<sup>a</sup> but in capitalist production they bluntly identify control, so far as it is conditioned by exploitation, with the same function, so far as it arises from the nature of the social labour process. (Pp. 313, 314.)

The supreme command of industry becomes the attribute of capital, just as in feudal times the supreme command in war and in the law-courts was the attribute of landed property. (P. 314.)

The capitalist buys 100 individual labour-powers, and gets in return a combined labour-power of 100. He does *not* pay for the combined labour-power of the 100. When the labourers enter the combined labour process, they already cease to belong to themselves; they are incorporated in capital. Thus the *social productive power of labour* appears as the *productive power immanent in capital*. (P. 315.)

Examples of co-operation among the ancient Egyptians. (P. 316.)

The natural co-operation at the beginnings of civilisation, among hunting peoples, nomads, or in Indian communities, is based: (1) on common ownership of the means of production; (2) on the natural attachment of the individual to the tribe and the primeval community.—The sporadic co-operation in antiquity, the Middle Ages, and in modern colonies is based upon direct rule and violence, mostly slavery.—Capitalist co-operation, on the contrary, presupposes the free wage-labourer. Historically, it appears in direct opposition to peasant economy and the independent handicrafts (whether in guilds or not), and in this connection, as a historical form peculiar to, and distinguishing, the capitalist production process. It is the first change experienced by the labour process when subjected to capital. Thus, here at once: (1) the capitalist mode of production presents itself as a historical necessity for the transformation of the labour process into a social process; (2) this social form of the labour process presents itself as a method of capital to exploit labour more profitably by increasing its productivity. (P. 317.)

Co-operation, as considered so far, in its *elementary* form, coincides with production on a large scale, but it does not constitute a fixed form characteristic of a particular epoch of capitalist production, and it still exists today, when capital operates

<sup>a</sup> Overhead costs.—*Ed.*

on a large scale without division of labour or machinery playing an important part. Thus, although co-operation is the basic form of the whole capitalist production, its *elementary* form reappears, as a particular form, alongside its more developed forms. (P. 318.)

### 3. DIVISION OF LABOUR AND MANUFACTURE

Manufacture, the classic form of co-operation based upon division of labour, prevails from about 1550 to 1770.

It arises:

(1) Either through the throwing together of different crafts, each of which performs a detail operation (e.g., vehicle building), whereby the individual craftsman in question very soon loses his ability to pursue his *whole* handicraft, on the other hand doing his detail work so much better; and thus the process is converted into a division of the whole operation into its component parts. (Pp. 318, 319.)

(2) Or many craftsmen doing the same or similar work are united in the same factory, and the individual operations, instead of being performed successively by one worker, are gradually separated and done simultaneously by several workers (needles, etc.). Instead of being the work of one craftsman, the product is now the work of a union of craftsmen, each of whom performs only a detail operation. (Pp. 319, 320.)

In both cases its result is a *production mechanism whose organs are human beings*. The work retains a *handicraft nature*; each detail process through which the product goes must be performable by *hand*; hence any *really scientific analysis of the production process is excluded*. Each individual worker is completely chained to a detail function *because* of its handicraft nature. (P. 321.)

In this way labour is saved, as compared to the craftsman, and this is increased still more by transmission to succeeding generations. Thus the division of labour in manufacture corresponds to the tendency of former societies to make a trade hereditary. Castes, guilds. (P. 322.)

Subdivision of tools through adaptation to the various partial operations—500 kinds of hammers in Birmingham. (Pp. 323-24.)

Manufacture, considered from the standpoint of its *total* mechanism, has two aspects: either merely mechanical assembly of independent detail products (watch), or a series of related processes in *one* workshop (needle).

In manufacture, each group of workers supplies another with its



raw material. Hence the basic condition is that each group **produces a given quantum in a given time**; thus a continuity, regularity, uniformity and intensity of labour of quite a different kind are created than in co-operation proper. *Thus here we have the technological law of the production process: that the labour be socially necessary labour.* (P. 329.)

The inequality of the time required for the individual operations stipulates that the different groups of workers be of different size and number (in type founding: four founders and two breakers to one rubber). Thus manufacture sets up a mathematically fixed ratio for the quantitative extent of the separate organs of the collective worker, and production can be expanded only by employing an additional multiple of the whole group. Moreover, only after a definite level of production has been reached does it pay to make certain functions independent: supervision, transporting the products from place to place, etc. (Pp. 329, 330.)

Combination of various manufactures into a united manufacture also occurs, but as yet it always lacks real technological unity, which arises only with machinery. (P. 331.)

Machines appeared in manufacture at an early date—sporadically—grain and stamping mills, etc., but only as something subordinate. The chief machinery of manufacture is the *combined collective worker*, who possesses a much higher degree of perfection than the old individual craft worker, and in whom all the imperfections, such as are often necessarily developed in the detail worker, appear as perfection. (P. 333.) Manufacture evolves differences among these detail workers, SKILLED and UNSKILLED, and even a complete hierarchy of workers. (P. 334.)

Division of labour: 1) general (into agriculture, industry, shipping, etc.); 2) particular (into species and subspecies); 3) in detail (in the workshop). The social division of labour also develops from different starting points. 1) Within the family and the tribe the natural division of labour according to sex and age, plus slavery through violence against neighbours, which extends it. (P. 335.) 2) Different communities according to location, climate, and level of culture, turn out different products which are *exchanged where these communities come in contact.* (P. 49.) Exchange with strange communities is then one of the chief means of breaking off the natural association of the community itself through further development of the natural division of labour. (P. 336.)

Division of labour in manufacture thus presupposes a certain degree of development of the social division of labour; on the

other hand, it develops the latter further—as in the territorial division of labour. (Pp. 337, 338.)

For all that, there is always this difference between social division of labour and division of labour in manufacture that the former necessarily produces *commodities*, whereas in the latter the detail worker does *not* produce commodities. Hence concentration and organisation in the latter, scattering and disorder of competition in the former. (Pp. 339, 341.)

Earlier organisation of the Indian communities. (Pp. 341, 342.) The guilds. (Pp. 343-44.) Whereas in all these there exists division of labour in *society*, the division of labour in manufacture is a *specific creation of the capitalist mode of production*.

As in co-operation, the functioning working body is a *form of existence of capital* in manufacture as well. Hence the productive power arising from the combination of labours appears as the *productive power of capital*. But whereas co-operation leaves the individual's mode of working on the whole unchanged, manufacture revolutionises it, *cripples* the worker; unable to make a product independently, he is now a mere *appendage* of the capitalist's workshop. The intellectual faculties of labour disappear as far as the many are concerned, to expand in scope for the one. It is a result of the division of labour in manufacture that the labourers *are confronted* with the intellectual faculties of the labour process as *the property of another and as a ruling power*. This process of separation, which begins as early as co-operation and develops in manufacture, is completed in large-scale industry, which separates science as an independent productive force from labour and presses it into the service of capital. (P. 346.)

Illustrative quotations.<sup>187</sup> (P. 347.)

Manufacture, in one aspect a definite organisation of social labour, is in another only a particular *method of begetting relative surplus-value*. (P. 350.) Historical significance precisely in this.

Obstacles to the development of manufacture even during its classical period are limitation of the number of unskilled workers owing to the predominance of the skilled; limitation of the work of women and children owing to the men's resistance; the insistence on the LAWS OF APPRENTICESHIP up to recent times, even where superfluous; continual insubordination of the workers, since the collective worker as yet possesses no framework independent of the workers; emigration of the workers. (Pp. 353, 354.)

Besides, manufacture itself was unable to revolutionise the whole of social production or even merely to dominate it. Its narrow technical basis came into conflict with the production

requirements that it had itself created. The machine became necessary, and manufacture had already learned how to make it. (P. 355.)

#### 4. MACHINERY AND LARGE-SCALE INDUSTRY

##### a. Machinery as Such

The revolution in the mode of production, starting in manufacture with labour-*power*, here starts with the *instruments* of labour.

All fully-developed machinery consists of 1) the motor mechanism; 2) the transmitting mechanism; 3) the machine tool. (P. 357.) The industrial revolution of the eighteenth century started with the *machine tool*. What characterises it is that the tool—in a more or less modified form—is transferred from man to the machine, and is worked by the machine under the operation of man. At the outset it is immaterial whether the motive *power* is human or a natural one. The specific difference is that man *uses* only his *own organs while the machine can, within certain limits, employ as many tools as demanded*. (Spinning-wheel, 1 spindle; jenny, 12 to 18 spindles.)

So far, in the spinning-wheel it is not the treadle, the power, but the spindle that is affected by the [industrial] revolution—at the beginning man is still motive power and tender at the same time everywhere. The revolution of the machine tool, on the contrary, first made the perfecting of the steam-engine a necessity, and then also carried it out. (Pp. 359-60; also pp. 361-62.)

Two kinds of machinery in large-scale industry: either (1) co-operation of similar machines (POWER-LOOM, ENVELOPE-MACHINE, which combines the work of a number of detail workers through the combination of various tools), in this case technological unity already, through the transmission and the motive power; or 2) machine system, combination of different detail machines (spinning-mill). The natural basis for this is the division of labour in manufacture. But at once an essential difference. In manufacture every detail process had to be adapted to the *labourer*; this is no longer necessary here—the labour process can be *objectively* dissected into its component parts, which are then left to science, or to experience based upon it, to be mastered by machines.—Here the quantitative ratio of the several groups of workers is repeated as the ratio of the several groups of machines. (Pp. 363-66.)

In both cases the factory constitutes a *huge automaton* (moreover perfected to that stage only recently) and this is its adequate form.

(P. 367.) And its most perfect form is the *machine-building automaton*, which abolished the handicraft and manufacture foundation of large-scale industry, and thus first provided the consummate form of machinery. (Pp. 369-72.)

Connection between the revolutionising of the various branches up to the means of communication. (P. 370.)

In manufacture the combination of workers is subjective. Here there is an objective *mechanical* production organism, which the worker finds ready at hand, and which can function only through collective labour; the co-operative character of the labour process is now a *technological necessity*. (P. 372.)

The productive forces arising from co-operation and the division of labour cost capital nothing; the natural forces: steam, water, also cost nothing. Neither do the forces discovered by science. But the latter can be realised only with suitable apparatus, which can be constructed only at great expense; likewise the machine tools cost much more than the old tools. But these machines have a much longer life and a much greater field of production than the tool; they therefore transfer a much smaller portion of value, comparatively, to the product than a tool, and hence the *gratuitous service* performed by the machine (which does *not* re-appear in the value of the product) is much greater than in the case of the tool. (Pp. 374, 375, 376.)

Reduction in cost through concentration of production is much greater in large-scale industry than in manufacture. (P. 375.)

The prices of finished goods prove how much the machine has cheapened production, and that the portion of value due to the instruments of labour grows relatively but declines absolutely. The productivity of the machine is measured by the extent to which it *replaces human labour-power*. Examples. (Pp. 377-79.)

Assumed a steam plough takes the place of 150 workers getting an annual wage of £3,000, this annual wage does *not* represent *all the labour performed by them*, but only the *necessary labour*—however, they also perform *surplus-labour* in addition. If the steam plough costs £3,000, however, that is the expression in money of *all labour embodied in it*. Thus, if the machine costs as much as the labour-power it replaces, the human labour embodied in it is always *much less* than that which it replaces. (P. 380.)

As a means of *cheapening* production, the machine must *cost less labour than it replaces*. But for *capital its value* must be less than *that of the labour-power supplanted by it*. Therefore, machines that do not pay in England may pay in America (e.g., for stonebreaking). Hence, as a result of certain legal restrictions, machines that

formerly did not pay for capital may suddenly make their appearance. (Pp. 380-81.)

b. Appropriation  
of Labour-Power Through Machinery

Since machinery itself contains the power driving it, muscular power drops in value.—*Labour of women and children*; immediate increase in the number of wage-labourers through the enrolling of members of the family who had not previously worked for wages. Thus the value of the man's labour-power is spread over the labour-power of the whole family, i.e., depreciated.—Now four persons must perform not only labour, but also surplus-labour for capital that one family may live, where only one did previously. Thus the degree of exploitation is increased together with the material of exploitation. (P. 383.)

Formerly the sale and purchase of labour-power was a relation between free persons; now minors or children are bought; the worker now sells wife and child—he becomes a slave-dealer. Examples (pp. 384-85).

Physical deterioration—mortality of workers' children (p. 386), in industrialised agriculture as well. (GANG SYSTEM.<sup>a</sup>) (P. 387.)

Moral degradation. (P. 389.) Educational clauses and manufacturers' resistance to them. (P. 390.)

The entrance of women and children into the factory finally breaks down the male worker's resistance to the despotism of capital. (P. 391.)

If machinery shortens the labour-time necessary to produce an object, in the hands of capital it becomes the most powerful weapon for lengthening the working day far beyond its normal bounds. It creates, on the one hand, new conditions that enable capital to do so, and on the other, new motives for so doing.

Machinery is capable of perpetual motion, and limited only by the weakness and limitations of the assisting human labour-power. The machine that is worn out in seven and a half years, working twenty hours daily, absorbs just as much surplus-labour for the capitalist, **but in half the time**, as another that is worn out in fifteen years working ten hours daily. (P. 393.)

The moral depreciation of the machine—BY SUPERSEDING—is in this way risked still less. (P. 394.)

---

<sup>a</sup> Here means women and adolescents working in a group for wages.—Ed.

Moreover, a larger quantity of labour is absorbed *without increasing the investments* in buildings and machines; thus not only does surplus-value grow with a lengthened working day, but the outlay required to obtain it diminishes relatively. This is more important in so far as the proportion of *fixed* capital greatly predominates, as is the case in large-scale industry. (P. 395.)

During the first period of machinery, when it possesses a *monopoly* character, profits are enormous, and hence the thirst for more, for boundless lengthening of the working day. With the general introduction of machinery this monopoly profit vanishes, and the law asserts itself that surplus-value arises, not from the labour *supplanted* by the machine, but from the labour *employed* by it, that is, from the variable capital. But under machine production the latter is necessarily *reduced* by the large outlays. Thus there is an inherent contradiction in the capitalist employment of machinery: for a given mass of capital it *increases* one factor of surplus-value, its *rate*, by *reducing* the other, the *number of workers*. As soon as the value of a machine-made commodity becomes the regulating social value of that commodity, this contradiction comes to light, and *again drives towards lengthening the working day*. (P. 397.)

But at the same time machinery, by setting free supplanted workers, as well as by enrolling women and children, produces a *surplus working population*, which must let capital dictate the law to it. Hence machinery overthrows all the moral and natural bounds of the working day. Hence the paradox that the most powerful means of shortening labour-time is the most infallible means of converting the whole lifetime of the worker and of his family into available labour-time for expanding the value of capital. (P. 398.)

We have already seen how the social reaction occurs here through the fixing of the normal working day; on this basis there now develops the *intensification of labour*. (P. 399.)

At the beginning, with the speeding-up of the machine, the intensity of labour increases simultaneously with the lengthening of labour-time. But soon the point is reached where the two exclude each other. It is different, however, when labour-time is restricted. Intensity can now grow; in 10 hours as much work can be done as ordinarily in 12 or more, and now the more intensive working-day counts as *raised to a higher power*, and labour is measured not merely by its length of time, but by its intensity. (P. 400.) Thus, in 5 hours of necessary and 5 hours of surplus-labour, the same surplus-value can be attained as in 6

hours of necessary and 6 hours of surplus-labour at lower intensity. (P. 400.)

How is labour intensified? In **manufacture** it has been proved (note 159, p. 401), pottery, for instance, etc., that *mere shortening of the working day* is sufficient to raise productivity enormously. In *machine labour* this was far more doubtful. But R. Gardner's proof. (Pp. 401-02.)<sup>188</sup>

As soon as the shortened working day becomes *law*, the machine becomes a means of squeezing more intensive labour out of the worker, either by GREATER SPEED OR LESS HANDS IN RELATION TO MACHINE. Examples. (Pp. 403-07.) Evidence that enrichment and expansion of the factory grew simultaneously therewith. (Pp. 407-09.)

#### c. The Whole Factory in Its Classical Form

In the factory the *machine* takes care of the proper manipulation of the tool; thus the qualitative differences of labour developed in manufacture are here abolished; labour is *levelled out* more and more; at most, difference in age and sex. The division of labour is here a *distribution of workers among the specialised machines*. Here division is only between *principal workers*, who are really employed at the tool, and *FEEDERS* (this is true only for the self-acting mule, scarcely so for the THROSTLE, and still less for the CORRECTED POWER LOOM), in addition, supervisors, ENGINEERS and STOCKERS, MECHANICS, JOINERS, etc., a class only outwardly aggregated to the factory. (Pp. 411-12.)

The necessity for adapting the worker to the continuous motion of an automaton requires training from childhood, but by no means that a worker be any longer chained to one detail function all his life, as in manufacture. Change of personnel can take place at the same machine (RELAY SYSTEM), and because of the slight effort required to learn, the workers can be shifted from one kind of machine to another. The work of the attendants is either very simple or is taken over more and more by the machine. None the less, at the beginning, the division of labour dictated by manufacture persists traditionally, and itself becomes a greater weapon for exploitation by capital. The worker becomes a lifelong part of a detail machine. (P. 413.)

All capitalist production, in so far as it is not only a labour process but also a process for expanding the value of capital, has this in common that it is not the worker who makes use of the

conditions of labour, but *vice versa*, the conditions of labour which make use of the worker; but only through machinery does this perversion acquire technological, palpable reality. Through its conversion into an *automaton*, the instrument of labour itself confronts the labourer, during the labour process, as *capital*, as dead labour that dominates and sucks dry the living labour-power. Ditto the intellectual faculties of the production process as the power of capital over labour... The detail skill of the individual, pumped-out machine operator vanishes as a tiny secondary thing alongside science, the tremendous natural forces and social mass labour which are embodied in the machine system. (Pp. 414, 415.)

Barracks-like discipline of the factory, factory code. (P. 416.)

Material conditions of the factory. (Pp. 417-18.)

#### c or d. The Workers' Struggle Against the Factory System and Machinery

This struggle, existing since the origin of the capitalist relationship, first occurs here as a revolt against the machine as the material basis of the capitalist mode of production. Ribbon looms. (P. 419.) Luddites.<sup>189</sup> (P. 420.) Only later do the workers distinguish between the material means of production and the social form of their exploitation.

In manufacture the improved division of labour was rather a means of *virtually* replacing the labourers. (P. 421.) (Digression on agriculture, displacement p. 422.) But in machinery the worker is *actually displaced*; the machine competes with him directly. HAND-LOOM WEAVERS. (P. 423.) Likewise India. (P. 424.) This effect is permanent, since machinery continually seizes upon new fields of production. The self-dependent and estranged form that capitalist production gives the instrument of labour as against the labourer is developed by *machinery* into a thorough *antagonism*—hence now the labourer's revolt first against the instrument of labour. (P. 424.)

Details of the displacement of workers by machines. (Pp. 425, 426.) The machine as a means of breaking the workers' resistance to capital by displacing them. (Pp. 427, 428.)

Liberal political economy maintains that the machine, displacing workers, at the same time releases capital that can employ these workers. On the contrary, however, every introduction of machines *ties up* capital, diminishes its *variable* and increases its constant components; it can, therefore, merely *restrict* capital's



capacity for employment. In fact—and this is what these apologists<sup>190</sup> also mean—in this manner not capital is set free; but *the means of subsistence* of the displaced workers are set free; *the workers are set free from the means of subsistence*, which the apologist expresses by saying that *the machine sets free means of subsistence for the worker*. (Pp. 429-30.)

This further developed (*very good for “Fortnightly”*<sup>191</sup>) (pp. 431-32): the antagonisms inseparable from the capitalist employment of machinery *do not exist for the apologists, because they do not arise out of machinery as such, but out of its capitalist employment*. (P. 432.)

Expansion of production by machines directly and indirectly, and thus *possible* increase in number of workers hitherto employed: miners, slaves IN COTTON STATES, etc. On the other hand, displacement of Scotch and Irish by sheep to suit the requirements of the woollen factories. (Pp. 433, 434.)

Machine production carries the *social* division of labour much further than manufacture did. (P. 435.)

c" or e. Machinery  
and Surplus-Value

The first result of machinery: *increasing surplus-value* together with the mass of products in which it is embodied and on which the capitalist class and its hangers-on live, thus increasing the number of capitalists; new luxury wants together with the means of satisfying them. *Luxury production* grows. Likewise *means of communication* (which, however, absorb only little labour-power in the more developed countries) (evidence p. 436)—finally, the *servant class* grows, the *modern domestic slaves*, whose material is supplied by the *releasing* [of workers]. (P. 437.) **Statistics.**

Economic contradictions. (P. 437.)

Possibility of *absolute increase* in the mass of labour in one branch of business owing to machines, and the modalities of this process. (Pp. 439-40.)

Enormous elasticity, capacity for sudden extension by leaps of large-scale industry at a high degree of development. (P. 441.) Reaction upon the countries producing raw materials. Emigration owing to release of workers. International division of labour of the industrial and agricultural countries—periodicity of crises and prosperity. (P. 442.) Workers thrown back and forth in this process of expansion. (P. 444.)

Historical data on this. (Pp. 445-49.)

Displacement of co-operation and manufacture by machinery (and the intermediate stages, pp. 450-51). Also change in branches of industry not run on factory lines but in the spirit of large-scale industry—domestic industry, an outside department of the factory. (P. 452.) In domestic industry and modern manufacture, exploitation still more shameless than in the factory proper. (P. 453.) Examples: London print-shops (p. 453), book-binding, rag-sorting (p. 454), brick-making (p. 455). Modern manufacture in general. (P. 456.) *Domestic industry: lace making* (pp. 457-59), *straw plaiting* (p. 460). Conversion into factory production with achievement of ultimate limit of exploitability: *WEARING APPAREL* by the *sewing-machine* (pp. 462-66). Speeding-up of this conversion by extension of the compulsory Factory Acts, which put an end to the old routine based upon unlimited exploitation. (P. 466.) *Examples: pottery* (p. 467), lucifer matches (p. 468). Furthermore, effect of the Factory Acts upon irregular work, owing to the workers' irregular habits, as well as to seasons and fashions. (P. 470.) Overwork alongside idleness, owing to the seasons, in domestic industry and manufacture. (P. 471.)

Sanitary clauses of the Factory Acts. (P. 473.) Educational clauses. (P. 476.)

Discharge of workers merely because of *age*, as soon as they are grown up and are no longer fitted for the work, and can no longer live on a child's wages, while at the same time they have learned no new trade. (P. 477.)

Dissolution of the MYSTERIES and of the traditional ossification of manufacture and handicraft, by large-scale industry, which converts the production process into a conscious application of natural forces. Hence it alone is *revolutionary*, as against all earlier forms. (P. 479.) But as a capitalist form it lets the ossified division of labour *persist for the worker*, and since it daily revolutionises the former's basis, it ruins the worker. On the other hand, in this very thing, in this necessary change of activities of one and the same worker lies the requirement of his being as versatile as possible and the possibilities of the social revolution. (Pp. 480-81.)

Need for extending factory legislation to all branches not operated on factory lines. (P. 482 ff.) Act of 1867. (P. 485.) Mines (note, p. 486 ff.).

Concentrating effect of the Factory Acts; generalisation of factory production and thus of the classical form of capitalist production; accentuation of its inherent contradictions, maturing

of the elements for overturning the old society, and of the elements for forming the new. (Pp. 488-93.)

*Agriculture.* Here release of workers by machines is even more acute. Replacement of the peasant by the wage-labourer. Destruction of rural domestic manufacture. Accentuation of the antithesis between town and country. Dispersion and weakening of the rural labourers, whereas the urban workers become concentrated; hence wages of agricultural workers are reduced down to a minimum. At the same time robbing of *the soil*: the acme of the capitalist mode of production is the undermining of the *sources of all wealth*: the soil and the labourer. (Pp. 493-96.)<sup>a</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> Here follows the title of the next chapter: Chapter V.—Further Investigations of the Production of Surplus-Value, and the manuscript breaks off.—*Ed.*

FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS



## Karl Marx

[DRAFT FOR A SPEECH  
ON FRANCE'S ATTITUDE TO POLAND  
(POLEMICS AGAINST PETER FOX)<sup>192]</sup>

Mr. Fox has rolled up a rather phantastic picture of the foreign policy of the French Ancient Regime. According to his view, France allied herself with Sweden, Poland, and Turkey in order to protect Europe from Russia. The truth is that France contracted those alliances in the 16th and 17th centuries, at a time when Poland was still a powerful state and when Russia, in the modern sense of the word, did not yet exist. There existed then a Grand Duchy of Muscovy, but there existed not yet a Russian Empire. It was therefore not *against Russia* that France concluded those alliances with the Turks, the Magyars, the Poles, and the Swedes. She concluded them *against Austria* and *against the German Empire*, as a means of extending the power, the influence, and the territorial possessions of France over Germany, Italy, Spain. I shall not enter upon details. It will suffice for my purpose to say, that France used those alliances in the midst of the 17th century to bring about the *treaty of Westphalia*,<sup>193</sup> by which Germany was not only dismembered, one part of it being given to France and the other to Sweden, but every little German prince and baron obtained the treaty right to sell his country and France obtained a *protectorate* over Germany. After the treaty of Westphalia, in the second part of the 17th century, Louis XIV, the true representative of the old Bourbon policy at the time of its strength, bought the king of England, Charles II, in order to ruin the Dutch republic.<sup>194</sup> His *system of vandalism and perfidy* then carried out against Holland, Belgium, Spain, Germany and Piedmont—during about 40 years, cannot be better characterised than by the one fact, that *in a memorandum*, drawn up in 1837 by the Russian chancellery for the information of *the present Czar*,<sup>195</sup> the system of

war and diplomacy of Louis XIV from the middle to the end of the 17th century *is recommended as the model system* to be followed by Russia.

Modern Russia dates only from the 18th century, and it is therefore from that time alone that resistance to Russia could have entered into the policy of France or any other European state.

I proceed at once to *the time of Louis XV* which Mr. Fox has justly pointed out as the epoch when the French foreign policy was most favourable to Poland and most hostile to Russia.

Now there happened three great events under the regime of Louis XV—in regard to Russia and Poland, 1) the so-called *Polish succession war*, 2) *the Seven Years' War*, and 3) *the first partition of Poland*. I shall consider the attitude taken by the French government in regard to these events.

### 1. *The So-called Polish Succession War*

After the death of *Augustus II* (king of Poland and elector of Saxony), in *September 1733*, one party of the Polish aristocracy wanted to elect his son<sup>a</sup> as king. He was supported by Russia and Austria, because he had promised to the Czarina<sup>b</sup> not to reclaim Courland,<sup>196</sup> formerly a fief of Poland, and because he had promised to the Emperor<sup>c</sup> the guarantee of the pragmatic sanction.<sup>197</sup> The other party, instigated by France, elected *Stanislaus Leszczinski*, who had formerly been made Polish king by Charles XII of Sweden and who was at that time the father-in-law of Louis XV. There broke consequently a war out between France on the one hand, Russia and Austria on the other. This is *the only war which France has ever professedly carried on behalf of Poland*. France made war in Germany and Italy, but as far as her Polish protégé was concerned, limited herself to sending 1,500 men to Dantzick, then a Polish town.<sup>198</sup> The war having lasted two years, what was its upshot? A *treaty of peace (Peace of Vienna, October 1735)*,<sup>199</sup> by which the *duchy of Lorraine*, a German fief, was *incorporated into France*, and the Bourbon dynasty planted in *Naples and Sicily*, the same dynasty of which king Bomba<sup>d</sup> was the last lively representative. In all other respects this "*war about the throne of Poland*" ended in acknowledging the *Russian candidate*, Augustus III, as king of Poland, but securing to Louis XV's

<sup>a</sup> Frederick Augustus II (later King Augustus III of Poland).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Anna Ivanovna.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Charles VI.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Ferdinand II (nicknamed "Bomba" for the bombardment of Messina in September 1848).—*Ed.*

father-in-law the prerogative of being called king and a very large yearly pension to be paid by Poland. This war instigated and carried on by France under false pretences, ended in the humiliation of Poland, the extension of the Russian power, and great disadvantages to Turkey and Sweden, which France had also driven into a false position and then left in the lurch. But I shall not enter upon these details.

The conduct of the French government cannot be excused on the plea that the British government prevented it during this so-called *Polish succession war* of acting in the right direction. On the contrary. When the Emperor Charles VI appealed to England, the latter clung to the Anglo-French alliance which had continued since 1716 and was barren of any good results whatever. At all events: this time the French government's good designs for Poland were not baffled by England.

Before leaving the subject, I must mention that the *peace between Turkey and Russia*, brought about by French mediation (Villeneuve, French ambassador) in 1739, was a great blow to Poland.<sup>200</sup> I quote Rulhière; he says:

"it annulled the treaty of the Pruth, the only shield that remained to the Poles" ("cet unique bouclier qui restait à la Pologne"), et le nouveau traité, signé à Belgrad, in 1739, déclara dans son dernier article "que toutes les conventions antérieures n'auraient plus aucune force".<sup>a</sup>

## 2. The Seven Years' War (1756-1763)

I come now to the 7 Years' War.<sup>201</sup>

Mr. Fox has told you that that war was very unhappy for France, because it deprived her, to the benefit of England, of most of her colonies. But this is not the question before us. What we have to inquire into is, what part France played during that war in regard to Poland and Russia.

You must know that from 1740 to 1748, during the so-called Austrian succession war,<sup>202</sup> France had allied herself with Frederick II of Prussia against Russia, Austria and England. During the *Seven Years' War* she allied herself with Austria and Russia against Prussia and England, so that, at all events, during this war England was the official enemy, and France the avowed ally of Russia.

It was first in 1756 under the Abbé Bernis, and then again 1758 under the duke of Choiseul, that France concluded her treaty with Austria (and Russia), against Prussia.

<sup>a</sup> and the last article of the new treaty signed in Belgrade in 1739 declared "that all previous conventions will have *power no more*". Cl. Rulhière, *Histoire de l'Anarchie de Pologne*, t. I, Paris, 1819.—Ed.



Let us hear *Rulhière*. (*Histoire de l'Anarchie de Pologne* etc. Paris, 1819. 2nd edit.)

"When Count Broglie arrived in 1752 as ambassador at Varsovie, France had no party in Poland. People thought of the promises which France had already so often failed to fulfil (auxquelles la France avait déjà si souvent manqué). They had not forgotten that three times since a century, France had rallied around her powerful Polish factions... but that after having formed them with passion (ardeur), she had always abandoned them with levity (elle les avait chaque fois abandonnées avec légèreté). She had left in distress the majority of those who had trusted to the seductions of her pretended projects for the welfare of the republic" (*t. I, 213*). ("Elle avait laissé dans l'infortune la plupart de ceux qui s'étaient livrés à la séduction de ces prétendus projets pour le salut de la république.")

"The Duke of Broglie, after three years' activity, had formed a counterparty against the Czartoryski,<sup>a</sup> won over the Polish court, put into motion the Swedes, the Tartars, the Turks, opened a connection with the Cossacks of the Ukraine" etc. "*Frederick II* contributed to call into life this formidable coalition against the Russians, from which he expected himself his own security. The Russian minister<sup>b</sup> had lost all influence at Warsaw. In one word, in the first months of 1756, at the moment when the hostilities between England and France, first opened in America, were on the point of embracing the whole of Europe, Count Broglie had it in his power to form in Poland a confederation which, supported by the subsidies of France, provided by her with arms and munitions, and protected by so many border nations would have altogether withdrawn Poland from the yoke of Russia and restored to that republic laws, government, and power. But France suspended all the help (secours) she had promised, and upset all the measures of her ambassador." (*Rulhière, t. I, p. 225.*)

The levity with which France abused her influence may be seen—en passant—from the way in which she treated *Sweden*. First she goaded her into a war with Prussia against Russia (in the Austrian succession war), and then into a war with Russia against Prussia, Sweden being both times the victim of those French intrigues, and Russia gaining both times in that quarter.

Well. What were the consequences of the Seven Years' War which France carried on as the *ally of Russia* (and Austria) against *Prussia* (and England)?

That the material resources of Poland were exhausted, that Russia founded her supremacy in Germany, that Prussia was made her slave, that Catherine II became the most powerful sovereign in Europe, and that the *first partition of Poland* took place. Such were the *immediate consequences* of the *French policy during the Seven Years' War*.

1) During the Seven Years' War the *Russian* armies treated Poland as their property, took there their winter-quarters etc. I shall quote *Favier*:

<sup>a</sup> Fryderyk Michał Czartoryski.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Heinrich Gross.—*Ed.*

"The peril was that Russia, improving the pretext of the war against the king of Prussia, enforced, on the territory of Poland, the passage of her troops, appropriated herself the means of subsistence, and even took her winter-quarters in Poland. By allowing her to employ anew those arbitrary means, that vast country was surrendered to the greediness of the Russian generals, the despotism of their court, and all the projects of future usurpations which Russia would be tempted to form, from the facility of exercising all sorts of vexations against a nation divided, insulated, and abandoned." (*Politique de tous les cabinets de l'Europe etc. 2nd edit. par L. P. Ségur, Ex-ambassadeur. Paris, 1801, t. I, p. 300.*)

France discredited herself by giving the Russians such free scope.

"That weakness on her part seemed the less pardonable (excusable) because ... she was then in a position to make the law to Russia and Austria, and not at all to receive it from them."

Count Broglie had made in vain proposals to that effect... France allowed Russia to treat Poland like her own property... *The Polish nation, from that moment, considered France as a mere instrument in the hands of the courts of Vienna and Petersburg.*

"*This was the origin of our discredit, of our nullity at the time of the election of Count Poniatowski, and of the bad success of everything we attempted or favoured since that epoch*". (303, 304, l. c. *Ségur.*) ("la nation polonoise ne vit plus dès lors la France que comme un instrument des cours de Vienne et de Pétersbourg. [...] Voilà l'origine de notre discrédit, de notre nullité etc.")

France was bound, by the *treaty of Oliva* (1660)<sup>203</sup> to protect the Polish Republic.

2) During the 7 Years' War the Russians used *Poland*, although she was ostensibly neutral,<sup>204</sup> as their basis of operations against *Prussia*. This the Poles *allowed under the diplomatic pressure of France*. It was thus that the Russians were enabled during 7 years to devastate Prussia proper, Silesia, Pomerania, Brandenburg, and even sack Berlin. They in fact ravaged the Prussian monarchy like wild beasts, while the French acted in the same style in Hanover, Westphalia, Saxony, Thuringia etc. Now, Poland was by the *treaty of Wehlau* (1660 or so)<sup>205</sup> obliged to defend Prussia, against Russia. Frederick II insisted upon the fulfilment of this treaty. That he was right in asking the Poles to observe at least a complete neutrality, and not allowing the Russians to use their country etc., is proved by the fact that on all the *diets* kept in Poland since the opening of the Seven Years' War, it was impossible to come to any resolution, because the *patriotic party* declared, the Poles could not deliberate as long as Russian armies occupied the Polish soil and acted against Prussia. In the last year of the war (1762) the nobility of Posen (Great Poland) had even formed a confederation against the Russians.

If f. i. Belgium allowed Prussia to use it during 7 years, despite its neutrality, as a basis of warlike operations against France, would France not be entitled to treat Belgium as an enemy, and, if she could, to incorporate Belgium, or destroy its independence?

3) The immediate upshot of the 7 Years' War was a treaty between Prussia and Russia, by which the king of Prussia professed himself the *vassal of Russia, Poniatowski king of Poland* but was allowed, in compensation, to share in the *partition of Poland*. That the latter was already convened upon in the treaty of 1764 between Russia and Frederick II<sup>206</sup> is shown by the fact that in the same year Frederick II's and Catherine II's ambassadors at Warsaw<sup>a</sup> solemnly *protested* against that "*calumny*", and that a few years later the English resident at Berlin<sup>b</sup> wrote to his court that Austria, although at first protesting, would be compelled by her proper interests to share in the partition of Poland.

Mr. *Favier* says:

"Our exclusive alliance with the court of Vienna deprived Frederick II of all hope, and reduced him to the necessity of joining that very court which had let loose France upon him, in order to destroy him."<sup>c</sup>

The same *Favier* avers that the secret of all the future successes of *Catherine II* and of the first partition of Poland is to be found in the infeodation to her of Prussia. (*Frederick II.*)

Such was the result of the French policy during the 7 Years' War. It cannot be said that England this time prevented her good designs for Poland, because France was then the ally of Russia, while England stood on the other side.

### [3.] *First Partition of Poland*

Now I must say that even if France had acted more energetically during the Polish war which ended in the first partition of Poland than she really did, it would not have made up for the immense services she had rendered to Russia during the Seven Years' War. The sending of some French officers and subsidies to Poland during the war of the *Confederation of Bar*<sup>207</sup> could in the best case only prolong a useless resistance. It is true that France incited (1768) Turkey to a war against Russia, but only to betray Turkey as usually, and prepare for her the "treaty of *Kudjuk Kainardji*" (1774),<sup>208</sup> from which the supremacy of Russia over Turkey must really be dated.

<sup>a</sup> Gedeon Benoît and Heinrich Gross.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Andrew Mitchell.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> L. P. Ségur, op. cit., t. I, p. 295.—*Ed.*

1770. *Russian Expedition into the Mediterranean*. The then almost dying republic of Venice showed much more courage than France. In that year *Choiseul* still French foreign minister. It was only at the end of 1770 (beginning of 1771) that he was replaced by the *Duke d'Aiguillon*.

"How," says *Favier*, "did it happen that, while France was at peace with England, no step was taken for a convention of neutrality for the Mediterranean? Or why did France alone not oppose this Russian enterprise in a quarter so important for her interests?"

The opinion of *Favier* is, that

"the destruction of the Russian fleet in the Mediterranean by the French [which] might have been easily effected, would probably have changed the whole course of events both in Turkey and Poland, and would, moreover, have taught Austria to respect the French Alliance" (*Ségur etc. Politique de tous les cabinets etc.*, v. II, p. 174).

But France who had goaded Turkey into the war against Russia did not move one finger against the Russian expedition of 1770, the only one which was of any import. (The *Turkish fleet* destroyed in the narrow bay of *Tschesmé*.<sup>209</sup>) The same *Choiseul* had English bluster (*Chatham* himself) not allowed to prevent him a year ago from buying *Corsica* from the *Genoese*. You must not forget that at that time *North* was minister, and could only keep himself in office by keeping the peace at any price. He was one of the most unpopular ministers. At that time revolutionary, antidynastic movement in England. It is true that in 1773 (the Russians made then a new naval expedition which, however, remained without any influence upon the war with Turkey) the duke of *Aiguillon* allowed himself to be prevented by the English Ambassador at Paris, Lord *Stormont*, from attacking the Russian fleet in the *Baltic* (and *Mediterranean*). At that time the first partition of Poland was already consummated. The true object of the French demonstration was not Poland, but Sweden, and France so far succeeded, that *Gustave III* was not forced by Russia to rescind his *coup d'état* (1772).<sup>210</sup>

Moreover, what sort of fellow this *d'Aiguillon* was?

*Ségur* says in his notes to *Favier*:

"When the rumour got first afloat as to the partition which was to give Prussia an increase of territory which Austria was afraid of, the court of Vienna warned France, and gave her to understand that she would oppose herself, if the court of Versailles would support her. Louis XV, at that time only occupied by his pleasures, and M. *d'Aiguillon* by his intrigues, the Austrian cabinet received no re-assuring answer and liked better to concur to the partition of Poland than to maintain alone a war against the Prussians and Russians combined." ([t. I], 147, Note.) "Count *Mercy*—Austrian ambassador—has publicly given out" (*répandu dans le public*) "that the king of Prussia had communicated to the Austrian

minister<sup>a</sup> the answers of the Duke of Aiguillon, by which that minister assured His Prussian Majesty that France was indifferent to all that could be done in Poland and that she would not consider a *casus foederis*" (case of war) "anything that might be agreed upon, in regard to that subject, by the courts of Berlin and Vienna" (243, Note).

Now, although I do not put any confidence whatever in the assurances of the Austrian court, which was then acting with the utmost perfidy, the very fact, that a *French ambassador* of Louis XVI (Ségur), published this at Paris, shows the estimation Louis XV and his d'Aiguillon enjoyed—and were worth enjoying.

#### [4.] *French Republic*

*From September 21, 1792 to November 11, 1799 (the day after 19 Brumaire, when the Executive Directory<sup>211</sup> was overthrown)<sup>b</sup>*

The second partition treaty *between Russia and Prussia on 4 January 1793.*<sup>c</sup>

The first crusade against France 1792 had taken such an unfortunate turn, that already in the beginning of winter the Austrian Netherlands (*Belgium*) were occupied by the French. Prussia withdrew her troops from the field of action; the condition insisted upon by her *on the Congress of Verdun*<sup>212</sup> for continuing her participation in the Anti-Jacobin war was that she should be allowed to make with Russia *a second partition of Poland*. Austria was to be compensated by indemnities in the Alsace.

At the end of 1793 (*September*) Prussia again withdrew her troops to march them, under the king,<sup>d</sup> to the Polish frontier (to "secure" his Polish possession), because some differences had broken out, in regard to some definitive stipulations, between Prussia and Russia, the latter seeming to turn against Prussia her influence over the expiring diet of the traitors of Targowicz.<sup>213</sup> The result of this second withdrawal of Prussia, to take real possession of her Polish provinces, forces the Austrians to *withdraw from the Alsace*.

*In the spring of 1794* Kościuszko's revolutionary rising. Prussia marched at once her troops against Poland. Beaten. In *September 1794*, while forced to retreat from Warsaw, at the same time rising

<sup>a</sup> Gottfried van Swieten.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The text in brackets is in French in the original.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> More accurately: January 23, 1793.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Frederick William II.—*Ed.*

in Posen. Then the king of Prussia declared his intention to withdraw from the contest carried on against France. Austria also, in the autumn 1794, detached a body of troops for Poland, by which circumstance the success of the French arms on the Rhine and so forth was secured. Already towards the end of 1794 Prussia commenced negotiations with France.<sup>214</sup> Withdrew. Consequence: *Holland* succumbed to the French (conquest of Holland through Pichegru).

Those diversions facilitated by turns the conquest of Belgium, the success on the Alps, the Pyrenees, the left bank of the Rhine, and, 1795, the conquest of Holland by Pichegru. In the very months October, *November* (1794) everywhere French successes when Kościuszko succumbed, Praga was taken by Suvorov etc., immense murdering etc.

*Third Partition of Poland signed: 24 October 1795.*

By the outbreak of the French Revolution Catherine got the opportunity quietly first to carry on her war with Turkey,<sup>215</sup> while all Europe was turned to the West.

As the Pope has issued bulls for crusades against the infidels, so Catherine II against the Jacobins. Even while *Leopold II* chased the *French Emigrés* from his states and forbade them to assemble on the French frontiers, Catherine, through her agent Rumjanzev, provided them with money and quartered them in the frontier provinces, bordering upon France, and ruled by ecclesiastic princes.

After the conclusion of her war with Turkey, Catherine II did not commence her hostilities against Poland before she had been informed that the National Assembly had *declared war to Austria*. This news arrived at Vienna on *30 April 1792*, and on the *18 May* the Russian ambassador Boulgakov *presented a declaration of war to the Polish king Stanislaus*.<sup>a</sup> The first in impressing upon England, Austria and Prussia the dangers of the revolutionary principles, Catherine steadily pursued her own separate interests (in Turkey and Poland) without furnishing a single Cossack or subscribing a single rouble for the "common cause".

*Poland was blotted out under cover of the French Revolution and the Anti-Jacobin war.*

Rev. L. K. Pitt (a nephew or cousin of the English minister), chaplain to the British factory at St. Petersburg, writes in a *secret document*: "*Account of Russia during the Commencement of the Reign of the Emperor Paul*":

---

<sup>a</sup> Poniatowski.—Ed.

"She" (the Czarina) "was not perhaps displeased to see every European power exhausting itself in a struggle, which raised in proportion to its violence her own importance ... the state of the newly acquired provinces in Poland was likewise a point which had considerable influence over the political conduct of the Czarina. The fatal effects resulting from an apprehension of revolt on the late seat of conquest, seem to have been felt in a very great degree by the combined powers who, in the early period of the revolution, were so near re-instating the regular government in France. The same dread of revolt deterred likewise the late Empress of Russia from entering on the great theatre of war."

The question is now: How behaved revolutionary France towards this useful ally.

Let us first hear a French historian, *Lacretelle* (t. XII, p. 261 sqq.):

"The Republic", says he, "had shown itself very indifferent to the troubles and misfortunes of Poland. It was on the contrary a great motive of security for it to see the Empress of Russia occupy all the forces of her powerful empire for the conquest and dismemberment of that unfortunate country. Very soon the French Republic became aware that Poland freed it of its most ardent enemy, the king of Prussia etc."<sup>a</sup>

But republican France actually betrayed Poland.

"The Polish agent Bars at Paris presented to the government", says *Ogiński*, an eye-witness, "the plan of the revolution which was preparing in Poland, and which was received with a general enthusiasm and approbation. He enumerated the assistance of every kind which would be necessary for that important and daring enterprise. The *Comité du Salut Public*<sup>216</sup> found his demand very just and promised to do every thing possible; but to promises all the negotiation was limited." (*Michel Ogiński: Mémoires sur la Pologne etc., from 1788 to the end of 1815. Paris, 1826, t. I, p. 358.*)

"The comité of public welfare had promised to general Kościuszko a sum of 3 millions of livres and some officers of artillery; but we did receive neither one single sou nor one single officer",

we are told by an aide-de-camp of *Kościuszko, J. Niemcewicz: Notes sur ma captivité à St. Pétersbourg, en 1794-1796. Paris, 1843. (V. p. 90.)*<sup>b</sup>

On 5 April 1795 the directory (which had then replaced the comité du salut public) concluded with Prussia the *Peace of Basel*. By this peace *Holland and the left bank of the Rhine were surrendered to France*. The northern part of Germany, designed by a line of demarcation, was *neutralised*, Prussia to be indemnified by the secularisation of several German bishoprics. That treaty of Basel

<sup>a</sup> Marx quotes *Lacretelle's Histoire de France, pendant le XVIII-ème siècle* from L. L. Sawaszkievicz's *Tableau de l'influence de la Pologne sur les destinées de la Révolution française et de l'Empire*, 3rd ed., Paris, 1848, p. 37, note.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Marx quotes both *Ogiński* and *Niemcewicz* according to *Sawaszkievicz*, op. cit., pp. 33-34.—*Ed.*

"by *guaranteeing the respective possessions* of the two contracting powers, and including no clause whatever in regard to the newly invaded provinces of Poland, granted their possession to the king of Prussia".<sup>a</sup>

Ogiński tells us that when the Poles were informed of the peace-negotiations, their agent *Bars* addressed the members of the directory peculiarly friendly to Poland, and asked for a clause obliging the king of Prussia to renounce etc.

"He was answered that the condition was not acceptable since it would retard the negotiations with Prussia, that France wanted to restore her forces, that the peace with Prussia would not last long, that the Poles should keep themselves ready for new efforts which would be asked from them in the cause of liberty and their country etc."

The same Ogiński, t. II, p. 133 and 223, tells us:

"The treaty concluded between the French Republic and the king of Prussia had made a very bad impression upon the Divan, which pretended that if France had been unable to obtain anything for Poland in her negotiations with the court of Berlin, it was impossible that the Turks alone could act in favour of Poland."

After the *third division* Russia was forced to keep quiet for a few years. The Poles now participated in all the campaigns of the *French Republic*, principally in Italy. (See: *Chodźko: Histoire des Légions Polonaises en Italie, de 1795 à 1802. Paris, 1829.*)

Before the conclusion of the Peace of Campo-Formio (17 October 1797),<sup>217</sup> after a plan mutually agreed upon, and with the consent of Bonaparte, General *Dombrowski* was to march through Croatia and Hungary, into Galicia, and thus make a diversion in favour of Bonaparte, who would have marched upon Vienna. *Charles de la Croix*, minister of foreign affairs (see Ogiński, t. II, p. 272-278) proposed to Ogiński "*to insurge Galicia*". Ogiński was afraid lest the Poles should be treated as mere tools thrown away after having been used. He therefore demanded a positive assurance that those sacrifices would earn for them French assistance for the recovery of their country. Lacroix played then the irritated bully. The French government did not want them; if they had no confidence, they might try their fortune somewhere else etc. He gave Ogiński three days' time for considering, after which they were to accept or [to] refuse, but without putting *any conditions* whatever. The poor Poles declared ready for whatever the French government wanted. But that government wanted only their formal acceptance in order to intimidate Austria by it and so to hasten the conclusion of peace. *Armistice at Leoben, 18 April 1797.*

<sup>a</sup> Here and below Marx quotes Ogiński's *Mémoires sur la Pologne* in the free rendering given in Sawaszkiwicz's book (op. cit., p. 40).—Ed.



*Treaty of Campo-Formio* in which the Poles were again sacrificed in the same way as they had been in the *treaty of Basel*.

In 1799 at last *Suvorov*, the effect of the disappearance of Poland made itself felt to the French republic. *Russian armies* appeared in Holland and in *Italy*. *Suvorov* penetrates to the very frontiers of France.

When on 27 July<sup>a</sup> 1799 the French surrendered Mantua to the *Russian* general Vielhorski,<sup>218</sup> there was a *secret article* in the capitulation by which the Austrians got back their deserters, viz. the Austrian *Poles* who had entered the legions. After the surrender of Mantua, the 2nd legion fell into the hands of the enemy; the first legion, under Dombrowski, joined the Great Army,<sup>219</sup> and was almost entirely annihilated in the great battles against the Russo-Austrian armies.

#### [5.] *Consulate*

9 November 1799 (18 Brumaire) *Consulate*. Bonaparte authorizes the formation of new Polish legions, one at Marseilles under Dombrowski, one on the Danube under general Kniaziewicz. These legions assist at Marengo and Hohenlinden.<sup>220</sup> See order of the day of general Moreau, where he renders justice

“to the stern constancy of general Kniaziewicz and his Polish soldiers”.<sup>b</sup>

*Treaty of Lunéville* with *Austria*, 9 February<sup>c</sup> 1801.<sup>221</sup> No article relating to Poland.

*Treaty of Paris*, October 1801, with Paul I of *Russia*.<sup>222</sup> In this treaty Paul I and Bonaparte promised each other

“not to allow that any of their subjects should be allowed to entertain any correspondence, whether direct or indirect, with the internal enemies of the actual governments of the two states, there to propagate principles contrary to their respective constitutions, or to foment troubles”.<sup>d</sup>

This article related to the Poles on the [one] hand, to the Bourbons and their partisans on the other.

In 1801 there appeared in the *Moniteur* a series of articles written by Bonaparte himself and justifying the ambition of France, because her conquests were hardly an equivalent for the acquisitions which *Russia*, *Austria* and *Prussia* had made by the partition of Poland. (*Thiers, Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire, t. III, p. 153.*)

<sup>a</sup> Inaccuracy in the manuscript: April 28.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Quoted from Sawaszkievicz, op. cit., p. 57, note.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Inaccuracy in the manuscript: January 26.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Quoted from Sawaszkievicz, op. cit., p. 58.—*Ed.*

During the peace the Polish legions were treated as an encumbrance. Part of them were, like Mamelucks, given by Bonaparte as a present to the queen of Etruria.<sup>a</sup>

*Treaty of Amiens. 27 March 1802.*<sup>223</sup> The first consul made embark, by force, for *St. Domingo* part of the Polish legions and made present of the other part to the new *king of Naples*.<sup>b</sup> Threatened by the fire of artillery, they were embarked at Genoa and Livorno to find their graves in *St. Domingo*.<sup>224</sup>

[6.] *Empire*

*May 1804 (crowned 2 December 1804) until 1815.*

*1806-1807.* During his war with Prussia, supported by Russia, Napoleon sent the remainders of the Polish legions under Dombrowski into Prussian Poland, where they conquered Dantzick for him, and insurged the country.

*18 December 1806.* Napoleon himself in Warsaw, then Prussian. Great enthusiasm of the Poles. In his autobiography *Thomas Ostrowski* (Paris 1836), *president of the Senate*, narrates that Napoleon, at the first audience he gave to the members of the administration, received them with the words:

"Gentlemen, I want to-day 200,000 bottles of wine, and as many portions of rice, meat and vegetables. No excuses; if not, I leave you to the Russian knout... I want proofs of your devotion; *I stand in need of your blood*" ("j'ai besoin de votre sang").<sup>c</sup>

He enrolled a Polish army. The campaign lasted until *6 May 1807*.

*25 and 26 June 1807.* Fraternalisation between Napoleon and Alexander on the Niemen.

*Treaty of Tilsit, signed 7 July 1807 (9 July with Prussia).*<sup>225</sup>

Art. V of that treaty proclaimed the foundation of *the duchy of Warsaw* which Napoleon cedes

"in all property and sovereignty to the king of Saxony,<sup>d</sup> to be ruled by constitutions, which, while securing the liberties and privileges of the duchy, were compatible with the *tranquillity of the neighbouring states*".

This duchy was cut out of *Prussian Poland*.

<sup>a</sup> Marie-Louise-Joséphine, wife of Duke Louis Bourbon of Parma.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Joseph Bonaparte.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Tomasz Ostrowski's account of Napoleon's speech was rendered by Antoni Ostrowski in *Żywot Tomasza Ostrowskiego*, Paris, 1836. Marx quotes from Sawasziewicz, op. cit., p. 66.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Frederick August I.—*Ed.*

Art. IX cedes to Russia a part of Poland, the circle of Byalistock, recently conquered from Prussia, and which

“shall be united in perpetuity to the Russian empire, in order to establish the natural limits between Russia and the duchy of Warsaw”.<sup>a</sup>

*Dantzic*, on the pretext of being made a free town, was made a French maritime fortress.

Many large estates in the new duchy were made a present of by Napoleon to the French generals.

*Lelewel* calls this justly the *Fourth Division of Poland*.<sup>b</sup>

Having beaten the Prussians and the Russians by the assistance of the Poles, Napoleon disposed of Poland, as if she was a conquered country and his private property, and he disposed of her to the advantage of Russia.

The duchy of Warsaw was small, without position in Europe. A large civil list; civil government by Saxony, military by Napoleon. *Davout* ruled like a Pasha at Warsaw. He made in fact of the duchy a recruiting place for France, a military dépôt.

(*Sawaszkiwicz, Tableau de l'influence de la Pologne sur les destinées de la Révolution française. Paris, 1848, 3<sup>ème</sup> édit.*)

The duchy of Warsaw was for Napoleon not only an advanced post against Russia. Napoleon had possessed himself of those very points which would serve him as a basis of offensive operations against Prussia and Austria. *Nicholas* acted in his spirit when he fortified those points by a chain of fortresses.

(By inserting at the head of the *treaty of Tilsit* the declaration that only out of courtesy for Alexander he restored to the king of Prussia<sup>c</sup> half of his old territories, Napoleon proclaimed that king, and Prussia, a mere appendage to Russia.)

By the *secret articles* of the *treaty of Tilsit* the public ones were partly revoked. Thus f. i. only to deceive Austria, the public treaty contained articles for the *integrity of Turkey*. By the secret articles Napoleon sacrificed *Turkey and Sweden* to the Czar who surrendered to him *Portugal, Spain, Malta, and the North African coast*; promised his accession to the continental system, and the surrender of the Ionian islands to France.<sup>226</sup> The *partition of Turkey* was only prevented by the opposition of Austria. All the arrangements for a partition of Turkey were beginning after the conclusion of the *Tilsit treaty*. In *August 1808* Alexander handed

<sup>a</sup> Articles of the Treaty of Tilsit are quoted from *Sawaszkiwicz, op. cit.*, p. 68.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. Lelewel, *Histoire de Pologne*.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Frederick William III.—*Ed.*

over to Napoleon the strong places of Dalmatia, also the protectorate over the Ionian islands; while the *Danubian principalities* were occupied by his troops, Napoleon ordered *Marmont*, the French commander in Dalmatia, to prepare the march upon Albania and Macedonia. The negotiations about the *partition of Turkey* were continued at Petersburg, whither Napoleon had sent *Savary*, the head of his gendarmes and mouchards. The *Report* on his *negotiations with Rumjanzev*, the Russian foreign minister, has been recently published. Even *Thibaudeau*, one of Napoleon's senators and admirers, says about the negotiations of Savary with Alexander I and Rumjanzev:

"Putting aside every diplomatical form, they transacted their business in the impudent and reckless way of robber-chiefs dividing their booty".<sup>a</sup>

According to the negotiations between Napoleon and Alexander at Tilsit, *Sweden* and *Denmark* were to be forced to join the continental system. Napoleon ceded to Alexander *Finland* (which the Russians occupied in 1808, and have ever kept since), and besides *Denmark* was interested in the robbery of *Sweden* by making *Norway* over to her. Thus Napoleon succeeded in completely breaking down this old antagonist of Russia.

27 September 1808. Napoleon and Alexander at the Erfurt Congress.

Never before had any man done so much to exalt the Russian power as Napoleon did from 1807-1812. From 1808 to 1811 the Poles were consumed by Napoleon in Spain. For the first time in their history they were prostituted as the mercenaries of despotism. Of the army of 90,000, formed in the duchy, so many were despatched to Spain, that the duchy was denuded of troops when the Austrian archduke Ferdinand invaded it in 1809.

1809, April. While Napoleon marched upon Vienna, the archduke Ferdinand upon Warsaw. The Poles invade Galicia, force the archduke to withdraw from Warsaw (1 June); the Russians, Napoleon's allies, enter Galicia to assist in fact the Austrians against the Poles.

14 October 1809: The Polish provinces called by the Austrians "New Galicia", together with the district of Zamojsk, was reunited to the duchy of Warsaw. Napoleon left to Austria old Galicia, after having separated from it, in order to make it over to Russia, the district of Tarnopol, part of old Podolia.<sup>227</sup> What we have to think of this *Fifth Partition* (Lelewel) may be seen from a satirical letter of Czar Alexander I to prince Kourakin, published at the time in

<sup>a</sup> A. C. Thibaudeau, *Le Consulat et l'Empire, ou Histoire de la France et de Napoléon Bonaparte de 1799 à 1815*, t. 6 (Empire—t. 3), p. 222, Paris, 1835.—Ed.

*the gazettes of Petersburg and Moscow*,<sup>a</sup> d. d. Petersburg 1/13 November 1809. The Czar writes:

"The treaty is being ratified between France and Austria, and consequently our hostile movements against the latter cease simultaneously. According to the principles of that peace, Austria remains, as before, our neighbour by her possession of Galicia, and the Polish provinces, instead of being united into one single body, are divided for ever between the three crowns. Thus the dreams of a political revolution in Poland have vanished. The present order of things fixes the limits between Poland and Russia who has not only not suffered any loss in this affair, but on the contrary extends her dominion" (au sein de la Pologne) "in the very heart of Poland."<sup>b</sup>

The *Poles* now demanded the restoration of the name of *Poland* for the duchy. The Czar opposed. On *October 20, 1809, Champagny*, minister of foreign affairs, addressed a note, by order of Napoleon, to the Russian government, in which it was stated that he approved the *effacing [of] the name of Pole and Poland*, not only from *every public act, but even from history*. This was to prepare his proposal—after his divorce with Joséphine—for the hand of the Czar's sister.<sup>c</sup>

*4 January 1810*: Secret convention between Napoleon's ambassador *Caulaincourt* and count *Rumjanzev*, to this effect:

"*Art. 1.* The kingdom of Poland shall never be re-established. *Art. 2.* The name of *Poland and Pole* shall never be applied to any of the parties that previously constituted that kingdom, and they shall disappear from every public or official act." Besides "the Grand duchy shall never be aggrandised by the annexation of any of the old Polish provinces; the orders of Polish chivalry shall be abolished; and, finally, all these engagements shall be binding on the king of Saxony, Grand Duke of Warsaw, as on Napoleon himself." (*Thiers, Consulat et l'Empire*, XI, [357, 358].)

It was after the negotiations for that convention that Napoleon proposed for the hand of Alexander's sister.<sup>228</sup> Napoleon's irritation and wounded self-love at the hesitation of the Czar (who delayed declaring himself from middle of December to middle of January, under various pretexts), and the repugnance of the Czar's mother,<sup>d</sup> made Napoleon look elsewhere for a wife, and break off negotiations.

"The Emperor Napoleon," says *Crétineau-Joly*: "*Histoire de l'église Romaine en face de la Révolution*", "did not allow his policy to lose itself in a phraseology sentimentally revolutionary. With one stroke of the pen his minister effaced, even

<sup>a</sup> *Sankt-Peterburgskije vedomosti*, November 9, 1809 and *Moskovskije vedomosti*, November 17, 1809.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Quoted from Sawaszkiewicz, op. cit., pp. 82-83.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Anna Pavlovna.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Maria Fedorovna.—*Ed.*

from history, the *name of Poland*, and a treaty, which subsequent events rendered null, struck out that name as if it were a geographical superfetation."

After his *marriage with the daughter of the Austrian Emperor*,<sup>a</sup> Napoleon had a new opportunity for the *restoration of Poland*. I quote from a French author, whose history is an apotheosis of Napoleon. *Norvins* says:

"Napoleon was enabled, in 1810, to realise, at last, that noble project", viz. the restoration of Poland, "because Austria offered him both the Galicias, but he refused, in order not to have a war with Russia who prepared war against him the very day after the conclusion of the treaty of Tilsit."<sup>b</sup>

After what has preceded, it is almost superfluous to say that Napoleon made his *war of 1812* against Russia not out of any regard for Poland. He was forced into it by Russia who on *19/31 December 1810* allowed the import of colonial commodities in neutral ships, prohibited some French commodities, hardly taxed others, and made not the least concession despite all the diplomatic efforts of Napoleon at preventing the war. He must either resign his *continental system*, or make war against Russia.

*28 June 1812*. Day of entry of Napoleon at Vilna. On that day the existence of *confederate Poland* (that is Poland united to Lithuania) was proclaimed at the diet of Warsaw, and a *national war*. Napoleon told the deputies of Warsaw, that he did not want a *national war*. (*Charras* tells<sup>c</sup> us that by his hatred of such a war etc. 100 days.)<sup>229</sup>

Written in December 1864

Reproduced from the manuscript

First published in K. Marx, *Manuskripte über die polnische Frage*, S.-Gravenhage, 1961

<sup>a</sup> Marie Louise, daughter of Francis I.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. M. Norvins' *Histoire de Napoléon* is quoted from Sawaszkiewicz, op. cit., p. 84.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> J. B. Charras, *Histoire de la campagne de 1815. Waterloo*, Londres, 1858.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[DRAFT FOR A REPORT  
TO THE CENTRAL COUNCIL]

JANUARY 24, 1865<sup>230</sup>

As to the accession of the General Federation of German Working Men's Societies, it will declare in one way or another the identity of its purposes with those of the International Association, but the adhesion cannot take place directly, through a formal resolution passed by the [representatives] of the General German Association, because such a step would be in contravention to the Prussian laws regulating associations.

From the same reason the Berlin Society of Printers and Composers, which takes the greatest interest in your proceedings, is disabled from adhering to the London society by way of a formal resolution.

However, even the latter society is sure to send a deputy to the Congress to be convoked by the London Committee.<sup>231</sup>

Moreover, you must not forget, that our journal,<sup>a</sup> the organ of the German Federation of Working Men's Societies, has been put at the entire disposal of the International Committee.

Written on January 24, 1865

Reproduced from the manuscript

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1961

---

<sup>a</sup> *Der Social-Demokrat.—Ed.*

## Karl Marx

[NOTES CONCERNING THE CONFLICT  
IN THE PARIS SECTION <sup>232</sup>]

21 Febr. (TUESDAY). Central Council resolves to send Le Lubez over there. Leaves.

WEDNESDAY. 22 Febr. (EVENING.) Lubez leaves.

Paris. 23 Febr. Invitation to a MEETING with Lefort at Fribourg's, etc. (See LETTER OF Fribourg.) Lefort's reply in Schily's letter (p. 2).

24 Febr.<sup>233</sup> **Evening.** MEETING Fribourg, etc.

25 Febr. Morning. Lefort and Lubez visit Schily.

Leaving Lefort in the vicinity for the time being, Schily then goes to Fribourg's, WHERE THEY FOUND DIFFERENT FRIENDS, AMONGST OTHERS A FRIEND OF LEFORTS. ALL WERE DECIDEDLY AGAINST HIS INTRUSION. SCHILY THEN WENT AWAY TO FETCH HIM, AND DID NOT CONCEAL FROM HIM THAT HE CONSIDERED HIS CLAIM SUCH AS FORMULATED BY HIM UNTENABLE (p. 2). Lefort was deceived on this occasion (l.c.).<sup>234</sup> Steps taken to meet Lefort halfway (2, 3).

25 (!) Febr. Evening. MEETING. Le Lubez absent; went to Lefort's soirée (3, 4).

Description of this MEETING of 25 Febr. (pp. 4, 5, 6).

Written on about March 4, 1865

Printed according to the original

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovët Peruvogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1961



## Karl Marx

[ORIGINAL DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE CONFLICT  
IN THE PARIS SECTION<sup>235</sup>]

I propose the following resolutions to the Sub-Committee.<sup>a</sup>

1) The present Paris branch Administration, consisting of Citizens Tolain, Fribourg, and Limousin, is confirmed in its functions by the London Central Council, which also expresses them its thanks for their zeal and activity;

2) The adjunction of Citizen *Pierre Vinçard* to the Paris branch Administration is thought desirable<sup>236</sup>;

3) While thanking Citizen Lefort for the part he took in the foundation of the International Society, and earnestly wishing for his collaboration, as *homme de conseil*, with the Paris branch Administration, the London Central Council at the same time consider themselves not entitled to impose Citizen Lefort in any official capacity upon the Paris branch Administration.

4) Citizen *Victor Schily* is appointed the Paris *delegate* of the London Central Council.

In this character he has to act only with the Paris branch *Administration*. He will exercise that *droit de surveillance* which the Paris branch themselves have thought proper to acknowledge as a necessary attribute of the Central Council under the present political conjuncture.<sup>237</sup>

Written on March 4, 1865

Reproduced from the manuscript

First published in Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16,  
Moscow, 1960

<sup>a</sup> This phrase is in German in the original.—Ed.

## Karl Marx

[MEMORANDUM TO HERMANN JUNG  
ABOUT THE CONFLICT IN THE PARIS SECTION<sup>238</sup>]

*Sub-Committee Sitting. 4 March.* He<sup>a</sup> wanted already to move his resolution, according to which the Paris Administration was to be composed as follows: Fribourg, Vinçard, Limousin, 3 members to be designated by Lefort, Schily as a sort of *umpire*.

*Sub-Committee Sitting. 6 March.* He reproduces that motion.

*Sitting of the Central Council. 7 March.* He allowed the appointment of Schily to pass *without division*, that is, he *accepted* it, speaking in a parliamentary sense.

After this had taken place, he writes in hot-haste to Paris, even before he had the *Resolutions* in his hand. He expected, as he said (14 March), that the *Paris Administration* would *protest* against Schily. As by Resolution V (*Resolution V. The Administration at Paris having expressed its readiness to acknowledge a direct delegation from the Central Council, the Council accordingly appoints Citizen Schily to be its delegate to the said Administration.*<sup>b</sup>) Schily was only accredited to *that* Administration, his appointment could only be protested against by them.

Having failed with them, Lubez conspires with the brothers of his lodge, to declare Schily's appointment the cause of their withdrawal.<sup>239</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Victor Le Lubez.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, p. 83.—*Ed.*

He puts himself in this awkward position: He protests against the Paris Administration in the name of Lefort, and he protests against Schily in the name of the Paris Administration which *represents* the French branch, etc.

On the remark of Mr. Fox (last sitting of Central Council) that this forgetfulness of Schily's nationality on 4 and 6 March, and his *vivid* recollection of it on March 14 could only be accounted for by his wish to revenge himself because of the slight he thought Mr. Lefort was put to, he accepted *this plain* explanation.

His *mean insinuations*:

1-stly) As if the introductory words of Resolution V had been inserted as a catch-vote on false pretences. These words rest upon facts, Mr. *Schily's open letter*, brought over by Lubez, read on March 7 in presence of Tolain, etc.; secondly Mr. *Schily's report*, communicated to the Sub-Committee; lastly the *resolutions passed by the meeting of 24th February* at Paris.<sup>240</sup> The words were only inserted to avoid even the appearance of dictatorship on the part of the Central Council.

2-ndly) There had on March 7 time been killed by personal altercations in order to hurry the acceptance of the 3 last resolutions; carry them by surprise.

3-rdly) Mr. Schily was no *ouvrier*. Rejected as *principle* by Resolution II.<sup>a</sup> Schily had only to act *privately* with the Paris Administration; Lefort was to act upon the *public stage* before the world in the name of the Association. The cases *not analogous*.

*As to Lefort.*

He asks us to appoint him Defender General in the French press. We do so because we suppose him to act in understanding, and in concurrence with Tolain, etc. This nomination so obtained, he turns afterwards *against* us into a legal title. On Tolain's letter, and *before* Lubez was sent to Paris, we *cancel* this appointment, as far as Mr. Lefort's *name* and *public position* is concerned. (We reduce it to this: he is allowed to write articles *not* signed by *himself*, but by *an ouvrier*—a thing which he might have done without our consent.) That such is the case, results from an angry letter he then wrote to Lubez, but he yielded. The Paris meeting of February 24th committed only this blunder that it *protested*

<sup>a</sup> The concluding part of Resolution II reads: the Council "protests that it does not sanction the principle that none but an *ouvrier* is admissible as an official in our Society".—*Ed.*





against a resolution that had ceased to exist. And *upon this* Mr. Lefort, or his friends at London, feign to forget that he had already given up the post he was named to. He even menaces us to *warn all democrats against us*, forgetting that *we can warn against him*, if necessary.

---

He and his man Lubez say that he is not moved by personal ambition. He only wants a political guarantee. Well. We appoint *Vinçard*, a man who represents more guarantees than Lefort et Le Lubez put together. Having been appointed, *Mr. Vinçard* turns into a nonentity for Lefort and Lubez. The only thing they could say against his proposal by Tolain, etc., afterwards confirmed by us, is this: that it was not at the right time communicated to Lefort. Thus this miserable point of etiquette is their last pretence of opposition, etc.

---

*International character of the Society endangered, and power of the Council to appoint ambassadors.*

*The class character of this movement. Républicains formalistes.*

---

1) Pas de *résolution* contre Schily; Marx déclare la nomination de Mons. Schily comme non-avenue et qu'il l'avait seulement acceptée parce qu'elle a passé *unanimentement*.<sup>a</sup>

2) The instructions given to Le Lubez to communicate to the French Administration and Lefort (in the sitting of Council,<sup>b</sup> 7th March), run thus: "*In case no compromise be arrived at, the Council declare that the group Lefort, **after** having taken out their cards of membership, will have the power, under our Statutes (see §7), to form a local branch society.*"<sup>c</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> "No *resolution* against Schily; Marx declares that appointment of M. Schily is cancelled and that he accepted it only because it was passed *unanimately*." The phrase is written in French in Jung's hand; the words "declares that appointment of M. Schily is cancelled and that" is written by Marx.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> This part of the phrase is written in Jung's hand; the word "private" at its beginning is crossed out; the rest of the paragraph is in Marx's hand.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See this volume, p. 83.—*Ed.*

In the sitting of the Council of March 14 this private instruction was changed *into a resolution*, because no compromise could be arrived at. This was *the only resolution passed*.

(There was the other resolution passed that Lubez had to communicate literally to both sides the whole of the resolution.)

Written on March 16-18, 1865

Reproduced from the manuscript

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1961

## Karl Marx

[NOTE TO HERMANN JUNG  
 ABOUT ERNEST JONES' LETTER  
 TO THE CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETING  
 MARCH 21, 1865<sup>241</sup>]

*Ernest Jones* writes to Marx (d.d. March 16, Manchester) that he will support the delegation sent to the Manchester Conference.<sup>242</sup> The middle class had sent to him and Hooson to sign the Circular convening the Manchester Conference. He had not accepted it at the date of the letter. He writes moreover<sup>a</sup>:

"We are going to hold district meetings in Manchester to organise the Manhood Suffrage movement in support of the London one."

Give *Mr. Cremer* (privately) the address of *E. Jones*: 55, Cross Street, Manchester.

Written on March 18, 1865

Reproduced from the manuscript

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet. Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1961

---

<sup>a</sup> These words are in German in the original.—*Ed.*



## Karl Marx

[NOTES FOR THE REPORT ON VALUE,  
PRICE AND PROFIT<sup>243</sup>]

1) A general rise in the rate of wages will, broadly speaking, produce a general fall in the rate of profits, leaving the values of commodities unaltered.

2) Under very exceptional circumstances, only a general rise of wages could be realised. If obtained, it could only [be] lost under very exceptional circumstances. The general tendency of production, upon its present basis, is not to raise, but to lower wages. Even if a general rise in the rate of wages should obtain for any longer period, it would not abolish but only mitigate the slavery of the wages' labourer, that is, of the mass of the people.

3) Trades' Unions work well as far as they counteract, if even temporarily, the tendency to a fall in the general rate of wages, and as far as they tend to shorten and regulate the time of labour, in other words, the extent of the working day. They work well as far as they are a means of organising the working class as a class. They fail accidentally, by an injudicious use of their power, and they fail generally by accepting the present relations of capital and labour as permanent instead of working for their abolition.

Written in June 1865

Reproduced from the manuscript

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny  
Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*,  
Moscow, 1961

## Karl Marx

[RECORD OF THE CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETING<sup>244</sup>]

JANUARY 16, 1866

*Eccarius* in the chair.

Minutes read and confirmed.

Citizens Longuet et Crespelle were nominated members of the Council.

*Marx* communicated to the Council the receipt by Fox of a letter of thanks by Mrs. O'Donovan for his articles in the *Workman's Advocate*<sup>a</sup> on Fenianism,<sup>245</sup> and the reprint, in the same paper, of the appeal for the support of the convicted Fenians.<sup>b</sup>

*Marx* proposed Citizen Longuet's nomination in his place as correspondent for Belgium. Seconded by *Jung*. Accepted.

*Jung* read a letter of Dujonquoy (Hotel de New York) requesting the payment of £7 17s. owed to him from the times of the Conference.<sup>c</sup>

A discussion followed in which *Le Lubez*, *Jung*, *Dupont*, *Wheeler*, *Lessner*, and others took part.

*Cremer*: The members of the Council and the Association ought [to] pay their cards immediately.

*Jung* proposes: That Dupont should tell Dujonquoy that the Council having not been largely attended, part of the bill be paid on Wednesday next and a definite answer given. *Seconded by Lessner*.

<sup>a</sup> P. Fox, "The British Coup d'État in Ireland", "The Influence of Irish National Feeling Upon the Relations Between Great Britain and the United States", "The Irish Difficulty Continued", *The Workman's Advocate*, Nos. 136-138, October 14, 21, 28, 1865.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "The State Prisoners. An Appeal to the Women of Ireland", *The Workman's Advocate*, No. 148, January 6, 1866.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The London Conference, September 25-29, 1865.—*Ed.*

*Jung reads: Talbot, of Caen, letter, and one pound (for 20 cards) (to Dupont).*

Propaganda in different towns of the departments of Calvados, Orne, La Manche.

Mr. *Wheeler* moves: That notice be given that everyone who does not (renew) pay his card until 15th February, will cease to be member of the Association. (To be advertised in the *Advocate*.) *Seconded by Citizen Jung*. Carried.

*Werecki* (as *delegate of the Poles*) explains their absence on the Standing Committee. On Monday they had a meeting and got the necessary money together. After some discussion, as to the place of meeting, *St. Martin's Hall*, next *Monday (22 January)*, 8 o'clock in the evening.<sup>246</sup>

*Cremer* read the *Appeal to the British Members*. Accepted Address. Difficulty as to the signature of the names. *Moved* subscription-sheets to be printed. Carried on the motion of *Wheeler*.

Recorded on January 16, 1866

Reproduced from the manuscript

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1961

January 16, 1866

...of the ... for the ... of the ...

to ... in ...

... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...

... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...  
... of the ... of the ...



## Frederick Engels

[SWEDEN AND DENMARK. TRAVEL NOTES]<sup>247</sup>

6 July, 9 a.m., *Hero* on the Humber, 11 a.m. at sea, fresh westerly breeze, 12 km per hour, wind rising, heavy sea after mid-day, wind veering more and more to the North, in the evening HALF A GALE, heavy rolling of the long ship, Captain Soulsby falls and breaks a rib, an English passenger badly hurts his face in similar circumstances, the MAINSAIL breaks loose from the lower block.

7 July, impossible to set foot on deck, heavy rolling until, towards evening, the wind at last abates and we can go on deck, with the Holmen light-house in view. Sea subsides more and more, but choppy.

8 July, 7 a.m. Vingan, then entrance to the Götaälv skerries, *roches moutonnées* everywhere, the effect of the ice visible at 1,000 paces. Soon the river gets narrower, with green valleys between the granite rocks, then a few trees too, finally the approaches to Göteborg, lovely and strange because of the squat spaciousness of the broad houses.

Göteborg proper, a modern city amid old-Swedish surroundings; all stone inside, all wood outside. Dutch canals with Dutch stench in the streets. The Swedes look far more German than English; foreign Finnish element among them. By and large, the women's complexions are poor; coarse, but not repulsive features; men more attractive, but also more reminiscent of the inland German philistine. People in their forties all look like Baden philistines.

English is tolerated. German predominates. The commercial and literary dependence on Germany very apparent. Railway stations, public buildings, private houses, villas, everything in the German style, with minor variations for climatic reasons. Of England, only

the parks and their tidiness, and a church in the English neo-Gothic style. One can speak German in every shop; even in hotel English speakers are requested to speak German if possible.

Pinks and hawthorn in full bloom, everything as on 8 May. Beautiful kinds of elms along with ashes predominate in the foliage. Green as an English spring. Interspersed everywhere with bare granite *moutonnées*.

The way of life quite Continental, not English at all despite the drinking of false port and cherry brandy. The style of the hotels—rooms, breakfast, cuisine—everything Continental. Similarly the mixing of classes in public houses. Aperitifs (Appetitsup) and Hors d'oeuvres (smörbrödsborden) (25 öre).

People's stature: medium height and stocky, 5'6" (Rhenish). Soldiers of horse artillery (värfvade) taller. Both officers and men rather militia-like, reminiscent of the Swiss. The Hull sailors look more like Holsteiners, Lower Saxons, Frisians, Angles and Danes than like Swedes. The Swedes *here* lack a manly expression of the face, mostly flabby bloated features, except for some seamen with Frisian physiognomy and sinewy build. The soldiers look like Westphalians, the officers too, NEITHER PRIVATE NOR OFFICIOUS.


As always, one can't help thinking how much is done everywhere on the Continent for the health and recreation of the *populus* as compared with aristocratic England.

Comic effect produced by the 2 English SWELL LADIES, stared at by all the Swedish women.

Voyage to Stockholm. Lay-out of the steamer: back cabin for sleeping, front cabin for taking meals. Substantial fare. Salad with cream. Sweets. People further inland showing more character in their features, the men more handsome, stronger and taller, the WOMEN PLAIN BUT HOMELY AND NOT UNPLEASANT, also tall and sturdily built. Their character increasingly reminds one of Black Forest people, Swiss and Tyroleans (Steub's Tyrolean Goths?). Country squires. The language too sounds very much like High German without gutturals.

Country at Götaälv lovely, but subdued, up to Trollhättan. Four waterfalls straight above one another. Mountains not over 600 to 800 feet high, but impressive. Then Lake Vänern with Kinnekullen<sup>a</sup>, flat and monotonous. Vättern likewise. Karlsborg's fortifications not badly laid out, long lines, polygonal, but isn't the mountain behind dominant now? The lakes beautiful but all alike. Endless forests of fir

<sup>a</sup> The name of a hill.—Ed.



Plan of the Swedish fortress of Karlsborg.  
*Drawing by Engels*





trees, damaged at that. None of the stately heavy firs of Switzerland.

SCOTCH FIR.

Motalaälv valley again partly cultivated, beautiful in places where trees—elms and birches—line the canal.

The skerry-dotted sea gets more and more beautiful towards Stockholm. Change in formation—limestone here and there and greater weathering, hence more gentle slopes and Alpine meadows rising direct from the sea. Marble quarries on two islands. The skerries become higher and more beautiful the closer one gets to Stockholm. Lovely scenery along Lake Mälär; forests, fields and villas alternating.

Stockholm's Norrbro [North Bridge] reminiscent of the Pont des Bergues in Geneva. Mosebacken splendid. Fine view from observatory too. Steam sloops to the Djurgården [zoo]. The latter most beautiful as a park. Many restaurants and cafés. French style with small tables *à la carte*, no *table-d'hôte*. Stockholmers' custom of eating in restaurants. Brännvinsbordet [snack with brandy] everywhere. Paiestko-öl [beer] better than in Germany. Exceedingly sweet drinks and food (kårger). Swedish beer not worse, but either too sweet or too sour. Wines—Bordeaux hyper-hermitagé, petit bourgogne with an addition of South French wine—main drink at table. Otherwise, the standard cuisine more German than French.

Stockholm has more the air of a capital city, foreign languages less *coulant*, but German spoken in every shop. Men's fashions, decidedly English in Göteborg, predominantly French here. Hypocrisy concerning *brännvinsbordet* when ladies around; childish entertainments: merry-go-rounds, puppet shows, tight-rope walkers and bad music. Boat parties still the best "mekanismen". And yet serious or hypocritical Lutheran character of the people, which tolerates no Tivoli-type public entertainments on a large scale.

Soldiers, even Guards, SLOVENLY in the militia manner, officers ditto. NO LIFE IN THEM. Not very tall either, no match to the men of the 69th. Eclectic uniform and old-fashioned leathers. Sentries chat. Beards. The Malmö hussars—as heavy as troopers of the line—are the most handsome of the men.

The trains—dear me. Three times ringing, once whistling. 5 minutes=15 à 20. Simple but good buffets, everything costs 1 riksdaler. Landscape picturesque, but after the first two hours monotonous and ultimately boring through perpetual repetition. The abundance of lakes readily explained by the effect of the ice. The valleys are mostly former seabed or peat moors.

Smart trick this sending the people to Malmö to bring a series of diplomatic negotiations to an end.<sup>248</sup>

Copenhagen. Really more like a *hovedstaden* [capital] in size and life-style than Stockholm, but still small and modest. Decided preponderance of Germans, even on the streets. Cheerful children, all kinds of entertainments, above all for children. At least a hundred merry-go-rounds. The adults infantile too; ballet, circus, etc.; even the children's cruelty, which takes the greatest satisfaction in tormenting children. Tivoli of the most characteristic kind.

Lovely trees everywhere in Copenhagen. Impressive entrance to the port. Old warships—very picturesque. The atmosphere of a peasant capital city that exploits 1.5 million peasants unmistakable everywhere.

Written between July 6 and 18, 1867

First published in the collection Friedrich Engels, *Auf Reisen*, Berlin, 1966

Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time

## APPENDICES



FROM THE MINUTE BOOK  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL<sup>249</sup>  
CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETINGS  
(October-November 1864)

*October 5, 1864*

The first meeting of the Committee, elected by the public meeting held at St. Martin's Hall on the 28th of September 1864, was held at 18, Greek St., Soho, on October 5th, 1864, and on the motion of Mr. *Weston*, seconded by Mr. *Whitlock*, Mr. *Odger* was voted to the chair.

The *Chairman* said the first business was the appointment of a secretary to the Committee when Dr. *Marx* proposed and Mr. *Whitlock* seconded that Mr. *Cremer* be appointed.

Mr. *Cremer* would prefer the appointment of M. Le Lubez who was he believed in every way qualified to fill the office.

M. Le Lubez having for various reasons declined the office, Mr. *Cremer* was unanimously elected. [...]

A very long and animated discussion then took place with regard to the principles on which the Association should be based, and ultimately on the motion of Mr. *Dell*, seconded by Mr. *Trimlett*, a sub-committee of 9 were appointed to draw up a platform of principles, such principles to be discussed at the next meeting of the General Committee.

The following were then elected as the Sub-Committee: Messrs. *Whitlock*, *Weston*, Dr. *Marx*, M. Le Lubez, Major *Wolff*, Mr. *Holtorp*, and Mr. *Pidgeon*, the *Chairman* and *Secretary* to be members by virtue of their offices.

*November 1, 1864*

Dr. *Marx* then read the Preamble, Address and Rules which the Sub-Committee had definitely agreed on and which they recommended to the Central Council for adoption.

Mr. *Whitlock* thought some explanation (in the form of a footnote) should be given as to the terms “nitrogen” and “carbon”.

Messrs. *Carter*, *Grossmith* and others spoke in favour of the Address.

Mr. *Whitlock* proposed, Mr. *Carter* seconded: *That the Address do pass as read.*

As an amendment Mr. *Worley* proposed and Mr. *Wheeler* seconded: *That the word “profitmongers” be erased.*

For amendment—11, for resolution—10. The amendment being carried, the word “profitmongers” was struck out and the Address was unanimously agreed to.

Dr. *Marx* then read the Preamble, and on the motion of Mr. *Wheeler*, seconded by *Blackmore*, it was carried unanimously.

The Rules were then discussed, and on the proposition of Mr. *Dell*, seconded by *Whitlock*, the Preamble, Address and Rules were unanimously agreed to.<sup>a</sup>

Mr. *Wheeler* then proposed and Mr. *Dell* seconded that the thanks of the Central Council be given to Dr. *Marx*, Mr. *Weston* and M. *Le Lubez* for their exertions and the production of so admirable an address. Carried unanimously.

First published, in Russian, in *Osnovaniye Pervogo Internatsionala*, Moscow, 1934

Reproduced from the Minute Book

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 5-16.—*Ed.*

FROM THE MINUTE BOOK  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETINGS<sup>250</sup>

(November-December 1864)

November 8, 1864

Dr. *Marx* proposed, Mr. *Jung* seconded, that any person not being able to attend the meetings cannot be a member of this Council.<sup>a</sup>

Dr. *Marx* called attention to the reports in the *Morning Star* and *Bee-Hive*<sup>b</sup> of the last meeting and complained that in such reports one of the fundamental principles of the Association, viz., truth, had been violated; he also complained of the Address having been published without the sanction of the Committee.<sup>251</sup>

The *Secretary*<sup>c</sup> explained that he had nothing to do with the reports, at which he was very much surprised; he believed Mr. Hartwell had supplied the reports in question.

To obviate the recurrence of such erroneous reports Dr. *Marx* proposed, Mr. *Fontana* seconded:

That the Secretary purchase a manifold writer and for the future all reports for the press be sent through the Secretary.

Mr. *Aldovrandi* proposed and Mr. *Carter* seconded:

That Dr. *Marx* be requested to correct the typographical errors in the Address and that 500 copies of the Address, Programme<sup>d</sup> and Rules be printed. Carried unanimously.

<sup>a</sup> This resolution as published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper* see on p. 17 of this volume.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Reports on the Central Council meeting of November 1, 1864 in *The Morning Star*, No. 2703, November 2, 1864 and *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 160, November 5, 1864.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> W. R. Cremer.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> A reference to the Preamble of the Provisional Rules of the International.—*Ed.*



*November 15, 1864*

Mr. *Cremer* then proposed, M. *Le Lubez* seconded: That 1,000 [copies of the] Address and Rules be printed. Carried unanimously. [...]

A long discussion then took place with regard to the terms on which organised bodies should be received into the Association, and ultimately on the motion of Dr. *Marx*, seconded by Mr. *Blackmore*, the question was adjourned to the next meeting.<sup>a</sup>

*November 29, 1864*

Dr. *Marx* then brought up the report of the Sub-Committee, also a draft of the address which had been drawn up for presentation to the people of America congratulating them on their having re-elected Abraham Lincoln as President. The address is as follows and was unanimously agreed to<sup>b</sup>: [...]

Mr. *Wheeler* proposed, *Le Lubez* seconded:

That the names of all those who are present be appended to the address, also those who are absent and are willing to endorse the views set forth in the address.<sup>c</sup>

*December 13, 1864*

Mr. *Fox* then read the address which he proposed should be adopted by the British Section of the Association and then transmitted to the National Government of Poland.<sup>252</sup>

A long discussion took place consequent on certain statements contained in the address and which statements were opposed by Mr. *Jung*, *Le Lubez*, Dr. *Marx* and supported by Mr. *Carter*.

Mr. *Fox* replied defending the statement that the traditional foreign policy of France had been favourable to the restoration and independence of Poland.

Mr. *Cremer* thought it important that the truth of this statement should be ascertained and would propose that the further

---

<sup>a</sup> Resolution on this point proposed by Marx and adopted by the Central Council on November 22, 1864 see on p. 18 of this volume.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 19-21.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The report on this meeting, published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 164, December 3, 1864, states that the resolution was also supported by Marx.—*Ed.*

consideration of the address be deferred till the next meeting.<sup>a</sup>

Mr. *Morgan* seconded the motion. Carried unanimously.

*December 20, 1864*

Mr. *Cremer* read a letter from Mr. Adams, the United States Minister, suggesting that the address to President Lincoln be sent to him, Mr. Adams, instead of being brought.

Dr. *Marx* proposed, Mr. *Fontana* seconded, that the Secretary send the address to Mr. Adams.

Mr. *Worley* proposed, Mr. *Wheeler* seconded, that Mr. Adams be again appealed to receive the deputation.

For amendment—5, for resolution—13.

Mr. *Fox* then resumed his defence of the address to the Polish National Government and in an able address contended for the truth of the assertions therein contained, after some discussion it was agreed to adjourn the question till next meeting.

*December 29, 1864*

Mr. *Fox* stated in the absence of Dr. *Marx* he should defer any discussion on the address to the National Government of Poland.

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1961

Reproduced from the Minute Book

---

<sup>a</sup> The report about this Central Council meeting, published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 166, December 17, 1864, has:

"Mr. *Fox* then brought up the address from the British Section of the Association to the National Government of Poland, when a very long and animated discussion took place, in which the following members took part—Messrs. *Le Lubez*, *Holtorp*, *Cremer*, *Marx*, *Carter*, *Weston*, *Jung*, the latter opposing a statement set forth in the address, viz., that the traditional foreign policy of France had been favourable to the restoration and independence of Poland. *Karl Marx* and *Mr. Le Lubez* also agreeing that while the foreign policy of France had appeared to favour such an object, in reality [it] had not, especially during the time of the first Napoleon, when the Poles had been used for his military ambition, and then cast aside. *Mr. Fox* defended the address and ably contended for the retention of the passage referring to the traditional foreign policy of France towards Poland, and it was ultimately agreed as the question was an important one that its further consideration be deferred till the next meeting."—*Ed.*

FROM THE MINUTE BOOK  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETINGS

(January-February 1865)

*January 3, 1865*

Dr. *Marx* handed in a German translation of the Address and Rules of the Association and stated that 50,000 copies had been circulated in Germany<sup>253</sup>; he also stated that a branch of the Association was being formed in Switzerland. [...]

Dr. *Marx* resumed the adjourned debate on the Address which it is proposed to send to the National Government of Poland, and in a very able historical resumé argued that the traditional foreign policy of France had not been favourable to the restoration and independence of Poland.<sup>a</sup> The Address of Dr. *Marx* was pregnant with important historical facts which would be very valuable in a published form.

Mr. *Fox* in reply stated he did not defend the foreign policy of modern France; all he contended for was that the foreign policy of old France had been favourable to the Independence of Poland.

The following was then proposed by Mr. *Jung*, seconded by *Le Lubez* and unanimously adopted:

That the views expressed in the address concerning the French foreign policy towards Poland not being borne out by historical facts, that it be amended so as to accord with the truths of history.

*January 24, 1865*

Correspondence was read [...] by Dr. *Marx* from the Compositors' Society of Berlin, also from the General German Working Men's Association, both expressing their entire concurrence with the principles of the International Working Men's Association and

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 311-27.—*Ed.*

regretting that there were legal impediments which prevented them from becoming affiliated members of the Association, but promising to send representatives to the congress.<sup>a</sup>

Dr. *Marx* also read a very interesting letter from the military commander<sup>b</sup> of St. Louis,<sup>254</sup> and a letter from M. Tolain having reference to the position they occupied in Paris in relation to International Working Men's Association.

A discussion then took place concerning certain statements or rumours in regard to M. Tolain, and it was agreed that before any cards of membership were sent to Paris that the truth of such rumours should be investigated.<sup>255</sup>

*January 31, 1865*

A discussion then took place regarding the period when the subscriptions of members should begin and end when Citizen *Marx* proposed and Citizen *Whitlock* seconded: That subscriptions begin on the First of January and end on the 31st of December.

Citizen *Cremer* then proposed and Citizen *Fontana* seconded: That those who have been elected members of the Central Council but have not taken out their cards of membership by the 1st of March next, shall after that date be considered as excluding themselves from the Central Council. [...]

Citizen *Marx* then read an extract from the *St. Louis Daily Press* eulogistic of our Address and Rules and expressing their regret at not being able to publish the whole.<sup>c 256</sup> [...]

The *Secretary*<sup>d</sup> then introduced the question of the suffrage, stating there was an attempt being made to organise a meeting for manhood suffrage and he thought the Council ought to watch the preliminary proceedings and for that purpose would propose that a deputation be appointed to attend the preliminary meeting which will be shortly held.

<sup>a</sup> The author's draft of this report see on p. 328 of this volume.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. Weydemeyer.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 173, February 4, 1865 has: "Dr. *Marx* also read an extract from the *St. Louis Daily Press* (America) approving the Address, and rules of the International, and regretting their limited space would not allow the entire publication of the Address, which, however, they printed in part, in proof of the deep interest which the Association has excited. It may be mentioned that hundreds of cards have been sent for from Paris, Belgium, &c.; and, although in some places on the Continent working men are prohibited from openly associating together for such principles as the International has in view, yet even in those places they are exerting themselves to find some plan whereby they may affiliate themselves to the Association without coming within the power of the law."—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> W. R. Cremer.—*Ed.*

A long discussion took place in which Citizens *Marx*, *Whitlock*, *Wheeler*, *Le Lubez*, *Carter* took part. Citizen *Wheeler* seconded the resolution which was carried unanimously.<sup>257</sup>

*February 7, 1865*

Citizen *Cremer* gave the report of the Sub-Committee; they recommended to the Central Council the following:

[1] That separate cards be issued to societies forming the Association, such cards to be of a general character stating that the society whose name it bore had affiliated itself to the International Association<sup>a</sup>;

2nd. That all the money subscribed in England for individual cards be sent to the Central Council, but if any branch of the Association shall incur any legitimate expense, the Central Council may, if they deem it judicious, grant a sum for the liquidation of such debt;

3rd. That our Continental brethren be supplied with cards at 1s. each, which sums to be sent to the Central Council.

They were proposed by Citizen *Cremer*, seconded by Citizen *Marx* and carried unanimously. [...]

Citizen *Marx* then proposed and Citizen *Wheeler* seconded, that Citizen *Lefort* be appointed as our literary defence in Paris. Carried unanimously.

*February 14, 1865*

Citizen *Marx* then stated that a branch of the International Working Men's Association had been formed in Manchester, he also read a letter from Mr. Ernest Jones on the subject of manhood suffrage.<sup>258</sup>

The letter was fully discussed.

Citizen *Marx* also read an extract from the German *Star*<sup>b</sup> which stated that the Swiss were interesting themselves on behalf of the Association and that a meeting of the Republican League and French Swiss Society had been held; they had accepted the rules and would form branches throughout Switzerland with a central council in Geneva.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 369-70.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> A reference to J. Ph. Becker's "Muthiges Kämpfen" in *Nordstern*, No. 296, February 11, 1865.—*Ed.*

*February 21, 1865*

On the motion of *Whitlock*, seconded by Citizen *Marx*, Citizen *Le Lubez* then read some correspondence from Paris which referred to unpleasant proceedings having taken place there, and as it was generally agreed that it would be difficult to settle the differences by correspondence, it was decided on the proposition of Citizen *Whitlock*, seconded by *Fontana*, that *Le Lubez* be sent to Paris to investigate the differences existing between Citizen *Lefort* and Citizen *Fribourg*.

Citizen *Marx* proposed, Citizen *Lessner* seconded, that Mr. *Schily* be appointed to co-operate with Citizen *Le Lubez* in settling the differences.<sup>a</sup> Carried unanimously.

It was also agreed that the delegates be invested with power to act as circumstances may determine.

*February 28, 1865*

Citizen *Marx* read correspondence from Manchester regarding the suffrage,<sup>259</sup> he also stated that he had withdrawn from any connection with the *Social-Demokrat*.<sup>b</sup>

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1961

Reproduced from the Minute Book

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 329.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 87-90.—*Ed.*

[REPORT OF A SPEECH BY KARL MARX  
AT THE ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION  
OF THE GERMAN WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY  
IN LONDON <sup>260</sup>]

[...] Of the speeches made at the anniversary celebration I shall only report some remarks by Karl Marx. Concerning the dispute about self-help versus state-help he said that both parties were mistaken. In bourgeois society all the means of subsistence and of labour belong to the capitalists and therefore self-help is nonsense. On the other hand, it is obvious that under a Bismarckian government state assistance is out of the question.—The workers cannot sell themselves to the Bismarck government. State assistance can only proceed from a state in which the proletariat exercises supreme power. To preach the emancipation of labour within the Prussian monarchy would be to raise a storm in a teacup. The emancipation of labour implies the liberation of Germany and this in turn entails the restoration of Poland and the overthrow of the Prussian monarchy. Turning to the Progress Party's <sup>261</sup> criticisms of the behaviour of the workers towards the bourgeoisie, Marx said that at the time when he had written that the workers must unite with the bourgeoisie against absolutism, it had been assumed that the German bourgeoisie would achieve at least as much as the English bourgeoisie had achieved in its time, but this had not happened in fact. In Germany, and particularly in Prussia, a press law was in force which freely permitted people high up in society to abuse and slander those beneath them. He added that the workers' newspapers and the workers' movement itself could only exist with police authorisation and that the government could only be attacked with kid gloves. In such conditions joint action by the workers and the bourgeoisie was impossible, particularly since the bourgeoisie was too cowardly to carry out its own programme.

Reported by Johann George Eccarius

First published in *Der Social-Demokrat*,  
No. 24, February 19, 1865

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Published in English for the first  
time

AGREEMENT  
BETWEEN MR. KARL MARX AND MR. OTTO MEISSNER,  
PUBLISHER AND BOOKSELLER <sup>262</sup>

1. We, the undersigned, jointly undertake to publish the first and all subsequent editions of the work entitled "**Capital**. A Critique of Political Economy" by Karl Marx on the following terms. The book will be approximately 50 signatures in length and will appear in two volumes. Each of the contracting parties will receive one half of the net earnings which are arrived at after deducting  $33\frac{1}{3}$  per cent discount for the retailers from the gross receipts and after deducting the costs of paper, printing, binding, transport and advertisement, etc., from the remainder.

2. The accounts will be drawn up each August for the copies sold during the preceding year and the profit will be shared out at the same time. The Publisher reserves the right, however, to pay one-third of the sum not more than three months later.

3. The cost of paper, printing and binding will be calculated on the basis of the original invoices. To cover the costs of advertising, transport, circulars, postage, etc., *Otto Meissner* will debit the production costs with the round sum of 100 Thalers for each edition, irrespective of whether the actual sum be greater or less.

4. Should the work yield no profit, any resulting loss will be borne by the Publisher, *Otto Meissner*, alone.

5. Neither of us may transfer his rights in the publication to a third party without the consent of the other, except in the event of death, when the ownership passes to the heirs without the need for an additional deed of assignment.

6. The size of the edition and the format of the work shall be determined by mutual agreement. The Publisher shall have the discretion to determine the price and the method of sale of the work.



7. Each of the contracting parties has the right to receive ten free copies of the work for his own private purposes and these, together with the review copies to be sent to newspapers, will be deducted from the edition when the accounts are presented.

8. The Author undertakes to deliver the complete manuscript of the work to the Publisher on or before the last day of *May* of this year, while the latter undertakes to publish the work in its entirety by *October* of this year at the latest, and to dispatch the first volume sooner if possible.

We regard the above eight points as binding upon us and our heirs.

Hamburg and

*Otto Meissner* in Hamburg

Drawn up not later than March 21, 1865

Printed according to the manuscript

First published in the book: *Karl Marx. Dokumente Seines Lebens*, Leipzig, 1970

Published in English for the first time

FROM THE MINUTE BOOK  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETINGS

(March-early July 1865)

*March 7, 1865*

Citizen *Fox* then read to the Council the report of the Committee and the resolutions recommended by it in reference to the imbroglio in Paris.<sup>263</sup>

It was agreed to consider the resolutions *seriatim*.<sup>a</sup>

*March 14, 1865*

Citizen *Le Lubez* read a letter from Citizen Lefort. He also stated it was a mistake to suppose he had been or was now in any way prejudiced in favour of Lefort or Tolain. He also read a letter signed by Citizens Bocquet, Denoual, and himself, protesting against the former decision of the Central Council in turning out Citizen Lefort, and another letter signed by Citizens Bordage, Leroux, Denoual, Bocquet, and himself, protesting against the appointment by the Central Council of anyone not a Frenchman as the delegate to the Administration in Paris.

Citizen *Marx* stated the protest was unnecessary as he, Citizen Marx, was certain that Citizen Schily would not accept the appointment if there was the slightest opposition to him: it was against Citizen Schily's wish that he had been elected.<sup>264</sup>

The *President* suggested the re-opening of the whole question. This was opposed by Citizens *Howell*, *Kaub* and *Cremer*.

The following resolution was then proposed by Citizen *Weston*, seconded by Citizen *Morgan* and carried unanimously:

---

<sup>a</sup> Here follows the text of the five resolutions on the conflict in the Paris section drawn up by Marx on behalf of the Standing Committee (see this volume, pp. 82-83) and record of the discussion on each of them.—*Ed.*

That the Central Council having the fullest confidence in Citizen Lefort, earnestly requests him to retain the card of membership he has in his possession and hopes that he will use his great influence to form a branch in France. [...]

Citizen *Weston* gave notice of the following propositions for discussion at the earliest opportunity:

1st. Would not an advance of wages of any particular section of industry be secured at the cost of the other sections.

2nd. Would not the supposed advantages of a general rise in wages be negated by the corresponding advance in prices.

*April 11, 1865*

The situations of corresponding secretary for France, also for Belgium, having become vacant consequent on the resignation of Citizen Lubez, Citizen *Jung* proposed, *Morgan* seconded, that Citizen Marx be corresponding secretary *pro tem* for Belgium.<sup>265</sup> Carried unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* proposed, Citizen *Cremer* seconded, that Citizen Dupont be appointed corresponding secretary for France. Carried unanimously. [...]

Citizen *Marx* stated that one of the 32 members who had met recently in Paris had been prosecuted by the French Government for publishing a pamphlet.<sup>a 266</sup> [...]

Citizen *Longmaid* proposed and Citizen *Marx* seconded:

That the Secretary write to those members of the Central Council who have not taken their cards of membership and inform them that unless they do so on or before April 25, that they will be considered as wishing to withdraw and their names will accordingly be struck off the roll of Councilmen. This resolution was considered by the Central Council necessary inasmuch as complaints had been made that a former resolution of a similar character had never been communicated officially to absentee members.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

It was then agreed to that the proposition of Citizen *Weston* on the question of wages<sup>b</sup> should come on for discussion on May 2nd and that members of the Association were eligible to attend the discussion, also that any member of the Central Council is at liberty to introduce a friend.<sup>267</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> Ch. Longuet, "La Dynastie des la Palice", *La Rive Gauche*, March 12, 1865.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this page, above.—*Ed.*

April 25, 1865

Citizen *Wheeler* proposed, Citizen *Marx* seconded, that Continental corresponding members be *ex officio* members of the Central Council. Carried unanimously. [...]

Citizen *Marx* read a letter from Ernest Jones on the suffrage,<sup>268</sup> he also read a letter from Citizen Fontaine asking for a declaration of principles. Questions in said letter referred to Sub-Committee.<sup>269</sup> He also read a letter from the composers at Leipsic referring to their strike and expressing a hope that the London composers would assist them.<sup>270</sup>

Citizens Fox, Marx and Cremer were deputed to attend the Compositors' Society.

May 2, 1865

*Marx* gave a report from Paris stating there were changes about being made there in the Administration which when made would be fully reported to the Central Council.<sup>271</sup>[...]

*Cremer* referred to the assassination of President Lincoln and proposed that an address should be drawn up and sent to the American people expressing the views of the Central Council on recent events in America, more particularly referring to the murder of Mr. Lincoln.

The resolution was seconded by *Lucraft* and carried unanimously.

*Weston* then read a portion of his paper on the question of wages; the remainder was adjourned to the next sitting.

May 9, 1865

Citizen *Fox* read a letter from Citizen Vinçard who had been appointed on the Paris Administration, stating that the state of his health would preclude him from accepting the appointment, also expressing his best wishes for the success of the Association and regretting that he could not assist to make it so.

*Jung* proposed, *Marx* seconded:

That the General Secretary write to Citizen Vinçard thanking him for his past services and hoping that he will, as far as [is] consistent with his health, do his utmost for the interest of the Association. Carried unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* read the address to President Johnson in reference to the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 99-100.—*Ed.*

*Cremer* proposed, *Weston* seconded:

That the address be adopted, written on parchment, signed by the Central Council and transmitted to President Johnson through the United States Legation. Carried unanimously.

Citizen Howell, who had been appointed to attend with Citizen *Cremer* the Reform Conference in Manchester on the 15th and 16th of May, having been elected by the Reform League as its secretary and being deputed by that body to attend said conference,<sup>272</sup> his appointment from this Council was therefore on the proposition of Citizen *Wheeler*, seconded by Citizen *Marx*, cancelled and Citizen *Odger* was elected in his stead. [...]

Citizen *Fox* proposed, *Bolleter* seconded:

That *Weston*'s question for discussion stand adjourned to Saturday, May 20th, at 8 o'clock, the entire sitting to be devoted to the discussion.<sup>273</sup> Carried unanimously.

#### May 16, 1865

Cit. *Marx* stated that he had sent to the *New-York Tribune* a copy of the Society's address to President Johnson.<sup>274</sup> He also mentioned that there had been an immense public meeting in Geneva in regard to the assassination of the late lamented President of the United States; that the Society's correspondent, Philipp Becker, had spoken at the same, and remarked upon the international character of the meeting.

Cit. Becker then proceeded to state that the Working Men's International Association was at the head of the new movement for popular rights,<sup>a</sup> which statement was received with cheers by the meeting.

#### May 23, 1865

Citizen *Weston* resumed the adjourned debate on his proposition regarding wages. He was followed by Citizen *Marx* who opposed Citizen *Weston*'s views as did Citizen *Wheeler*, after which *Cremer* proposed the adjournment of the debate till the 30th.<sup>b</sup> Carried unanimously.

---

<sup>a</sup> The reference is to the electoral reform movement in England.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The point was not debated on that date.—*Ed.*

*May 30, 1865*

Citizen *Marx* recommended that the Council should concentrate its efforts upon promoting the success of the Working Men's Congress to be held in Belgium this year.<sup>273</sup>

*June 6, 1865*

Citizen *Marx* stated that when Citizen *Weston's* propositions are again discussed he should read a paper in reply and propose a series of counter-resolutions.

*June 20, 1865*

Citizen *Marx* then read a part of his paper in reply to Citizen *Weston's* propositions on the question of *wages*.<sup>a</sup>

Citizen *Weston* thought that in the part of the paper read by Citizen *Marx* nothing had been advanced or proved which in any way affected the principles *he* affirmed.

Citizen *Cremer* thought Citizen *Marx* had given two or three practical illustrations or rather facts which completely destroyed the positions affirmed by Citizen *Weston*.

The question was adjourned till June 27th at 9 o'clock. Citizen *Marx* will then read the latter part of his paper and propose a series of counter-resolutions.

*June 27, 1865*

Citizen *Marx* then, after recapitulating the principal points in the first part of his paper which he had read at the last sitting, proceeded to read the latter part, at the conclusion of which Citizen *Cremer* said there were many who would like to have both papers--of Citizen *Weston* and Citizen *Marx's* reply--printed, but he hardly knew how the expense was to be met.

Citizen *Weston* questioned the correctness of the statement contained in Citizen *Marx's* paper having reference to agricultural labourers.

On the motion of Citizen *Eccarius* the debate was adjourned to the next sitting to be opened by Citizen *Eccarius*.

*July 4, 1865*

Citizen *Eccarius* resumed the adjourned debate on Citizen *Weston's* propositions, arguing against Citizen *Weston's* views.

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 101-49.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Fox* slightly differed with Citizen *Eccarius* as to the continued intellectual progress which Citizen *Eccarius* asserted had been made by mankind.

Citizen *Carter* altogether ignored the statistics of political economists and preferred to look at and judge man by what we knew of him.

Citizen *Kaub* proposed the adjournment of the debate till the next sitting. Carried unanimously.<sup>276</sup>

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet. Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1961

Reproduced from the Minute Book

[A CARD ISSUED TO SOCIETIES  
FORMING THE ASSOCIATION<sup>277</sup>]

INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION  
FOUNDED ON 28th SEPTEMBER, 1864,  
AT A PUBLIC MEETING HELD AT ST. MARTIN'S HALL,  
LONDON

Central Council,  
18 Greek Street, London, W.

The Address and Statutes issued by the Provisional Central Council fully explain the Association's objects and aspirations, which, however, may be summed up in a few words. It aims at the protection, advancement, and complete emancipation, economical and political, of the Working Classes. As a means to this great end it will promote the establishment of solidarity between the manifold divisions of labour in EACH COUNTRY, and the co-operation of the Working Classes of DIFFERENT COUNTRIES.

Its Organisation, with a Central Medium at London, and numerous affiliated Branches in Europe and America, will assist in uniting the Working Classes of all countries in a perpetual bond of fraternal co-operation. Annual Congresses of Delegates, elected by the affiliated Working Men themselves, will create for the Working Classes a public and powerful European representation.

The *Executive Council on behalf of the Operative Bricklayers' Society*, assembled at the 25, Hatfield Street, Blackfriars, London,<sup>a</sup> having subscribed to the principles, and applied to enter the fraternal bond, are hereby admitted as an affiliated Branch of the Association.

Dated the 21st of February 1865

G. Odger, President of Council  
G. W. Wheeler, Honorary Treasurer

E. Dupont, Corresponding Secretary	for	France.
K. Marx,	do	Germany.

<sup>a</sup> Italicised words and "21st of February 1865" are in handwriting.—Ed.



*E. Holtorp,*

do

Poland.

*H. Jung,*

do

Switzerland.

*L. Lewis,*

do

America.

*W. R. Cremer,* Honorary General Secretary.

Published as a leaflet in London in the  
summer of 1865

Reproduced from the leaflet



# International Working Men's Association.

CENTRAL COUNCIL,

18 GREEK STREET, LONDON, W.



Trade, Friendly, or any Working Men's Societies are invited to join in their corporate capacity, the only conditions being that the Members subscribe to the principles of the Association, and pay for the declaration of their enrolment (which is varnished and mounted on canvas and roller), the sum of 5s. No contributions are *demanded* from Societies joining, it being left to their means and discretion to contribute or not, or as they may from time to time deem the *efforts* of the Association worthy of support.

The Central Council will be pleased to send the Address and Rules, which fully explain the principles and aims of the Association, to any Society applying for them: and, if within the London district, deputation will gladly attend to afford any further information that may be required. Societies joining are entitled to send a representative to the Central Council. The amount of contribution for individual members is 1s. per annum, with 1d. for Card of Membership; which may be obtained, with every information concerning the Association, by applying to the Honorary Secretary, or at the Central Council's Meetings, which are held every Tuesday Evening, at 18 Greek Street, from Eight to Ten o'clock.

E. DUFONT,	Corresponding Secretary for France.
K. MARX,	" " Germany.
E. HOLTROP,	" " Poland.
H. LUNG,	" " Switzerland.
L. LEWIS,	" " America.

G. ODGER, *President of Central Council.*  
G. W. WHEELER, *Hon. Treasurer.*  
W. R. CREMER, *Hon. Gen. Sec.*

## FORM OF APPLICATION

FOR SOCIETIES WISHING TO JOIN THE

**International Working Men's Association.**



We, the Members of the \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ assembled

at the \_\_\_\_\_

declare our entire concurrence with the principles and aims of the International Working Men's Association, and pledge ourselves to disseminate and reduce them to practice; and as an earnest of our sincerity we hereby apply to the Central Council to be admitted into the fraternal bond as an affiliated Branch of the Association.

Signed on behalf of the Members, \_\_\_\_\_ in number.

\_\_\_\_\_ Secretary.

\_\_\_\_\_ President.

\_\_\_\_\_ 186



REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE QUESTIONS  
OF A CONGRESS AND CONFERENCE  
AS AMENDED AND PASSED BY THE CENTRAL COUNCIL  
AT A SUMMONED MEETING  
ON THE 25TH OF JULY, 1865<sup>279</sup>

In consequence of the urgent representations of our French and Swiss correspondents who call upon the Central Council to take some steps in fulfilment of the pledge given at the time of the foundation of the Association that a congress would be held in Brussels in the present year to discuss questions of general interest to the proletarians of Europe, your Committee have taken the whole subject into their consideration and submit to you the following series of proposals:

1. That it is not possible to assemble a congress in Brussels or London at the present time. In lieu thereof we propose a conference which shall assemble in London on Monday, September 25th.

2. That the following declaration be published in the Continental and British journals which are favourable to our cause:

“The Central Council of the International Working Men’s Association announce that they have resolved on postponing the convocation of a general congress of working men at Brussels or elsewhere for three reasons:

“1st. Because they have felt the advisability of having a preliminary conference with a few delegates from their principal branches on the Continent touching [on] the programme which ought to be laid before the said congress.

“2nd. Because in Britain the reform movement, the general elections and the industrial exhibition and in France the strikes have absorbed the energies and attention of the working classes to such an extent as to have retarded the maturity of the Association.

“3rd. Because during the present year the Belgian Parliament has passed an alien act<sup>280</sup> of such a character as to put an end to

the project the Association had entertained of holding a congress, or to any they might have entertained of having a conference in the capital of Belgium.”

3. The conference is to be constituted in this wise: two delegates from every central administration are to be invited, also two from Lyons. The cost of the travelling expenses of the delegates will be borne by their constituents. Their costs in London will be defrayed by the Central Council.

4. As to the ways and means of defraying these costs, the Committee have received the generous offer from Citizen Jung that he will board and lodge the delegates from Switzerland. For the rest the Committee recommend:

1st. That the members of the Central Council renew their annual subscriptions in the month of September previous to the assembling of the conference.

2nd. That the General Secretary<sup>a</sup> be instructed to appeal to the secretaries of the societies who have already joined the Association to exert themselves to sell cards of membership to their individual members for the sake of meeting the outlay of the conference.

3rd. That the members of the Central Council be recommended to take cards on sale, paying to the Council the amount of the same in ready money recouping the immediate outlay from the produce of the sales.

5. The Committee propose that the Central Council should adopt and submit to the conference a certain programme which was amended and passed in the following form by the Central Council:

- 1) Questions relating to the Congress.
- 2) Questions relating to the organisation of the Association.
- 3) Combination of effort by means of the Association in the different national struggles between capital and labour.
- 4) Trades' unions, their past, present, and future.
- 5) Co-operative labour.
- 6) Direct and indirect taxation.
- 7) Reduction of the number of the hours of labour.
- 8) Female and children labour.
- 9) The Muscovite invasion of Europe and the re-establishment of an independent and integral Poland.
- 10) Standing armies, their effects upon the interests of the productive classes.

6. Preliminary sittings of the delegates to be held with Committee, the definitive sittings with the Central Council.

<sup>a</sup> W. R. Cremer.—*Ed.*

7. On the 28th of September a soirée will be held for the three following objects: 1st, to commemorate the founding of the Association; 2nd, to do honour to the Continental delegates; and 3rd, to celebrate the triumph of federalism and free labour in America.

The soirée to consist of a tea, speaking, conversation, and dancing.

First published in Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16,  
Moscow, 1960

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book



TO THE WORKING MEN  
OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND <sup>281</sup>

Fellow Working Men!

It is a fact that amongst the thousands of daily and weekly newspapers existing at the present day, those that advocate the interests of the working class and defend the cause of labour might be counted at your fingers' ends. Nor is this to be wondered at when you bear in mind that, almost without exception, they are the property of capitalists, established for their own use, either for political party purposes or as commercial speculations. Thus, the publicity of matters concerning our political enfranchisement, our social emancipation, or our material well-being as hired wages labourers depends to a great extent on sufferance, and when now and then an editor, in his superior wisdom, takes it into his head to side with us, it is frequently doubtful whether decided opposition would not be preferable to the favour bestowed. This is a very unsatisfactory state of things for a body of men like the working men of this country with high and well-founded aspirations to raise themselves in the political and social scale.

Benjamin Franklin is reported to have said,

“If you want a thing done, and well done, do it yourself”,

and this is precisely what we must do. If your expected elevation is not to prove a delusion and a mockery—we must take the work of our salvation into our own hands, and this can only be done by acquiring a more prominent position in the press and on the platform than we have hitherto done.

In order that we may guard against deceitful friends, we require a press of our own. To this end we must establish and support as many newspapers and periodicals as we can, wherein we ourselves

must advocate and defend our own cause against open antagonists and wily friends. In the press, as well as on the platform, we must qualify ourselves to hold our own against all comers; for then, and not till then, shall we succeed in bettering our condition.

To accomplish this, a number of well-known advocates of working-class interests have established a Limited Liability Association, entitled "The Industrial Newspaper Company", with a nominal capital of £1,000, divided into shares of £1 each; 2s. 6d. to be paid on application, and 2s. 6d. on allotment per share.

The Company have succeeded in purchasing the copyright, goodwill, &c., of the *Miner and Workman's Advocate*, which they have resolved to turn into a first-class newspaper, not only for miners, but for all branches of industry—a newspaper in which all political, social, and industrial questions, whether they affect the whole or only a portion of the working class, shall be amply discussed.

We, the undersigned, on behalf of the Company, invite all lovers of freedom who have the welfare of their fellow beings at heart to co-operate in the good and arduous task the Company have undertaken, by taking up shares, helping to increase the circulation, &c., so that the working man's press may soon be able to occupy an honourable position, and—take an active and dignified part in the struggles of the day.

Application for shares may be made immediately, by letter, enclosing 2s. 6d. for each share applied for.

G. Odger, President  
E. S. Mantz, Secretary *pro tem.*  
G. W. Wheeler, Treasurer

Written in the latter half of August 1865

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The Miner and Workman's Advocate*, No. 130, September 2, 1865

THE INDUSTRIAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY  
(LIMITED)

Capital £1,000, in Shares of £1 each. Deposit 2s. 6d. per Share.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mr. G. Odger, Chairman	Mr. Nieass
— W. R. Cremer	— Jung
— R. Applegarth	— Christmas
— Coulson	Dr. Marx
— H. Turff	Mr. Weston
— Eccarius	— Le Lubez
— W. Stainsby	— Kaub
— Worley	— Morgan
— Facey	— Lessner

Treasurer—Mr. E. Coulson  
Secretary—Mr. Edwin Shelly Mantz

PROSPECTUS

The object of the promoters of the above Company is to supply a great want of the age—to establish a Newspaper devoted to the interests of the Working Classes, and to secure for them a truthful exponent of their wrongs, and a faithful champion of their rights.

To further this object, the Board of Directors are happy to state that they have succeeded in purchasing the *Miner* Newspaper, which is now incorporated with the *Workman's Advocate*, and they have also made arrangements with some of the most advanced writers to contribute to its columns.

The well-known character of the men connected with its management renders it needless to indulge in professions. Suffice it to say, that it will be Democratic in Politics—and ever prepared to maintain principle against expediency.

To those who have been accustomed to view the efforts of the poor as a series of vain struggles of Labour against Capital, it may be observed that those efforts have failed, not from a want of justice in the objects to be attained, but from the want of a legitimate organ to influence public opinion. If an Oxford Professor or an enlightened writer have occasionally come forward to champion the creed of the downtrodden millions, his voice has been but the echo of human agony, heard amidst the clamour of contending interests, and silenced by the diatribes of newspaper hirelings. To say the Newspaper Press represents public opinion, is to administer insult to intelligent men. It is the property of speculators, political leaders, large contractors, and railway directors. Can we expect truth through the channels of falsehood—light from the regions of darkness, or fairness from those whose business it is to calumniate, pervert, and deceive? Certainly not. Hence the necessity for an organ that shall be beyond the taint of corruption, invulnerable against attacks, and inspired by men who feel it is their mission to teach the truths they have acquired by hard toil and bitter suffering.

The *Workman's Advocate* boldly takes its stand upon this necessity. Dignified and fearless, as becomes the champion of the masses, it requires the aid of no dishonest scribes or unprincipled adventurers. It will look to Labour and Labour's friends for its associates. The class that has produced an Elliott, Clare, and Burns—that has given a Defoe to fiction, a Stephenson to science, and a Shakespeare to literature, still claims within its ranks many a noble son who can wield the pen as well as the shuttle or the hammer.

An Industrial Newspaper Company is an application of the Co-operative principle—a sign of the times that the men of action are likewise men of thought, who will tell their own "unvarnished tale", in an organ of their own.

On the great questions of the day the *Workman's Advocate* will pronounce a decided opinion. With the view of promoting the complete political and social enfranchisement of the toiling millions, it will energetically support Manhood Suffrage, vote by ballot, representation based upon numbers, direct taxation, the nationalisation of the land, the development of co-operative self-employment to national dimensions, reduction of the number

of the hours of labour, Saturday half holiday movements, political international, and trade associations, everything that tends to advance the cause of human progress.

Originated by the representatives of Labour, to the sons of Labour must it chiefly look for encouragement and support; but as good men are to be found in every station of life, it is believed that many ardent lovers of freedom who have means at their command, will derive a pleasure in co-operating with our efforts. Aid from this source will be generous, and may be gracefully tendered, as it will be gratefully received.

Firm in the faith of those political truths, for the utterance of which so many noble martyrs have suffered, and conscious that the period has arrived when revolutions must be effected by mental effort, and not by physical violence, the conductors of the *Workman's Advocate* will never descend to scurrility or vulgar abuse, but seek to prove the justice of its claims by the soundness of its arguments, and the charity of its spirit.

Enrolling amongst its literary associates some of the brightest intellects of all countries, its articles upon Foreign Affairs will be the matured opinions of profound thinkers; and from its close connections with the International Working Men's Association, which has correspondents in all parts of the world, this department will be one of its most valuable features.

Upon domestic topics the result of the week will be faithfully recorded in a well-written Summary, and the various movements of political bodies will be chronicled and commented fairly on.

On all questions affecting the rights of Labour the platform will be its own, and every working man will feel that at least the columns of one journal will be open to him and those who advocate his cause.

To bring the proprietorship of the *Workman's Advocate* within the reach of the masses, the Shares are being issued at the sum of £1 each; and to make the mode of payment as easy as possible, the Directors have determined to accept deposits of 2s. 6d. per Share.

(By order of the Directors)

E. S. Mantz, Secretary

## FORM OF APPLICATION FOR SHARES

Please to allot me \_\_\_\_\_ Shares in the Industrial Newspaper Company, for which I send \_\_\_\_\_ as my first deposit, authorising the Secretary to instruct the district collector to wait upon me weekly.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

To Mr. E. S. Mantz, Secretary,

Rose Cottage, 60, Downham Road, Kingsland.

Written in the latter half of August 1865

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The Miner and Workman's Advocate*, No. 132, September 16, 1865

FROM THE MINUTE BOOK  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETINGS

(September 1865)

*September 12, 1865*

A discussion then took place as to the forthcoming conference taken part in by *Marx, Weston, Lubez, Cremer*, and on the motion of Citizen *Lubez*, seconded by *Mantz*, the further consideration of the question was adjourned till the 19th inst., the meeting to be special for the consideration of the conference.

*September 19, 1865*

Citizen *Marx* announced that no delegates from Germany would attend the conference, but that a report of the doings in Germany would be sent him which he would read to the conference.<sup>282</sup> He had also sent [a letter] to Ernest Jones asking him to be present and speak at the soirée.<sup>283</sup>

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1961

Reproduced from the Minute Book

FROM THE MINUTES OF THE LONDON CONFERENCE  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION <sup>284</sup>

MEETING OF STANDING COMMITTEE  
WITH CONTINENTAL DELEGATES

*September 26*

The question of a general congress was next discussed.

*Marx* in the name of the Central Council proposed that the Congress assemble in Geneva.

*Dupleix* seconded the proposition.

*Fribourg* wished it recorded that the French delegates had received instructions to propose Geneva instead of, as heretofore decided, Belgium as a protest against the law passed in Belgium with regard to foreigners.<sup>285</sup> The resolution was carried unanimously.

*De Paepe* proposed, *Tolain* seconded, that the following be submitted to the Conference this evening:

That the Conference transfer the place of meeting of the Congress from Belgium to Geneva as a solemn protest against the law concerning foreigners passed in Belgium. Carried unanimously.

The period for the assembling of the Congress was next discussed.

*Marx* and *Cremer* in the name of the Central Council proposed that it take place in September or October of next year, unless unforeseen circumstances shall occur to necessitate its further postponement.

The delegates from *Paris* as an amendment proposed that the Congress assemble on the first Sunday in April next year. They all declared that to longer postpone the Congress would be fatal to the Association in France. [...]

*Marx* was impressed by the statements of the French delegates and was inclined to withdraw the resolution. [...]



The French delegates would so far yield as to agree to the last week in May.

*Marx* having withdrawn his proposition for September, the amendment became the resolution and was unanimously agreed to.<sup>286</sup> [...]

*Marx* and *Fribourg* proposed that the following questions be submitted to the Congress: "Co-operative labour", "Reduction of the number of the hours of labour", "Female and child labour".

All present voted for them as questions but Weston.

*Marx* and *Fribourg* proposed the following for the Congress: "Direct and indirect taxation". Agreed to.

The following questions marked 3, 4 and 10<sup>287</sup> on the programme were also agreed to:

3. Combination of effort by means of the Association in the different national struggles between Capital and Labour.

4. Trades' unions—their past, present and future.

10. Standing armies: their effects upon the interests of the productive classes.

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1961

Reproduced from the manuscript

FROM THE MINUTE BOOK  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETINGS  
(October 1865-January 1866)

*October 3, 1865*

The question as to the publication of the doings at the conference was then discussed.

Citizens *Carter* and *Lubez* proposed that Citizen Marx be requested to compile the report of the conference proceedings. Carried unanimously.

*Tuesday, November 21, 1865*

The *Secretary for Germany*<sup>a</sup> stated that, in view of the sudden demand for cards that had arisen at Paris, he and the Secretary for Switzerland<sup>b</sup> had guaranteed the printer for the cost of preparing 2,000 cards, of which number 1,000 should be sent to Paris, 500 reserved for the French province and 100 reserved for Germany. He desired the sanction of the Council to this arrangement.

It was moved by Citizen *Morgan* and seconded by *Wheeler* and carried *nem. con.*: "That we sanction the arrangement made by Citizens Marx and Jung with the printer of the cards and that the allotment of them be as proposed by Citizen Marx."

GENERAL REPORT

Citizen *Marx* stated that on his proposition it had been resolved at the conference that a report should be drawn up of the transactions of the Association for the first year of its existence.

<sup>a</sup> Marx.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Jung.—*Ed.*

He now advised that the resolution for preparing such report be rescinded on two grounds: (1) because the French delegates had already published a report, (2) that its publication at the present moment was not opportune and should be delayed until May.<sup>288</sup> He had, however, communicated copies of the resolution and programme to our correspondents in Belgium and to Citizen Jung.

The resolution for drawing up a report was accordingly rescinded.

### PROPAGANDA IN GERMANY

The *Secretary for Germany* said he was glad to be able to report that our Association was at length making headway in Germany, where it had obstacles to overcome greater than those which existed in France.<sup>289</sup> Steps were being taken to form branches in Berlin, Mayence and Leipsic by men for whom the speaker could vouch. These societies would probably be represented at the Geneva Congress.

*Tuesday, November 28*

### SWITZERLAND

In the regretted absence of the Secretary for Switzerland, Citizen *Marx* stated that Citizen J. Ph. Becker had issued a proclamation to the German Swiss, concerning the Association, portions of which he thought should be translated and published in our report.<sup>290</sup> In it it was announced that the branch societies in Switzerland were about to issue a paper in German and French which would be the organ of the Association in that country.<sup>a</sup>

*December 26. Boxing night!*

Citizen *Le Lubez* laid on the table the first of a projected series of attacks on the policy of the Central Council published in the *Journal de Verviers* (Belgium).<sup>291</sup>

Citizen *Marx* made some observations in defence of the Council.

---

<sup>a</sup> A reference to the *Journal de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs* and *Vorbote*.—Ed.

January 9, 1866

*Marx* thought that the Constitution published in the *Echo de Verviers* as emanating from the French branch in London ought to have been laid before the Council before publication. He then alluded to the attack which he said was written by Citizen Vésinier.

*Jung* denounced the attack as an infamous one and exposed some of its misstatements. Such a manifesto ought to have been signed. He moved that Vésinier retract these falsities or be expelled from the Association.

*Le Lubez* admitted that Vésinier was the author of the attack.

*Marx* took occasion to defend our Paris correspondents from the aspersions made upon them. They had left with the Council all their accounts and correspondence and had behaved in the most honourable manner. [...]

*Marx* objected to the word "retractation". Vésinier should be called upon to substantiate or to make his exit. [...]

*Jung*, then withdrew his motion and *Marx* moved and *Jung* seconded that Vésinier be called upon to substantiate his accusation or, failing to do so, be expelled.

*Le Lubez* moved as an amendment that the subject be referred to a committee of three to conduct a correspondence with Vésinier. He objected to the harsh measure of expulsion. This amendment was not seconded.

The motion of *Marx* was carried with one dissentient and one neutral.

January 23, 1866

*Marx* read a letter from the Leipsic correspondent Liebknecht. They had formed a small branch there; he also referred to a visit he had recently received from the editor<sup>a</sup> of the *Social-Demokrat*.<sup>292</sup>

*Marx* also read letter from De Paepe<sup>b</sup> explaining his long silence; he was sorry they had not increased in numbers; but they had now confederated with the "People"<sup>c</sup> and had made the *Tribune of the People* their organ<sup>293</sup>; they wished to exchange with the *Workman's Advocate*.

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1961

Reproduced from the Minute Book

<sup>a</sup> Hofstetten.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> of January 14, 1866.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *La Tribune du Peuple*.—*Ed.*

FROM A LETTER BY JENNY MARX  
TO JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER<sup>294</sup>

The following lines are taken from a letter written in London on January 29:

“With respect to religion, a significant movement is currently developing in stuffy old England. The top men in science, Huxley (Darwin’s school) at the head, with Charles Lyell, Bowring, Carpenter, etc., give very enlightened, truly bold, free-thinking lectures for the people in St. Martin’s Hall, and, what is more, on Sunday evenings, exactly at the time when the lambs are usually making a pilgrimage to the Lord’s pastures; the hall has been full to bursting and the people’s enthusiasm so great that, on the first Sunday evening, when I went there with my family, more than 2,000 people could not get into the room, which was crammed full. The clerics let this dreadful thing happen three times.—Yesterday evening, however, the assembly was informed that no more lectures could be held until the court case brought by the spiritual fathers against the SUNDAY EVENINGS FOR THE PEOPLE<sup>a</sup> was heard. The gathering emphatically expressed its indignation and more than a hundred pounds were then collected for fighting the case. How stupid of the clerics to interfere. To the annoyance of this pious band, the evenings even closed with music. Choruses from Händel, Mozart, Beethoven, Mendelssohn and Gounod were sung and received enthusiastically by the English, who had, until now, only been allowed to bawl out JESUS, JESUS, MEEK AND MILD<sup>b</sup> or take themselves off to the GIN palace on Sundays.”<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> In the original the English words are followed by a German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the original the first words of a hymn are given in English with a German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The next two paragraphs are from *Der Verbote* editors.—*Ed.*

These events may well provide the incentive for the numerous societies of free-thinkers in England,<sup>295</sup> which so far have taken a more reserved stand, to come before the people in order that their research might be put to practical use.

It is also a sign of the times that the Fenian cause<sup>296</sup> arouses deep sympathy among the English working class, both because it opposes the clerics and because it is republican.

Written on January 29, 1866

First published in *Der Vorbote*, No. 2,  
February 1866

Printed according to the journal  
checked with the manuscript

Published in English for the first  
time

TO THE EDITOR OF *L'ECHO DE VERVIERS*<sup>297</sup>

18, Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, London

Sir,

We count upon your sense of justice and your desire "to spread the truth and the light among the working classes" in asking you to publish the following letter, a copy of which has been sent to Citizen V.<sup>a</sup>

Yours faithfully,  
Jung

Mr. V.,

*L'Echo de Verviers* published an article, in its issue No. 293 of December 16, 1865, ostensibly aimed at explaining to working men the spirit that animates the members of the Central Council of the *International Working Men's Association*. Citizen Le Lubez, who presented it to the Council (as he had been instructed to do), recognised that the article, although anonymous, was from your pen.

After long discussion, the Central Council at its meeting on January 9, 1866, adopted the following resolution:

"Citizen V. is expected to provide evidence for the facts he has cited; if he refuses or is incapable of doing so, he shall be expelled from the *International Working Men's Association*."<sup>b</sup>

Since your article departs completely from the truth, the Central Council regards it as its duty to restore the full facts. The Central Council is aware of its mission, and of the mandate entrusted to it;

<sup>a</sup> Pierre Vésinier.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Cf. this volume, p. 389.—*Ed.*

it will not refute slander with slander, nor lies with lies. It will not stoop to personal accusations but will let the accused vindicate themselves. It will not be deterred by any obstacles, and despite false friends, it will leave no spot or blemish on its reputation.

Particularly noteworthy are the following passages:

## I

“Before long all the French and Italian members resigned on account of the presence of Messrs. Tolain and Fribourg in the Committee, and their intrigues” (*Echo de Verviers*, No. 293).

Of the nine French members, only two withdrew, namely, Messrs. Denoual and Le Lubez, the latter returning shortly afterwards. As for the Italians, one of them (Citizen Wolff) gave as the reason for his resignation, not “the presence of Messrs. Tolain and Fribourg in the Committee, and their intrigues”, but a Central Council resolution concerning Citizen Lefort<sup>a</sup> proposed by the Sub-Committee, for which he himself had voted, a few hours earlier, as a member of the Sub-Committee.

## II

“The Committee continued to function without them, and has done so to this day” (*Echo de Verviers*, No. 293).

Of the two French members who withdrew, Citizen Le Lubez, former secretary for France, returned shortly afterwards as the delegate from the Deptford section; consequently, the Committee did not function without him for long.

## III

“It (the Committee) published an Address and Provisional Rules, the former being from the pen of an eminent publicist of Latin race, etc.” (*Echo de Verviers*, No. 293).

The Address and the Rules were published prior to the withdrawal of the two French members and the Italian members. The Address is not from the pen of an eminent publicist of Latin race, but of a writer of Teutonic race.<sup>b</sup> The Address was adopted

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 82-83, 330.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The reference is to Giuseppe Mazzini and Karl Marx.—*Ed.*



unanimously by all the members of the Central Council, including the French and the Italians, even before the publicist of Latin race had acquainted himself with it. So far from being its author, had he acquainted himself with it, he would have urged the Italian members to oppose it because of its anti-bourgeois character. But, having arrived too late, all he could do was to prevent the Italian members from translating it into Italian. It is evident that you have never read this Address, and the eminent publicist of Latin race will not thank you for attributing it to his pen.

#### IV

“Has it (the Committee) pursued the aim it has set itself—the complete emancipation of the working people?

“No. Instead, it has wasted a precious year to call a conference and work out the programme of the congress that is to take place in Geneva, etc.” (*Echo de Verviers*, No. 293).

The Central Council hardly began to function till around 1865. This means that nine months passed before the conference was held. It spent these “precious” nine months to establish international relations and extend its contacts in Britain. Every week, for a period of several months, deputations composed of Council members were sent to various working men’s societies to induce them to join the Association. Here is the result: at the time of the conference the *International Working Men’s Association* numbered 14,000 members in Britain; among the affiliated societies were such important organisations as the Shoemakers’ and Operative Bricklayers’ societies; the most influential and noted men of these large working men’s organisations (TRADES UNIONS) were members of the Central Council; a newspaper had been founded whose very title (*The Workman’s Advocate*) indicates its mission, a newspaper which always and everywhere defends the interests of the working class.

The association for universal suffrage (the Reform League) was founded in Britain, an association which has thousands of members and whose secretary,<sup>a</sup> as well as most of the members of its Executive Council, have been elected from our midst.<sup>298</sup>

In France we have several thousand supporters.

In Paris there is a strong, active and irreproachable Administration with over two thousand members; there are branches in

---

<sup>a</sup> George Howell.—Ed.

Lyons, Rouen, Nantes, Caen, Neufchâteau, Pont-l'Évêque, Pantin, St. Denis, Lisieux, Puteaux, Belleville, etc., etc., etc.

In Switzerland—an administration in Geneva, made up of the finest people, with 500 members, and branches in Lausanne, Vevey, Montreux and the Neuchâtel canton.

In Belgium the movement was taking shape under the most auspicious circumstances, and the Central Committee had reason to believe that it would not be long before Spain followed suit.

## V

“No, it (the Committee) did not invite to its conference in September 1865 even a single delegate from Germany, where there are so many working men's societies, nor from the numerous British societies, nor from the Italian societies, which are so well organised, nor from those existing in France, for Tolain, Fribourg & Co. are not delegates of any society of French working men—they delegated themselves; they did not provide any proof of being invested with any mandate. Far from being delegates of French working men's associations, their very presence was the sole reason why the latter did not send delegates to the London Conference. We could name several associations which refused for this reason to attend, etc., etc.” (*Echo de Verviers*, No. 293).

In principle, representation at the conference was restricted to the sections of the International Working Men's Association and to the societies which had subscribed to its principles; moreover, the state of our finances impelled us to limit the number of delegates to the barest minimum.

In the case of Germany, “where there are so many working men's societies”, the only ones that could have been represented were the consumers' societies, founded by Schulze-Delitzsch, and the Lassallean societies, the General Association of German Workers. The former—whose membership is unaware of the fact—are merely a tool of the Prussian liberal bourgeoisie, with Schulze-Delitzsch as one of its *matadors*; the Lassallean societies were, and still are, in a state of complete disintegration, one group having entered into a coalition with Bismarck, while the other, which had not yet reconstituted itself, recognised as its leader J. Ph. Becker, the Swiss delegate to the conference. While the conference was in session, he received a mandate from the workers of the Solingen factories, and he also represented the German Society in Geneva—the German Workers' Educational Society. The German Society in London (German Workers' Educational Society) was represented by its delegates to the Central Council.<sup>299</sup>

Apart from the obstacles which working men encounter in forming societies in Germany, the law also prohibits them from joining foreign societies. Nevertheless, several sections have been formed in the North and South of Germany.

In view of all these difficulties, is it so very surprising that Germany was not represented as well as the Central Council would have liked?

The British societies were very well represented by the British members of the Central Council: Odger, the President, is Secretary of the TRADES COUNCIL (supreme council of all the British TRADES UNIONS); Cremer, the General Secretary, is a member of the Carpenters' Executive Committee; Howell, Secretary of the Reform League and a member of the Operative Bricklayers' Executive Committee, and Coulson, Secretary of the latter society, are both delegates from it to the Central Council; Wheeler, general manager of a mutual life insurance company, is a member of the Central Council.

The shoemakers (5,500 members) were represented by Odger, Morgan and Cope, while Shaw represented the house-painters, etc., etc.

Citizen Wolff, who attended the Italian working men's congress at Naples in 1865, and the other Italian members of the Council, did not succeed in winning a single supporter in Italy, although they took a very active part in the work of the Central Council. The Central Council deploras the fact that the Italian members did not, even before they withdrew, enjoy sufficient confidence with "the Italian societies, which are so well organised", to persuade at least one of them to join the International Association.

"Not a single delegate from those [societies] existing in France, for Tolain, Fribourg & Co. are not delegates of any French society—they delegated themselves".

The members of the Lyons section regretted that the lack of funds had prevented them from sending delegates, but like those of the Caen and Neufchâteau sections, they sent a manifesto, thereby taking part in the work of the Central Council.

Tolain, Fribourg, Limousin and Varlin had been elected by general vote in the Paris section; this section is composed of workers of all trades as well as several hundred members of the *Crédit au Travail* association. Beluze, who heads the association, is also a member of the section. All of them took, or could have taken, part in the election of the delegates. Limousin, one of the four Paris delegates, is secretary of the Board of the newspaper *L'Association*, international organ of the co-operative societies.

Mr. Clariol was delegated by the Printers' Society of Paris. On the invitation of the Central Council, Messrs. Schily, Dumesnil-Marigny and others came from Paris to attend the conference, in which they took a very active part.

Which are the other societies that you say were prevented by the presence of Tolain, Fribourg & Co. from sending delegates to the conference? Are you referring to the Society of December 10,<sup>300</sup> the only one permitted by the present French regime?

The report on the conference appeared in all the liberal newspapers of Paris without giving rise to a single complaint or a single objection on the part of the members of the International Association or the French co-operative societies. The mandate given to the delegates had been verified and approved by the Sub-Committee of the Central Council.

At the very beginning of the conference the Paris delegates presented a detailed and faithful report on the activities of their Administration and the state of their finances, and corroborated it by putting their books and the whole of their correspondence at the disposal of the Central Council. The Central Council may congratulate itself on the effective steps taken by the Paris Administration to establish and propagate the International Association in France.

## VI

"Belgium sent a very able delegate, Citizen De Paepe, but he was the only representative from that country, which numbers many associations" (*Echo de Verviers*, No. 293).

It is regrettable that Belgium sent only one delegate and that this delegate was the one to represent the least number of electors. Nevertheless, that country was fittingly represented in the person of César De Paepe.

## VII

"Switzerland, or rather Geneva, sent two delegates who are not Swiss, namely, a French refugee and another from Baden, who arrived for the conference together with the two supposedly French delegates mentioned above—altogether five or six persons of the same brand, and one real and serious delegate, the Belgian" (*Echo de Verviers*, No. 293).

The Swiss delegates<sup>a</sup> had been elected by general vote by all the members of the various sections of the International Association in

<sup>a</sup> F. Dupleix and J. P. Becker.—*Ed.*

Switzerland, the Grütli Society,<sup>301</sup> which is entirely Swiss, and the German Society.

The German Workers' Educational Society, too, participated in the election through its representatives in the International Association's organisation in Switzerland. By the choice of their delegates, the Association's Swiss members have won an honourable place in the history of the International Association.

The Swiss delegates arrived at the conference, not "together with the two supposedly French delegates", but with the four Paris delegates.

Citizen Becker, one of the conference delegates, has been a naturalised Swiss for more than twenty years. He was made a citizen of the town of Bienne in recognition of his services to the cause of world democracy. A working man himself, he became distinguished as an agitator, soldier, organiser and writer. He has always used his manifold talents for the cause of the working people. It is ridiculous to see pygmies assailing such giants, whose merits, clearly, may be judged only by men who are themselves known for their probity and disinterested attitude.

## VIII

"We ask: is that a satisfactory result?" (*Echo de Verviers*, No. 293).

The Central Council is composed almost exclusively of workmen who are used to handling hammers and files, and it is only at the price of personal sacrifice that they can change them for the pen. Whenever they turn to the pen, they do so to defend or promote a noble cause, and not to sell themselves to Bonapartism. If the result is not as satisfactory as workers in general would have liked it to be, we are convinced that they will take into account the evenings spent working after a long and exhausting day of labour, and the anxiety which their brothers had to experience before they achieved the present state of affairs.

## IX

"Yielding to pernicious influences, questions such as the abolition of Russian influence in Europe that bear no relation to the aims of the Association, were included in the programme of the Geneva Congress" (*Echo de Verviers*, No. 294).

What are the pernicious influences to which the Central Council yielded by including in its programme the question of the need to do away with Muscovite influence in Europe (not Russian influence, which means an entirely different thing)? The need to "do away with Muscovite influence in Europe" is recognised in principle by our Inaugural Address, which was certainly not published under anyone's pernicious influence.

What are the other questions included in the programme as a result of pernicious influences?

## X

"This enormous mistake has already had fatal consequences; the Poles have demanded en masse to be admitted into the Committee, and they will soon command a vast majority on it" (*Echo de Verviers*, No. 294).

The Poles did not demand en masse to be admitted into the Central Council, and far from commanding a vast majority on it, they form less than one-twentieth of it.

How can one reason with a writer who says:

"The Committee drew up and put to the vote a programme of twelve points covering nearly all the more general problems of political economy, but did not pose a single scientific question",

and who, a few lines further down, recognises, without even pausing for breath, "the scientific importance" of the very same questions?

The Central Council, far from being exclusive, has always sought to benefit by the knowledge and culture of all sincere friends of the working people's cause; it has been doing all in its power to promote its great principles and to unite the workers of all countries. To this end, it has founded three newspapers in Switzerland: *Journal de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs* and *La Voix de l'Avenir*, published in French, and *The Forerunner* (*Vorbote*), published in German; and one in Britain, *The Workman's Advocate*, the only English newspaper which, proceeding from the right of the peoples to self-determination, recognises that the Irish have the right to throw off the English yoke.

The Central Council cannot pass judgement on its own actions. The Geneva Congress will decide whether the Council is worthy of

the trust placed in it, or whether it has abandoned lightly the noble goal set before it.

I remain, Sir, your faithful servant,

H. Jung

For the Central Council  
of the International Working Men's Association

February 15, 1866

First published in *L'Echo de Verviers*,  
No. 43, February 20, 1866

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Translated from the French

RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECH  
ON MAZZINI'S ATTITUDE TO THE  
INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION<sup>302</sup>  
FROM THE MINUTES  
OF THE CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF MARCH 13, 1866

Citizen *Marx* made a speech in reference to the proceedings at the previous meeting. He said it was not true, as Major Wolff had stated, that Mazzini had written our Statutes. He, Marx, wrote them after discussion in Committee. Several draughts were discussed, Wolff's draught among the rest.<sup>303</sup> On two points they were quite distinguished from each other. Marx spoke of capital oppressing labour. Wolff wanted centralisation and understood by Working Men's Associations only benefit societies. Mazzini's statutes were printed at the time of the conference in Naples.

It could hardly be true that Mazzini had seen Marx's Address before it was printed as it was in Marx's pocket, unless Mazzini saw it after it had been put in Le Lubez's hands and before it had been taken to the *Bee-Hive*.

Again Mazzini wrote to Brussels, to Fontaine, a letter which was to be communicated to the Belgian societies, in which he warned them against Marx's Socialist views. This was stated by De Paepe at the conference.<sup>304</sup>

Major Wolff was not a member of the Council. Major Wolff ought to have sent a letter informing the Council that he intended to prefer his complaint. He [Marx] protested against the proceedings at the last meeting in the name of himself and the other Continental secretaries. He desired a note of this to be taken as it might be brought before the Congress at Geneva.



MANCHESTER SCHILLER INSTITUTE CIRCULAR<sup>305</sup>

Carlton Buildings, Cooper Street,  
March 19, 1866

The Schiller Institute, whose six-year-long existence offers complete proof that it is an institution which satisfies real needs, must leave its present premises in June next year, since the lease will then have expired, and the owner will have definitely refused to extend it.

The Board of Directors has therefore to tackle the following task in order to provide the Institute with the premises it needs for its purpose.

After all attempts to find a suitable building had failed, and no contractor could be found who was prepared to erect such a building which would then be let to the Institute, there remained no other way out than to see if the necessary funds could be raised for a building to be erected at the Institute's own expense.

The essential points that one must bear in mind here are the following:

The Institute must be located in a central part of the city.

Visitors to the Institute must be able to enter it on the ground floor.

Its individual rooms must be at least the same size as the present ones.

The fulfilment of these conditions appeared indispensable to us, if the Institute was to continue to thrive. In addition, however, it seemed desirable to provide the various associations existing in Manchester with the opportunity of finding a common home in the projected new building. This purpose can be achieved if the uppermost floor were turned into a hall seating 250 to 300 people. Such a hall would make a negligible difference to the cost of the building, while the Institute's income could be greatly supplemented by letting it.

We have accordingly put every effort into finding a suitable plot of land and into ascertaining the cost of such an undertaking.

The following is the result of our calculations:

Cost of a plot of land with a building area of approximately 350 to 400 square yards	£6,000 to £7,000
Cost of the building work	£3,500 to £4,000
Equipping and furnishing the building	£500 to £500
	<hr/>
Total	£10,000 to £11,500

We firmly believe we can obtain a mortgage of £5,000 to £6,000 on land and property of this type, and draw from the past financial practices of the Institute, taking account of the expected increase in income and expenditure, the firm conviction that the interest on such a loan would be covered.

To go ahead with our plan, we would therefore need capital of our own of from £5,000 to £5,500.

Although the Schiller Institute is open to members from all nations and non-Germans have repeatedly taken part in its activities, the Institute is essentially a German one.

According to the present register, it has a membership of over 300 members and offers them the following facilities:

a library consisting of more than 4,000 volumes at present,  
a reading room in which 55 newspapers are available, most of which are German,

lectures on scientific and literary subjects, namely in the special associations, which have been formed for this purpose within the Institute.

Whenever possible the Institute does its best to further German intellectual activities, and also offers opportunities for social gatherings to be held on its premises which are particularly beneficial to new arrivals from the fatherland who have no other meeting place here.

We are firmly convinced that the Institute can pursue these goals in the future to an even greater extent, if we are able to carry out our plans to improve the Institute from the point of view of accommodation, as the latter would also improve our financial situation.

From the above, it becomes obvious that we are mainly appealing to Germans residing in Manchester; we are enquiring whether they are willing to provide the funds necessary for the purposes mentioned.

So as not to burden the Institute from the outset with exorbitant interest payments, the Board of Directors decided to attempt to raise the above-mentioned sum by donations; however, to ensure that the building to be erected could only be used for the purposes of the Institute, it was simultaneously decided that, in case the Schiller Institute should cease to function, the donors should become its creditors to the amount of their donation, and this will be expressly stated in the receipts given for donation.

As soon as it was made known that the Institute intended to have its own building and thereby safeguard its existence, such a lively response was evoked among the members that within a few days nearly £1,200 in donations of £25 and less were placed at the disposal of the Board of Directors.

This highly significant sum is essentially the result of the willing efforts and sacrifice of the more recently arrived Germans who also represent those who benefit directly from the Institute.

Encouraged by this result, which proves that even at the present moment the Institute is needed by a significant number of Germans residing locally, we are now turning to those who take perhaps a less involved interest in an institution which strives for such goals and which, once it is firmly established, will form a focal point of all German efforts in Manchester.

We are appealing to you to enable us to carry out our plans by donating the funds.

The Board of Directors trusts that all the Germans in Manchester will work together for this goal which will benefit us all. Only in this way can it hope to see this project come to life, and therefore believes it is justified in warmly recommending these plans.

By order of the Board of Directors

*F. Engels*, Chairman  
*J. G. Wehner*, Treasurer  
*A. Burkhard*, Secretary

First published as a leaflet in March 1866

Printed according to the leaflet

Published in English for the first time

FROM THE MINUTE BOOK  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETINGS  
(May 1866)

*May 1, 1866*

*Lessner* reported that as a number of German tailors had been imported into Edinburgh and as it was currently reported that some of the London employers were making arrangements to bring several here, the German tailors resident in London had formed themselves into a committee and wished to co-operate with the Council of the International Working Men's Association to checkmate the designs of the employers and their agents which they had in Germany.

*Marx* stated that if *Lessner* would send him the facts, he would directly communicate with the German papers.<sup>306</sup>

*May 15, 1866*

Citizen *Marx* read extracts from Leipsic journals<sup>a</sup> cautioning German tailors against coming to England to supplant the English tailors who were on strike.

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1961

Reproduced from the Minute Book

---

<sup>a</sup> A reference to "A Warning" written by *Marx* for German newspapers (see this volume, pp. 162-63).—*Ed.*

Paul Lafargue

SURVEY OF THE PROGRESS  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S  
ASSOCIATION<sup>307</sup>

The *International Working Men's Association* was founded at a meeting on September 28, 1864 in St. Martin's Hall, London. This meeting was attended by representatives of the principal European nations (Germany, Poland, Switzerland, France, Belgium and Italy). The election took place of a provisional Central Committee charged with the tasks of editing the manifesto, drawing up the regulations and establishing branches throughout Europe.

Our present wish, in advance of the Congress,<sup>a</sup> is to give an account of what has been achieved to all the members of the *Association*, as well as to those who have not yet joined.

ENGLAND

A large number of the English working men's societies\* have accepted the principles of the *International Association* and are affiliated to it (the society of bricklayers, the shoemakers, the cabinet-makers, the tailors, etc.)...

At the present time the societies of the carpenters, coopers, joiners, etc., are ready to become members.

The reform movement has absorbed the entire attention of the working class for a moment and the entire activity of the Central

\* The reader should remember that the English working class is partly organised. Indeed its societies (*trade-unions*) comprise all the members of a singular industry. Some of these societies contain a considerable number of men; the shoemakers, for example, number around 30,000 members.

<sup>a</sup> A reference to the Geneva Congress of the International.—Ed.

Council. But for some time past deputations from the Central Council have been sent to all the working men's societies in order to acquaint them with its principles and to invite them to join. These deputations have everywhere been warmly received.

In London the Central Council has established a newspaper, *The Commonwealth*, which has become its official organ.

A German branch and a French branch of the *International Association* have been formed.

But its greatest title to public attention is that it has awakened and sustained in the English working class the consciousness of its own political power, a consciousness that had been lost since the reaction of 1848,<sup>a</sup> as was pointed out in the Inaugural Address. The stimulus it has provided in this respect has been so great that the society of shoemakers has deleted from its statutes the clause which forbade it to concern itself with politics; the society of masons is in the process of doing likewise.

It is the *International Association* which induced the workers to persevere in their anti-slavery policy during the American War. The International was one of the first to send a message of congratulations to Lincoln on his re-election.<sup>b</sup> Lincoln replied and strongly urged the members of the Association to continue its campaign for union and harmony.

The *Association* has taken the initiative in the movement of the Reform League. After the first meeting of the reformists an organisational and agitational committee was set up. It was composed of 27 members, 24 of whom belonged to the Central Council, and it was these who called for universal suffrage.<sup>308</sup> At a time when the entire English press clapped its hands and applauded the government's treatment of the Fenians, *The Commonwealth* was alone in venturing to raise its voice in their defence. The Central Council even sent a request to the Secretary of State to be granted an interview with the Minister in order to plead for better treatment for the prisoners. The request was refused.<sup>309</sup>

The *International Association* has latterly achieved a success which has modified the attitude of the press towards it. The journeymen tailors had been *LOCKED OUT* by their employers,\* who

\* In England, the employers as well as the workers go on strike. They close their workshops and set their wretched employees out on the street. This is what is happening at the moment in Sheffield where the workers in the woollen industry are without work and all the other societies have come to their aid.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 10.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 19-21.—*Ed.*

immediately sent agents to the Continent to recruit workers to replace them. The Central Council warned its correspondents, who managed, either by word of mouth or through the press, to thwart the plans of the employers. However, a certain number of German workers, who originated in towns where the *International Association* has no members, did arrive in Edinburgh. Two of their compatriots were dispatched to meet them and on their return they were able to report to the Central Council, announcing the workers' departure, which in fact took place a few days later.\*

### SWITZERLAND

It is above all in Switzerland that the *International Association* has experienced the most rapid growth and has achieved some positive results. It has established branches in almost all the towns of Switzerland: Geneva, Lausanne, Vevey, Montreux, La Chaux-de-Fonds, St.-Imier, Sonvillier, Porrentruy, Bienne, Basle, Zurich, Aubonne, Wetzibonne, etc.

The *International Association* is the owner of three newspapers, two written in French, the *Voix de l'Avenir* and the *Journal de l'Association Internationale*, and one in German, *Der Vorbote*. All the Swiss papers have put their publicity at the service of the *Association*.

In Lausanne the members of the *Association* undertook work for the state last winter, earning around 24,000 francs, with the aim of providing workers with work during the idle season. The workshop, managed by the workers themselves and without the participation of any employer, was a source of astonishment to visitors and the municipal authorities. The *Association* has set up a bank known as the *Caisse du crédit mutuel* with a capital of 20,000 frs divided into shares of 5 francs each.—A workers' circle has been created.

In La Chaux-de-Fonds a bakers' co-operative has been established and a butchers' co-operative has been announced. Hardly had the bakery been started when the bakers lowered the price of bread to 16 centimes a pound. Nor has the project of the butchers' co-operative failed to have an impact on the price of meat; the butchers have already reduced it by 9 centimes.

\* At the request of Odger, its President, the Central Council intends to discuss the question of the war and will call a large meeting of workers to sound out popular feeling.

In Geneva a consumers' society is being formed. In Offenbach it has been decided to create funds for the construction of workers' homes, on the lines of the *familistère*<sup>a</sup> of Guise, near Paris.

### GERMANY

The *International Association* in Germany, as in France, has not been able to develop very far, owing to the absence of freedom! Nevertheless it has succeeded in forming branches in Leipzig, Hamburg, Hanover, Mainz, Berlin, Pelewodau,<sup>b</sup> Lulingen, Langenbielau, Puilberg, Wult, Eudorf, etc.

With the approach of war,<sup>c</sup> greater freedom has been allowed and so the *Association* is now better able to prosper. All the chief leaders of the German working-class movement have accepted its principles and are actively engaged in propagating them.

### FRANCE

The *International Association* has branches in a number of towns: Paris, Lyons, Bordeaux, Caen, Neufchâteau, Argentau, Rennes, Rouen, Grandville, etc., etc.

Although little developed as yet, it has rendered a service to the working class of Lyons. The tulle workers were on strike and were about to give in because their bosses had threatened to bring in English workers who, it was alleged, were paid less. The workers asked for information and the Central Council replied that the opposite was the case. So they persevered and obtained their demands.

### BELGIUM

Several branches have been established in Brussels, Antwerp, Liège, Verviers, Ghent, Namur, Patignies, etc. The society known as *Le Peuple* is federated with the *International Association*, and its organ, the *Tribune du Peuple*, now belongs to the Association.

In the Belgian Reform movement, it is the Association that has exercised the greatest influence and through its numerous

<sup>a</sup> A workers' community based on Fourierist principles.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Presumably Peterswaldau.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—*Ed.*



meetings it has succeeded in focussing reformist aspirations unequivocally on the issue of universal suffrage.

### ITALY

Hitherto Italy has been preoccupied with the questions of unity and has not been able to devote much thought to social problems. However the Central Committee of all the Italian workers' societies has accepted the principles of the *International Association* and has undertaken to promote its ideas. Branches already exist in Genoa, Milan, etc.

### AMERICA

The Association is in communication with New York and a number of towns in Massachusetts.

Written at the beginning of June  
(before 12), 1866

First published in *La Rive Gauche*,  
No. 24, June 17, 1866

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Translated from the French

Published in English for the first  
time

FROM THE MINUTE BOOK  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
CENTRAL (GENERAL) COUNCIL MEETINGS  
(June-December 1866)

*June 12, 1866*

*Lafargue* read from *La Rive Gauche* a summary of doings of the Central Council.<sup>a</sup>

Citizen *Marx* read a letter from Leipsic which stated that all the Saxon working men's associations had joined the International.<sup>310</sup>

*June 19, 1866*

The debate on the war<sup>311</sup> attracted a large concourse of members. It was ably opened by Citizen *Eccarius*, who illustrated his address with a map of Germany, made for the occasion. He was followed by Citizens *Le Lubez*, *Fox*, *Lafargue*, *Marx*, who made a highly interesting speech, *Carter*, *Dutton* and *Hales*. Speeches were made in French and English.

*July 17, 1866*

The Discussion on the War was then resumed. Cits. *Dutton*, *Bobczynski* and *Marx* were the principal speakers. Cits. *Cremer* and *Fox* withdrew their respective amendments, and the wording of the Bobczynski-Carter resolution was amended and ultimately passed, *nem. con.*, in the following form:

“That the Central Council of the International Working Men's Association consider the present conflict on the Continent to be one between Governments and advise working men to be neutral, and to associate themselves with a view to acquire strength by unity and to use the strength so acquired in working out their social and political emancipation.”<sup>312</sup>

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 406-10.—*Ed.*

*July 24, 1866*

That the Secretary and any member of the Central Council take whatever steps they may deem advisable to get Italian societies represented at the Congress. Carried unanimously.<sup>313</sup> [...]

The Order of the Day was then discussed, led off by *Cremer* who proposed as recommendation to Congress that the Central Council should sit in London. Seconded by *Marx*. Carried unanimously.<sup>314</sup>

*September 18*

Citizen *Marx* stated that the notice of the Manchester tailors' strike<sup>315</sup> had been inserted in the democratic journals in the North, South, and Centre of Germany; he gave a list of those journals.

*September 25*

*Lawrence* moved that *Marx* be President for the ensuing twelve months; *Carter* seconded that nomination.<sup>316</sup> *Marx* proposed *Odger*: he, *Marx*, thought himself incapacitated because he was a head worker and not a hand worker. *Weston* seconded *Odger*. A ballot was taken and *Odger* was carried by 15 v. 3. [...]

*Marx* proposed to constitute this Committee<sup>a</sup> provisionally only, for the present. The Committee to consist of the office-holders and secretaries already appointed. Agreed to by common consent.

*October 2*

*Carter* contended that affiliation and membership were two different things and that the Congressional Rules applied only to the latter.

*Marx*, on the authority of the Minutes, contradicted *Carter* and said that the Congress refused to recognise any affiliation as distinct from membership.<sup>317</sup>

*October 9*

On the motion of *Marx* the General Secretary<sup>b</sup> was ordered to write to the French *Ministre de l'Intérieur* complaining of the

<sup>a</sup> The Standing Committee.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Fox*.—*Ed.*

seizure of the Association's papers and requesting that they be restituted.<sup>318</sup>

Citizen *Dupont* read a letter from Citizen Fribourg of Paris asking for the Minutes of the Congress to enable them to publish a report of the Congress.

*Marx* protested against the latter step, inasmuch as the duty of publishing an account of the Congress was devolved by that body exclusively on the Central Council. Further, the Parisians had kept their *Mémoire*<sup>319</sup> in violation of the Congressional order, which ordained that this and other documents should be handed over to the Central Council.

The General Secretary was ordered to write to Fribourg in this sense.

#### *November 6*

The *Secretary* then brought up the following resolution from the Standing Committee:

1. "That any member of the Central Council who shall be absent for more than four sittings from Council meetings without giving satisfactory reasons therefor, shall be liable to have his name erased from the list of the Council.

2. "This resolution to be immediately communicated to every member of the Council."

A lively discussion sprang up on this resolution, *Carter*, *Lessner*, *Hales*, and *Jung* being in favour of it and *Eccarius*, *Fox*, and *Weston* against it.

*Weston* thought that at least so important a resolution should not be carried in so thin a meeting and until notice had been given in the *Commonwealth*. He moved that the debate be adjourned until next week; *Lessner* seconded this, and the adjournment was carried unanimously.

#### *November 20*

On the resolution from the Standing Committee being read with regard to absentees, the following amendment was carried:

That a book be provided for the members of the Council to sign their names in; the said book to be presented to [the] Congress for inspection; and, if any delegate from a society should be absent more than four nights without assigning [a] reason for so doing, the Secretary shall write to the society he represents and inform them of the neglect. [...]

It was proposed by Citizen *Marx* and seconded by Citizen *Jung*:  
That the anniversary of the Polish Insurrection be celebrated on  
the 22nd of January.<sup>a</sup> Carried unanimously.

*November 27*

*Fox* then proceeded to say that the French Government had, since the close of the Geneva Congress, departed from its policy of neutrality towards them and was levying war upon them. The French Government had allowed us two years' growth and we were now able to defy the Continental blockade which the French and the Prussian governments had declared against us. We could no longer trust the French and Prussian post-offices; we must seek indirect and secret means of communication with our Continental friends.

*Marx* said that we must force Bonaparte to declare himself, in order that any credit he may have gained for his liberality in letting us flourish unmolested might be lost to him.

*December 18*

*Marx* reported that *Revue des deux Mondes* and *Revue contemporaine* had been commenting on the doings of the Association, and, although they did not agree with the objects of the Association entirely, still they acknowledged it to be one of the leading events of the present century. *Marx* also said that the *Fortnightly Review* had been commenting on the matter.<sup>b</sup>

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866* and *1866-1868*, Moscow, 1961 and 1963

Reproduced from the Minute Book

<sup>a</sup> See *Marx's* speech at the Polish meeting (this volume, pp. 196-201).— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> A reference to Louis Reybaud's "L'Economie politique des ouvriers", *Revue des deux Mondes*, t. 66, November 1, 1866, J. E. Alaux's "Une forme nouvelle du socialisme", *Revue contemporaine*, t. 53, October 15, 1866 and an editorial in *The Fortnightly Review*, No. 37, December 1866.— *Ed.*

REPORT OF A SPEECH BY KARL MARX  
AT THE ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION  
OF THE GERMAN WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY  
IN LONDON

FEBRUARY 28, 1867<sup>320</sup>

Karl Marx spoke about wage labour and capital and showed very lucidly how the workers create capital, how they are kept in a state of slavery with the help of the product of their own labour and how capital is constantly used to make their shackles ever stronger. Admittedly the so-called free labourer has the consciousness of being a free labourer, but he is all the more subject to the power of capital as he is compelled to sell his labour for a pitiful wage to obtain the means for satisfying his most essential needs. In most cases, the material condition of the free labourer is worse than that of the slave or serf. The working class has no need to abolish personal property, which was abolished long ago, and is still being abolished daily; what must be abolished is bourgeois property, which is wholly based on fraud.

Regarding social relations in Germany, Marx noted that the German proletariat was best able successfully to effect a radical cure. Firstly, the Germans had to a greater extent freed themselves of all religious nonsense; secondly, unlike the workers in other countries, they need not go through the lengthy period of bourgeois development, and thirdly, their geographical position would compel them to declare war on Eastern barbarism, as it was from there, from Asia, that all reaction hostile to the West had issued. This was impelling the workers' party onto the ground of revolution, the ground on which it must act to attain complete emancipation.

Reported by Friedrich Lessner

Printed according to the journal

First published in *Der Vorbote*, No. 3,  
March 1867

Published in English for the first  
time

FROM THE MINUTE BOOK  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

GENERAL COUNCIL MEETINGS

(April 1867)

*April 16*

*Lafargue* (on behalf of Marx) said that the resolution moved by Odger at one of the Reform meetings conferring a vote [of] thanks upon Count Bismarck was calculated to injure the credit of this Association.<sup>321</sup> He therefore demanded that a vote of censure should be passed upon Odger.

A discussion ensued which ended in instructing the Secretary<sup>a</sup> to write to Odger requesting his attendance at the next meeting.

*April 23*

After some discussion in which several members took part, the following resolution, proposed by Citizen *Lessner* and seconded by Citizen *Lafargue*, was carried unanimously.

Resolved, "That inasmuch as Citizen Odger has proposed a resolution at the Council of the Reform League thanking Mr. Bismarck for what he had done for the democratic cause in Germany; and inasmuch as Citizen Odger is President of the International Working Men's Association,<sup>b</sup> the General Council feels it to be its duty to repudiate any solidarity with the said resolution and with Citizen Odger's speech in support thereof."

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny  
Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1866-1868*,  
Moscow, 1963

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book

<sup>a</sup> P. Fox.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Inaccuracy in the minutes: at that time Odger was President of the General Council. There was no such post as President of the International Working Men's Association.—*Ed.*

MANCHESTER SCHILLER INSTITUTE CIRCULAR<sup>322</sup>

TO THE UNDERWRITERS OF THE FUND  
FOR THE BUILDING  
OF A NEW SCHILLER INSTITUTE

Since the subscription, which was started last year by the Board of Directors for the above purpose, was closed owing to the war<sup>a</sup> and the business crisis after £2,875 had been subscribed, the conditions pertaining to the Institute's existence were fundamentally changed with respect to the new building. The Board of Directors accordingly considers it its duty to give the underwriters of the fund the necessary explanation.

Since the sum of money stipulated in the circular of March 19, 1866, was insufficient to cover the cost of the building proposed (a total of £5,000 to £5,500 was needed), and in the circumstances obtaining at the time there were also no prospects for collecting the remaining amount in time, the Board of Directors had no choice but to look around for temporary premises for the present.

It turned out that such premises were not available in the centre of the city where the Institute was to be located according to the Basic Rules. Consequently, the Board of Directors was forced to maintain the present premises until June 1868 which could only be achieved by paying double rent, a rise from £225 to £450.

In these circumstances, the question could no longer be ignored whether it was absolutely essential for the Institute to be in the centre, i.e. in the city's business quarter; whether the advantages thereby gained would not be paid for too dearly, owing to the enormous increases in the prices of land and in rents; and whether a, strictly speaking, less central site, for example, near All Saints' Church, which would cost far less, might not in fact be more

<sup>a</sup> The Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—*Ed.*



convenient and central for the overwhelming majority of the Institute's members.

According to the plan drawn up last year, even if £5,000 were collected through donations, the Institute would still have to carry a mortgage of £5-6,000, and would therefore have to pay interest amounting to between £250 and £300 annually. As the value of land in the centre of the city has significantly increased since last March alone, the purchasing price fixed at the time and the mortgage necessary to cover it, and therefore the Institute's annual debt, can likewise be assumed to be greater. The Institute's balance-sheet over the last two years has only shown £200 left for rent. Although we could count on more members in better premises, and certain additional revenue would have to be taken into account, it is still obvious that the above mentioned interest could only just be afforded. Every pound paid in rent is taken from the Institute's education fund. Last year we were only able to allocate £80 for journals and £20 for the library, although the Institute's total income was £500.

It would be quite different if the premises were moved to the All Saints' district. Here, among other things, there is a suitable plot of land in an extremely favourable position going for £1,700, with an additional £26 CHIEF RENT. By way of example, this building site forms the basis of our calculations:

Purchasing price of the plot of land	£1,700 0 0
Building costs	£3,500 0 0
New furniture	£ 500 0 0
	<hr/>
Total	£5,700 0 0

for which a mortgage of £2,000 could certainly be obtained. In this case, subscriptions to the building fund would only need to total approximately £3,500 to £4,000, that is £1,000 to £1,500 less than if the new building were in the centre of the city. After the success of last year's subscriptions and with the change in circumstances, we have every reason to hope that the requisite amount will be collected in a short time.

The financial position of the Institute would improve substantially, in spite of the total subscriptions necessarily being smaller. Besides the CHIEF RENT of £26, there would be £100 interest to pay on the mortgage, so that the total sum needed for the rent would be only £126 instead of £225, which was paid last year, and £450 that we are paying now, or the £250 to £300, which was envisaged in last year's building plan. Even with the income of the last

financial year, instead of £100, £174 could be spent annually on the Institute's library and reading room, which would be almost double the sum available for that purpose. Now, however, it is certain that, with this new building for the Institute, new financial sources would become accessible owing to the increased number of subtenants and the greater membership, and the proceeds from these sources would be used almost exclusively to support the Institute's intellectual pursuits.

If the Institute remains in the centre of the city as it has done up till now, even with donations of £5,000 to £5,500, it will at best only be in a position to eke out an existence with great difficulty and will have to appeal to the German circles in Manchester at every unfavourable change in circumstances.

If, however, it is moved to a district where building sites are cheaper, then donations of £3,500 to £4,000 would not only once and for all establish a permanent existence for itself, but also guarantee an annual surplus in income which would finally allow it to fulfil its purpose in the best way possible.

In these circumstances, the Board of Directors could be in no doubt as to what action it should take. It decided to move to the All Saints' district and set about changing the Basic Rules connected with this. The Board called a general meeting on June 6th which was well attended and where all but one of the participants voted for the following:

"The general meeting declares it desirable that, in the future, Article 1 of the Basic Rules should read in the following manner:

"It is declared expedient to establish a literature and arts institute, to be known as the Schiller Institute here in the city, on the best possible central site

"and authorises the Board of Directors through Article 7 of the Basic Rules and Clause 20 of the Regulations to take a conditional vote on it."

As a result the Board of Directors has taken the necessary steps for definitive voting, which is to take place at the end of August.

The question was raised why, once the decision was made to move the Institute, nobody looked round for a house which could have been taken for a number of years at a relatively cheap rent. The Board of Directors replied that it had been looking for just such a house, but had not found one; that a house of this type would only be found in a location much farther away from the centre of the city than the All Saints' district; that such a location was only to be chosen in an emergency and finally that even in that case at least £1,500 to £2,000 in donations would be needed for the necessary extensions and the furnishing of premises which

would only after all be temporary. For these reasons, such premises were rejected for the present.

When the Board of Directors gains the necessary majority, of which there can be no doubt, to change the Basic Rules, it intends to do the following:

Should the funds prove sufficient to purchase a suitable plot of land near All Saints', to erect a building on it according to the plans made last year, namely with the basement equipped for the gymnastics club and with a large hall on the first floor accommodated, among other things, for the choir, so that the original aim would be achieved of bringing all of Manchester German Associations together under one roof.

If, on the other hand, the contributions should not reach the sum necessary, to correspondingly scale down the new building, but in any case only to put up a building which would conform to the Institute's needs better than the present premises.

The Board of Directors requests you to acquaint yourselves with the above mentioned changes in the building plan and at the same time would like to inform you that a deputation from its midst will have the honour to seek your approval for this.

By order of the Board of Directors

*F. Engels*, chairman

*J. G. Wehner*, treasurer

*A. Davisson*, secretary

Manchester, June 28, 1867

First published as a leaflet

Printed according to the leaflet

Published in English for the first time

THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S  
ASSOCIATION  
ON THE LAUSANNE CONGRESS <sup>323</sup>

TO MEMBERS,  
AFFILIATED SOCIETIES AND ALL WORKERS

Proletarians!

From the correspondence that we receive we can see that the members of the Association are continuing to spread its principles, and that the number of branches is multiplying. This work is particularly striking in Switzerland, where most of our branches are actively engaged in establishing workers' societies of every kind and putting them in contact with us.

Following the Marchiennes massacre,<sup>324</sup> Belgium is making commendable efforts to gather the whole of the Belgian proletariat under our banner.

However, various circumstances have impeded propaganda work in other countries:

Germany, which prior to '48 had manifested such an interest in the study of social questions, has concentrated almost all its active forces on the movement for unification.

In France, where the freedom of the working class is extremely limited, the spread of our principles and of our Association has not been as rapid as one might have hoped: for we had thought that the aid which, *thanks to us*, the English workers' societies gave to French workers' societies during their strikes<sup>325</sup> might have won for us the support of all French workers. Now, as the struggle in France between the capitalist class and the working class is entering into that phase which we will call the *English* phase, that is to say, is becoming particularly acute, the workers must understand that if they are to resist the power of the capitalists successfully, the different members of the working-class community must be linked together by a powerful bond of unity.

England, which has been preoccupied with the reform movement, had put the economic movement temporarily aside. However, now that the reform movement has ended and the enquiry into *the trade unions*<sup>326</sup> is revealing the size and noting the strength of the working class, we believe that the time has come for all workers' societies to recognise our usefulness.

At delegate meetings of the working class tribute has already been paid more than once to the role played by our Association, and a large number of societies have already joined our ranks. It is England, whose working class possesses a powerful organisation, that is called upon to be our most reliable support.

The United States appears to have emerged rejuvenated from its bloody war: the working class is already centralised and has brought its influence to bear upon the bourgeois government which rules in America, obliging several State Legislatures to pass a bill introducing the eight-hour working day. The forthcoming presidential elections have compelled the various political parties to state their position: speaking for the radical party, Wade, president of the Senate, has recognised the need to devote special attention to the question of labour and capital, and he has come out openly in favour of a transformation of capitalist and landed property. As the working class in the United States has considerable organisational power, it will be able to impose its will.

Today, in every civilised country, the working class is on the move, and it is in such countries as America and England, where industry is most developed, that the working class is most solidly organised and the struggle between the bourgeois class and the working class is at its sharpest.

The power of the human individual has disappeared before the power of capital, in the factory the worker is now nothing but a cog in the machine. In order to recover his individuality, the worker has had to unite together with others and create associations to defend his wages and his life. Until today these associations had remained purely local, while the power of capital, thanks to new industrial inventions, is increasing day by day; furthermore in many cases national associations have become powerless: a study of the struggle waged by the English working class reveals that, in order to oppose their workers, the employers either bring in workers from abroad or else transfer manufacture to countries where there is a cheap labour force. Given this state of affairs, if the working class wishes to continue its struggle with some chance of success, the national organisations must become international.

Let every worker give serious consideration to this new aspect of the problem, let him realise that in rallying to our banner he is defending his own bread and that of his children.

We, the General Council, appeal to everyone to ensure that the next Congress, which will take place on September 2, 1867, in Lausanne, will be an impressive demonstration by the working class.

According to the Regulations of the first Congress, each branch has the right to send one delegate to the Congress. Those branches with more than 500 members may also send one delegate for every additional 500 members. Those branches which do not have sufficient resources to send a delegate may join with other branches and contribute to the cost of sending a delegate who will represent them.<sup>a</sup>

The questions to be debated at the Congress are:

1) What *practical* measures can be taken to turn the International Association into a common centre of action on behalf of the working class (female and male) in its struggle to liberate itself from the yoke of capital?

2) How can the working classes use for their own emancipation the credit that they give to bourgeoisie and governments?

Greeting and fraternity:

Corresponding Secretaries:

*E. Dupont*—for France; *K. Marx*—for Germany; *Zabicki*—for Poland; *H. Jung*—for Switzerland; *P. Fox*—for America; *Besson*—for Belgium; *Carter*—for Italy; *P. Lafargue*—for Spain; *Hansen*—for Holland and Denmark

*G. Odger*, President  
*G. Eccarius*, Vice-President  
*W. Dell*, Treasurer  
*Shaw*, Secretary-Treasurer  
*Peter Fox*, General Secretary

16, Castle Street, Oxford Street

Drawn up in the middle of July 1867.

First published as a leaflet "Prolétaires, parmi les correspondances...", London, July 1867

Printed according to the leaflet

Translated from the French

Published in English for the first time

<sup>a</sup> Reference to articles 6, 7 and 8 of the Administrative Regulations. See this volume, pp. 445-46.—*Ed.*

RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECH ON THE STATISTICS  
IN THE NEW BLUE BOOK <sup>327</sup>

FROM THE MINUTES  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF JULY 23, 1867

Citizen Marx called the attention of the Council to a Parliamentary Blue Book,<sup>328</sup> "Reports by Her Majesty's Secretaries of Embassy and Legation on the Manufactures and Commerce of the Countries in which they reside, 1867", of which the following is an extract:

"During the first eleven months of 1864 the imports into Belgium of raw cast iron were 7,200 tons, of which 5,300 were British; in the corresponding period of 1865 they rose to 18,800 tons, of which 17,000 tons were British, and in 1866 they rose to 29,590 tons, of which 26,200 tons were British. On the other hand, the exports of Belgian cast iron during the first eleven months of 1864 amounted to 24,400 tons, 17,200 tons of which went to France, and 5,900 tons to England; whereas in the corresponding period of 1866 they did not amount to more than 14,000 tons, of which 9,600 tons were exported to France, and only 241 tons to Great Britain. The exports of Belgian rails have also fallen from 75,353 tons, during the first eleven months of 1864, to 62,734 tons in 1866.

The following is an exact statement, in a tabular form, of the quantities of *iron and steel of all sorts* imported into Belgium from Great Britain, and of Belgian iron and steel exported to Great Britain during the first eleven months of 1866, as compared with the corresponding period of 1864.

IMPORTS INTO BELGIUM FROM GREAT BRITAIN.  
FIRST ELEVEN MONTHS

	1866	1864
	<i>tons</i>	<i>tons</i>
Ore and filings	0	1
Raw, cast, and old iron	26,211	5,296
Hammered iron (nails, wire, etc.)	1,031	1,777
Castings	41	24
Wrought iron	255	203
Steel in bars, plates, and wire	3,219	1,227
Wrought steel	522	0
Total	31,289	8,528

EXPORTS FROM BELGIUM TO GREAT BRITAIN.  
FIRST ELEVEN MONTHS

	1866	1864
	<i>tons</i>	<i>tons</i>
Ore and filings	1,768	5,555
Raw, cast, and old iron	241	5,920
Hammered iron (nails, wire, etc.)	6,727	9,436
Castings	5	7
Wrought iron	12	0
Steel in bars, plates, and wire	50	56
Wrought steel	16	5
	Total	
	8,817	20,979

The results may be briefly stated thus:—whereas in 1864 (taking the first eleven months of the year) Belgium supplied England with 20,979 tons of iron and steel, in 1866 she only sent 8,817 tons, whilst the exports of British iron and steel to Belgium rose from 8,528 tons in 1864 to 31,289 tons in 1866" [No. 5, pp. 594-95].

It would be recollected that some of the middle-class newspapers had last year raised an outcry about the pernicious effects of the Trades Unions, that their doings were driving the iron trade from this country into the hands of the Belgian ironmasters. None of the papers that had raised that outcry had even mentioned the appearance of this Blue Book, much less stated its contents.

First published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 302, July 27, 1867 and *The Working Man*, No. 18, July 27, 1867

Reproduced from the Minute Book



RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECH ON THE ATTITUDE  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION  
TO THE CONGRESS OF THE LEAGUE  
OF PEACE AND FREEDOM<sup>329</sup>

FROM THE MINUTES  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF AUGUST 13, 1867

While the balloting was going on, Citizen *Marx* called attention to the Peace Congress to be held in Geneva. He said it was desirable that as many delegates as could make it convenient should attend the Peace Congress in their individual capacity; but that it would be injudicious to take part officially as representatives of the International Association. The International Working Men's Congress was in itself a peace congress, as the union of the working classes of the different countries must ultimately make international wars impossible. If the promoters of the Geneva Peace Congress really understood the question at issue they ought to have joined the International Association.

The present increase of the large armies in Europe had been brought about by the revolution of 1848; large standing armies were the necessary result of the present state of society. They were not kept up for international warfare, but to keep down the working classes.<sup>330</sup> However, as there were not always barricades to bombard, and working men to shoot, there was sometimes a possibility of international quarrels being fomented to keep the soldiery in trim. The peace-at-any-price party would no doubt muster strong at the Congress. That party would fain leave Russia alone in the possession of the means to make war upon the rest of Europe, while the very existence of such a power as Russia was enough for all the other countries to keep their armies intact.

It was more than probable that some of the French Radicals would avail themselves of the opportunity to make declamatory speeches against their own Government, but such would have more effect if delivered at Paris.

Those who declined putting their shoulders to the wheel to bring about a transformation in the relations of labour and capital ignored the very conditions of universal peace.<sup>a</sup>

First published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 305 and abridged in *The Working Man*, No. 21, August 17, 1867

Reproduced from the *Minute Book*

---

<sup>a</sup> In the minutes here follow the text of the resolution moved by Marx on this point (see this volume, p. 204) and the report on its adoption by the Council.—*Ed.*

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S  
ASSOCIATION<sup>331</sup>

THE DUTIES IMPOSED UPON THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
BY THE FIRST ANNUAL CONGRESS<sup>a</sup>

The Congress passed a resolution appointing the London delegates to wait upon the Swiss, the French, and the British postal authorities to bring the question of international penny postage—of cheap postage—under their notice.<sup>332</sup>

The Swiss postmaster agreed to all the deputation urged, but observed that the French Government stepped [in their] way.

In France the delegates could get no audience, and the British Government only consented to receive a written statement which has been sent.

The other duties imposed upon the General Council by the first annual Congress were: 1. The publication, in several languages, of the transactions of the Congress, including the letters and memoirs addressed to that Congress. 2. To publish periodical or occasional reports in different languages, embracing everything that might be of interest to the Association. 3. To give information of the supply and demand for labour in different localities. 4. An account of co-operative societies. 5. Of the condition of the working class in every country. The Council was also charged with causing a statistical inquiry to be instituted, which was to contain special and detailed information about every branch of industry, in which wages labour is employed, in the most civilised countries of Europe.

To enable the Council to fulfil these various duties, the Congress voted a contribution of threepence per member to the Executive, and a salary of £2 a week to the General Secretary, leaving his appointment to the Council.

As soon as the London delegates had returned, and the Council was reorganised, information was received that some of our

<sup>a</sup> The French version has here: "The Duties Imposed by the Geneva Congress (September 1866)".—*Ed.*

Congress documents had been seized on the person of Jules Gottraux by the French police on the frontier.<sup>335</sup>

The General Secretary was instructed to write to the French Minister of the Interior, but not receiving any reply, an application was made to the British Foreign Office. Lord Stanley, with the greatest readiness, instructed Lord Cowley, the British Ambassador at Paris, to intercede; the result was that within a few days our documents were restored, and a parcel of *Tribunes du Peuple*, which had evidently been seized from somebody else, superadded.

The Congress documents were then handed over to the Standing Committee, with instructions to prepare the report for publication. As there were no funds to pay the General Secretary this labour devolved upon volunteers, who had to do it in their spare hours, which caused further delay. When all was ready the lowest estimate to have a thousand printed in one language was £40. To comply with the Congress instructions required an immediate outlay of £120; the cash in hand on the 31st of December amounted to 18s. 4d.

The General Secretary was instructed to appeal to the affiliated societies of the British section for their contributions—only the London cigar-makers and the Coventry and Warwickshire ribbon-weavers responded immediately. The board of management of the latter association, with a highly commendable zeal to fulfil its obligation—having no funds in hand and many members out of work—forthwith raised a levy to the required amount from the members in work.

The Council then availed itself of an offer made by Citizen J. Collet, the proprietor and editor of the *International Courier*, to publish the report in French and English in weekly parts in the columns of his journal. He also agreed to stereotype the whole at his own expense with the view of publishing it in pamphlet form, and to let the Council share in the profits, if any, the Council undertaking no responsibility whatever in case of loss.

But hardly was this highly advantageous arrangement completed when, on account of not having complied with some legal intricacy, of which the government had previously taken no notice, Citizen Collet had to suspend the publication of his journal for several weeks, and it was not till March that the publication of the Congress report could be regularly proceeded with.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> "Congress of Geneva. International Association of Working Men", *The International Courier*, Nos. 7-15, February 20, March 13, 20 and 27, April 3, 10 and 17, 1867; "Congrès de Genève. Société Internationale des Travailleurs", *Le*

The numbers of the *International Courier* containing the report have been sent gratis to the branches. A German version could, for want of a similar opportunity, not be published.

When the publication was completed it was again want of funds that prevented, and still prevents, the publication in pamphlet form.

To make matters worse the French police seized a parcel of rules and cards of membership, purposely issued for the French section, the printing of which cost £4, which was borrowed money.<sup>334</sup> Besides this dead loss, there was the further injury of curtailing the contributions, which in France depend principally upon the scale of individual membership. Beyond all this, there were the old liabilities which were acknowledged as the debt of the Association by the Congress, but no special provision made for their liquidation. They have greatly hampered our action, and continue to be a source of trouble.

Under these circumstances it was utterly impossible to publish either periodical or occasional reports; nor have our correspondents taken the trouble to send us any special information with a view to such publication. The question of entering upon the statistical inquiry had to be abandoned for the present year. To be of any use at all it cannot be limited to the trades at present comprised within the circle of our affiliated societies. Such an inquiry, to answer its purpose, must include every trade, every country, and every locality. This involves not only a large expenditure for printing, stationery, and postage, but also an amount of labour in the shape of correspondence, compiling, and arranging the scattered and specific statements into a comprehensive and comprehensible whole, [so] that the possibility of having it done by volunteers in their leisure hours is altogether out of the question.

#### INTERFERENCE IN TRADES' DISPUTES<sup>a</sup>

One of the best means of demonstrating the beneficent influence of international combination is the assistance rendered by the International Working Men's Association in the daily occurring trades' disputes. It used to be a standard threat with

---

*Courrier international*, Nos. 8-16, March 9, 16, 23 and 30, April 6, 13, 20 and 27, 1867.—*Ed.*

<sup>a</sup> The French version has here: "The Role of the International Working Men's Association in the Struggle between Capital and Labour".—*Ed.*

British capitalists, not only in London, but also in the provinces, when their workmen would not tamely submit to their arbitrary dictation, that they would supplant them by an importation of *foreigners*. The possibility of such importations taking place was in most cases sufficient to deter the British workmen from insisting on their demands. The action taken by the Council has had the effect of putting a stop to these threats being made publicly. Where anything of the kind is contemplated it has to be done in secret, and the slightest information obtained by the workmen suffices to frustrate the plans of the capitalists. As a rule, when a strike or a lock-out occurs concerning any of the affiliated trades, the Continental correspondents are at once instructed to warn the workmen in their respective localities not to enter into any engagements with the agents of the capitalists of the place where the dispute is. However, this action is not confined to affiliated trades. The same action is taken on behalf of other trades upon application being received. This generally leads to the affiliation of the trades that invoke our aid.

Now and then it happens that the capitalists succeed in getting a few stragglers, but they generally repudiate their engagements upon being informed of the reason why they were engaged.

During the London basket-makers' dispute last winter information was received that six Belgians were at work under the railway arches in Blue Anchor Lane, Bermondsey. They were as strictly guarded against coming in contact with the outside public as a kidnapped girl in a nunnery. By some stratagem a Flemish member of the Council succeeded in obtaining an interview, and upon being informed of the nature of their engagement the men struck work and returned home. Just as they were about to embark a steamer arrived with a fresh supply. The new arrivals were at once communicated with; they too repudiated their engagements, and returned home, promising that they would exert themselves to prevent any further supplies, which they accomplished.<sup>335</sup>

In consequence of the appeals made by deputations from the Council to various British societies, the Paris bronze-workers received very considerable pecuniary support during their lock-out, and the London tailors on strike have in turn received support from Continental associations through the intercession of the Council.<sup>336</sup> The good offices of the Council were also employed on behalf of the excavators, the wire-workers, the block-cutters, the hairdressers, and others.

PROPAGANDA AND AFFILIATED SOCIETIES<sup>a</sup>

The work of propaganda and affiliation of societies has been greatly impeded in England during the past year. It seems as if the British Legislature could never move a step in the right direction in any matter of great social or political importance unless compelled by a threatening and overwhelming pressure from without, when the public excitement assumes the character of a monomania. While the Reform agitation was at its height, the frequent monster demonstrations in course of organisation, it was almost hopeless to try to engage the attention of working men to the somewhat distant aims of the International Working Men's Association. Most of our British Council members took an active part in these proceedings, which reduced our available forces to go on deputations, while the proceedings themselves caused so much excitement and absorbed so much of the attention of those who might have entertained our applications, that there was no room for their consideration. These proceedings, too, in diverting men's attention to other objects have had the effect of preventing many new members being enrolled and some old ones to renew their subscriptions. Everywhere one was met with the observation that the struggle for Parliamentary Reform was [not] only the struggle of a season, but the paramount duty of the hour and an indispensable stepping stone to that complete emancipation of the working classes from the domination of capital which is the aim of the International Working Men's Association. One step has undoubtedly been gained by the Act of 1867.<sup>337</sup> It is sufficiently comprehensive to enable the working classes to politically combine for class purposes within the precincts of the Constitution, and exercise a direct influence upon the Legislature in matters of social and economical reform in as far as they affect the labour question.

But though our propagandism has been much impeded during the past it has not been arrested. The ordinary mode of proceeding with the affiliation of corporate bodies is somewhat tedious. When the Council has any reasonable ground for believing that the question will be favourably entertained by an association, it applies to the president or secretary by letter. If the application be favourably received, a deputation is requested to attend the Executive to state the aims of the Association. If the

<sup>a</sup> In the French version this and the next sections are combined in Section III entitled "English Section" which is divided in its turn into two paragraphs: "a) Propaganda" and "b) Contributions".—*Ed.*

Executive endorses the statement of the deputation it recommends the question to be entertained at some future general or delegate meeting, when perhaps the deputation is again requested to attend. In some cases the question of affiliation is decided at once—in others the votes of all the members and branches have to be taken to arrive at a decision.

The affiliation of 33 organised bodies has been brought about in this manner during the past year. More than twenty have been corresponded with and received deputations. With some the decisions are pending, others have deferred the consideration to a more favourable opportunity; only one society has flatly refused to enter into any relationship because the Association entertains political questions.

#### CONTRIBUTIONS AND AFFILIATED SOCIETIES

The question as to the contributions of affiliated societies occupied the Council at various times. While the question was pending, the Executive of the Operative Bricklayers' Society joined and agreed to contribute £1 per annum.

In March 1865, a deputation from the Council waited on the conference of the Amalgamated Cordwainers' Association, at which the following resolution, proposed by the delegate from Birmingham, and seconded by the delegate from Hull, was unanimously carried:

"That we cordially agree with the principles of the International Working Men's Association as represented by the deputation from that body, and pledge ourselves to join them for the furtherance of those principles, and endeavour to spread them amongst our constituents."

The question of contributions was raised, but the discussion being out of order was stopped. Some weeks after it was resolved that a declaration of enrolment should be printed, for which organised bodies should pay an entrance fee of 5s., that as many cards as possible should be sold to individual members of such societies, the remainder, when funds were required, should be left to their generosity. It was while this state of things lasted that the liabilities already alluded to were incurred.

The money granted by various affiliated societies last year were voluntary gifts towards defraying the expenses of the delegates to the first Congress, and it was expended for that purpose.

The Cordwainers' Executive granted £5.



To remove this state of uncertainty the Council proposed a minimum contribution per member from affiliated societies.

The Congress voted threepence, which the British delegates maintained could not be levied from trades societies in England.

When, after the Geneva Congress, our deputations were sent to trades societies, it was found that, as the British delegates had foreseen, the threepence per member formed an insurmountable obstacle to the affiliation of organised bodies.

On the 9th of October the Council resolved unanimously that the contribution should be lowered to one halfpenny per member. All the societies that have since been affiliated have joined with that understanding.

The Amalgamated Cordwainers' Association has distinctly declared that the resolution of its Conference of 1865 does not amount to an affiliation, and the conference of the same body of 1867 has rescinded the resolution, which enabled the Council to grant us £5 last year.

The Executive of the Operative Bricklayers has paid £1 for 1867, but has not yet announced any decision, whether it considers the whole society affiliated or not.

The Cordwainers' Association was put down in last year's estimate as containing 5,000 members, the Bricklayers' 3,000 to 4,000.

Two appeals have been made in the course of the year for the contributions; some of the previously affiliated societies have paid, others have not; but, excepting the cordwainers, none have repudiated their obligation.

The Executive of the Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners has recently passed resolutions to contribute £2 per annum to the funds of the Council, but the question is now under consideration to take the votes of all the members whether the association is to be affiliated in its entirety or not. It numbers about 9,000 members, and extends over England, Wales, and Ireland. The following is a list of the affiliated societies of the British section, and the money furnished by them during the last two years.<sup>a</sup>

Beyond this the elastic web-weavers have granted £1 to the Congress fund; the cigar-makers £1 ls.

There is a considerable difference in the actual income of the two years, but there is an essential difference as to its purport. Last year the money was voted to send delegates to the Congress; it was therefore not available for other purposes; this year's income consists of contributions to defray the expense of

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 435-36.—*Ed.*

Names of affiliated societies	Gifts and Entrance Fees 1866			Contributions 1867		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
London, Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein .....	2	0	0	0	0	0
London, French Branch .....	0	0	0	0	4	9
Central Section of Polish Exiles .....	0	0	0	0	4	10
Operative Bricklayers' Executive .....	0	0	0	1	0	0
No. 1 Lodge of Operative Bricklayers .....	0	8	0	0	0	0
Alliance Cabinet-Makers' Society .....	10	0	0	1	13	4
West End Cabinet-Makers' Society .....	5	0	0	1	7	0
Day Working Bookbinders' Society .....	0	8	3	0	17	6
Hand-in-Hand Coopers' Society .....	6	0	0	0	6	0
London Cigar-Makers' Association .....	5	0	0	1	9	0
Amalgamated Cordwainers' Executive .....	5	0	0	0	0	0
Darlington Section of ditto .....	0	5	0	0	0	0
Nottingham Section of ditto .....	0	5	0	0	2	1
Coventry and Warwickshire Ribbon-Weavers .....	0	5	0	1	9	0
Packing-Case Makers .....	1	5	4	0	0	0
Saddlers and Harness Makers .....	4	0	0	0	0	0
Kendal Shoemakers' Society .....	0	5	0	0	1	8
West End Ladies' Boot-Makers .....	6	0	0	0	10	0
London Operative Tailors .....	3	0	0	0	0	0
Darlington Section of Amalgamated Tailors .....	0	5	0	0	1	8

Societies Affiliated Since Sept., 1866

London Basket-Makers' Society .....	0	5	0	0	0	0
Block-Printers of Lancashire .....	0	5	0	2	1	8
London Coach-Builders .....	0	5	0	0	0	0
Coach-Trimmmers (The Globe) .....	0	5	0	0	1	10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
Coach-Trimmmers (The Crown) .....	0	5	0	0	5	0
Elastic Web-Weavers .....	0	5	0	0	5	0
United Excavators .....	0	5	0	0	0	0
French Polishers .....	0	5	0	0	0	0
Organ-Builders .....	0	5	0	0	2	1
Pattern-Drawers and Block-Cutters .....	0	5	0	0	0	0
Carpenters' and Joiners' Executive .....	0	0	0	2	0	0
United Society of Journeyman Curriers (joined August 27) .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
National Reform League <sup>338</sup> .....	0	5	0	0	2	6

Paid For Congress Fund			
West End Ladies' Boot-Makers .....	4	10	0
London Cigar-Makers .....	1	1	0
Elastic Web-Weavers .....	1	0	0
.....	0	10	0
Basket-Makers .....	0	12	6

administration. Last year, we incurred liabilities because we had no settled income; this year, we liquidated liabilities, because we had such an income.

The reason why some of our affiliated societies have not yet paid their annual contribution, and why others have not contributed to the Congress fund, is severe pressure upon their funds in consequence of the stagnation of trade, strikes, and lock-outs.

We have received several letters, stating these as reasons why the same societies that contributed so handsomely towards the Congress fund last year, cannot give anything this year. The tailors' strike has absorbed all the available funds of the London trades societies.

#### CONTINENTAL AND AMERICAN SECTIONS

As a rule, the General Council only corresponds with individual branches abroad, where police restrictions prevent the formation of branches.<sup>a</sup>

In Belgium an attempt has been made to affiliate trades societies, but we have no information about the result, nor have we received any contributions.

Germany is still in an unsettled state. Citizen Philipp Becker, the President of the German section at Geneva, has succeeded in establishing several branches, but we have no particulars at present.

In Italy there is a regular working men's organisation with whose officers we are in correspondence, but formal affiliations have not yet taken place.

In the New World, we have two affiliated branches at New York and Hoboken, N.J. We are in correspondence with the National Labour Union Committee, and the President<sup>b</sup> of the International

<sup>a</sup> In the French version here follow the reports on the activity of the Association's sections in France, Switzerland and Belgium.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> W. Sylvis.—*Ed.*

Ironmoulders' Union.<sup>339</sup> Particulars will be found in the special report of the American Secretary.<sup>340</sup>

### GENERAL REMARKS

The past year has been characterised by intense struggles and agitation. In America, in England, in France, in Belgium strikes, lock-outs, persecution and prosecution of the working class have been the order of the day.

The capitalists have perseveringly treated the workmen as nobodies who only exist obsequiously to submit.

One society in the United States has spent 70,000 dols. to resist the encroachments of the capitalists<sup>341</sup>; in England it has been decided in the courts of law that to rob the funds of trades unions is not punishable by law. An official inquiry into the working of trades unions has been instituted with a view to damage their character and to affix to them the stigma of being criminal in their proceedings.<sup>342</sup>

The wholesale prosecutions of the London master tailors against their men, the attitude of magistrates, judges, and the daily press, the convictions of the Paris tailors and the massacre at Marchienne,<sup>343</sup> are facts that demonstrate incontrovertibly that society consists but of two hostile classes—the oppressors and the oppressed—and that nothing short of a solitary union of the sons of toil throughout the world will ever redeem them from their present thralldom. We therefore conclude with the motto: *Proletarians of all Countries, Unite!*<sup>344</sup>

FROM THE MINUTE BOOK  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

GENERAL COUNCIL MEETINGS

(September 24-October 22, 1867)

*September 24*

Upon the proposition of Citizen *Hales*, it was unanimously agreed not to appoint a standing president.<sup>345</sup>

Upon the proposition of Citizen *Shaw*, it was unanimously [agreed] that the functions hitherto performed by the financial secretary should be transferred to the general secretary and the office of financial secretary abolished.

*October 8*

Citizen *Marx* announced that a member of the Association, Citizen *Lieb knecht*, had been returned to the North German Parliament by the working men of Saxony.<sup>346</sup> He was the only member that had dared to attack Bismarck's war policy, for which he had been invited by the Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein—a Schulze-Delitzsch society—to receive the acknowledgements of the working men for his services.

*October 22*

Citizen *Marx* read some extracts from the stenographic reports of the North German Parliament. Mr. *Lieb knecht*, a member of the Association, had delivered a speech in favour of the abolition of standing armies and the introduction of popular armaments, and subjecting Bismarck's conduct in the Luxemburg affair to a severe criticism.<sup>347</sup>

FROM A LETTER BY JENNY MARX  
TO JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER<sup>348</sup>

We present here an excerpt from a letter by a friend in London; among other things, it mentions the Working Men's Congress in Lausanne and the Peace Congress in Geneva,<sup>349</sup> as well as Marx's latest work:

"...You will simply not believe what a tremendous sensation the Lausanne Congress has caused here in all the papers. Once *The Times* had set the tone, by printing daily reports,<sup>a</sup> the other papers no longer considered it beneath their dignity to print not just short notices on the labour question, but even long editorials. There has been comment on the Congress not only in all the dailies, but the weeklies, too. It was, on occasion, quite naturally treated in a condescending and ironical way. After all, everything has a comical side, as well as a more lofty one, so why should our good Working Men's Congress, with its garrulous Frenchmen, be the exception? In spite of everything, however, generally it was treated quite properly and taken *au sérieux*. Even the *Manchester Examiner*, the organ of the Manchester school,<sup>350</sup> and John Bright himself, in an excellent leader presented it as important and epoch-making. When compared with its stepbrother, the Peace Congress, the advantage was always on the elder brother's side, one seen as a threatening tragedy of fate, while the other as merely farce and burlesque.

"If you have already acquired Karl Marx's book,<sup>b</sup> and if, like me, you have not yet managed to work through the dialectical

<sup>a</sup> "International Working Men's Congress", *The Times*, Nos. 25909, 25911-25913, September 6, 9-11, 1867. The author of the reports was Eccarius.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> K. Marx, *Das Kapital, Kritik der politischen Oekonomie*. Erster Band, Hamburg, 1867.—*Ed.*

subtleties of the first chapters, I advise you to read those on the primitive accumulation of capital and the modern theory of colonisation first. I am sure that, like myself, you will obtain great satisfaction from this part. Marx does not, of course, have any specific remedy at hand, which the bourgeois world, that now also calls itself socialist, so violently cries out for, he has no tablets, no ointments, or lint, to heal the gaping, bleeding wounds of our society; but to me it seems that, basing himself on the natural historical rise and development of modern society he has indicated the results and their practical application, including even the most daring conclusions, and that it was no small matter to bring the astounded philistine to the giddy heights of the following problems by means of statistical data and dialectical reasoning:

“Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one. It is itself an economic power... A great deal of capital, which appears today in the United States without any certificate of birth, was yesterday, in England, the capitalised blood of children... If money “comes into the world with a congenital blood-stain on one cheek”, capital comes dripping from head to foot, from every pore with blood and dirt.’ Or the whole passage from: “The knell of capitalist private property sounds, etc.”,<sup>a</sup> to the end.

“I must admit openly that I was gripped by this simple pathos and that history became as clear as daylight to me.”

Written on about October 5, 1867

Printed according to the journal

First published in *Der Vorbote*, No. 10,  
October 1867

Published in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>a</sup> See the 1887 English edition of *Capital*, Vol. I, pp. 776, 781, 785 and 789.—*Ed.*

RULES AND ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION<sup>351</sup>

RULES<sup>a</sup>

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,<sup>b</sup> but for equal rights and duties, and the abolition of all class rule;

That the economical subjection of the man of labour to the monopoliser 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 class of different countries;

That the emancipation of labour 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;<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The 1866 French edition here reads: "Rules of the International Working Men's Association Adopted by the Geneva Congress at the Sitting of September 5, 1866".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The 1866 French edition has "not a struggle for new privileges" instead of "not a struggle for class privileges and monopolies".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The 1866 French edition has "of these countries" instead of "of the most advanced countries".—*Ed.*



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 the immediate combination of the still disconnected movements;

For these reasons:—

The first International Working Men's Congress<sup>a</sup> declares that this International Association and 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;

This Congress considers it the duty of a man to claim the rights of a man and a citizen, not only for himself, but for every man who does his duty. No rights without duties, no duties without rights;

And in this spirit they have drawn up<sup>b</sup> the following Rules of the International Association:—

1. This Association is established to afford a central medium of communication and co-operation 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. The General Council shall consist of working men belonging to the different countries represented in the International Association. It shall from its own members elect the officers necessary for the transaction of business, such as a president, a treasurer, a general secretary, corresponding secretaries for the different countries, &c. The Congress appoints annually the seat of the General Council, elects a number of members, with power to add to their numbers, and appoints time and place for the meeting of 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.

4. On its annual meetings, the General Congress shall receive a public account of the annual transactions of the General Council.

---

<sup>a</sup> In the 1866 French edition this paragraph begins with the words: "The Congress of the International Working Men's Association held in Geneva between September 3 and 8, 1866".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The 1866 French edition has "the Congress has adopted as final" instead of "they have drawn up".—*Ed.*

In cases of urgency, it may convoke the General Congress before the regular yearly term.

5. The General Council shall form an international agency between the different co-operating associations,<sup>a</sup> 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.<sup>b</sup> 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.

6. 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<sup>c</sup>; the members of the International Association shall use their utmost efforts to combine the disconnected<sup>d</sup> working men's societies of their respective countries into national bodies, represented by central national organs.<sup>e</sup> 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.<sup>f</sup>

7. The various branches and sections shall, at their places of abode, and as far as their influence may extend, take the initiative

<sup>a</sup> In the 1866 French edition the beginning of the paragraph reads: "The General Council shall establish relations with different workers' associations".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The end of the sentence from the words "when immediate practical steps..." reads in the 1866 French edition: "when some practical proposal or international complication demands interference by the Association, its action be uniform".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The part of the sentence from the words "the usefulness of the International General Council" to "local societies" reads in the 1866 French edition: "the usefulness of the General Council will be the greater the less its actions are scattered".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In the 1866 French edition this word is omitted.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The 1866 French edition has "Central Councils" instead of "central national organs".—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> Articles 7-12 are omitted in the 1866 French edition.—*Ed.*

not only in all matters tending to the general progressive improvement of public life but also in the foundation of productive associations and other institutions useful to the working class. The General Council shall encourage them in every possible manner.

8. 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.

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. Every section or branch has the right to appoint its own corresponding secretary.

11. While united in a perpetual bond of fraternal cooperation, the working men's societies, joining the International Association, will preserve their existent organisations intact.

12. Everything not provided for in the present Rules will be supplied by special Regulations subject to the revision of every Congress.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS<sup>a</sup>

1. The General Council is commissioned to carry the resolutions of the Congress into effect. (A) For this purpose it collects all the documents sent by the Central Committees of the different countries, and such as it may be able to procure by other means. (B) It is charged with the organisation of the Congress, and to bring the Congress programme to the knowledge of all the branches through the medium of the Central Committees.

2. As often as its means permit, the General Council shall publish a report embracing everything that may be of interest to the International Working Men's Association, taking cognisance above all of the supply and demand for labour in different localities, Co-operative Associations, and of the condition of the labouring class in every country.

3. This report shall be published in the several languages and sent to all the corresponding offices for sale. To save expense the corresponding secretaries must previously inform the General

---

<sup>a</sup> The 1866 French edition has "Special Regulations".—*Ed.*

Council of the approximate number of copies that may be disposed of in their respective localities.<sup>a</sup>

4. To enable the General Council to fulfil these duties an annual contribution of ONE PENNY per member will be levied from affiliated societies for the use of the General Council payable in quarterly instalments.<sup>b</sup> This contribution is destined to defray the expense of the General Council, such as the remuneration of the General Secretary, postage, printing, &c.<sup>c</sup>

5. Whenever circumstances may permit Central Committees representing groups of branches using the same language<sup>d</sup> will be established. The functionaries of these Committees are elected by the respective sections, but may be recalled from their offices at any time. They shall send their reports at least once a month, oftener if need be.

6. The expense of the Central Committees shall be defrayed by their respective sections.<sup>e</sup> Every branch, whatever the number of its members, may send a delegate to the Congress.

7. Branches that are not able to send a delegate may unite with other branches to form a group to send a delegate to represent them.

8. Every branch, or group, consisting of more than 500 members, may send a delegate for every additional full 500 members. Only the delegates of branches and sections who have

<sup>a</sup> In the 1866 French edition this sentence is part of the previous one and reads "whose duty it is to send one copy to each branch".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The 1866 French edition has: "To enable the General Council to fulfil these duties a contribution of 30 centimes (3d.) per member of the Association will be levied for 1866-1867 as an exception."—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The 1866 French edition has "expenses on publication, correspondence, organisation and other preparations for the Congress" instead of "postage, printing, &c."—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The words "representing groups of branches using the same language" are omitted in the 1866 French edition.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> In the 1866 French edition the next sentence opens Article 9 the end of which corresponds to Article 7 in the English edition; in the French edition this phrase is followed by two Articles which are missing in the English edition, namely:

"7. The only function of the corresponding Central Councils, and also the General Council, is to recognise the credit granted to members of the Association by their respective branches when their cards are countersigned by the secretary of the branch to which the bearer belongs.

If the branch to which the bearer applies to make use of his credit is short of funds, it is authorised to draw on the bureau of the branch issuing the credit.

8. The Central Councils and the branches must communicate the reports of the General Council on demand and free of charge to every member of the Association."—*Ed.*

paid their contributions to the General Council can take part in the transactions of the Congress.<sup>a</sup>

9. The expense of the delegates is defrayed by the branches and sections who appoint them.<sup>b</sup>

10. Every member of the International Working Men's Association is eligible.<sup>c</sup>

11. Each delegate has but one vote in the Congress.<sup>d</sup>

12. Every section is at liberty to make Rules and Bye-Laws for its local administration, suitable to the peculiar circumstances of the different countries. But these Bye-Laws must not contain anything contrary to the general Rules and Regulations.

13. The present Rules and Regulations may be revised by every Congress, provided that two-thirds of the delegates present are in favour of such revision.

#### BYE-LAWS FOR THE UNITED KINGDOM<sup>e</sup>

1. The contribution for individual members is ls. per annum.

2. Societies joining in their corporate capacity have to pay an entrance fee of 5s.

3. Affiliated societies in the Metropolitan district have the right to send a delegate to the meetings of the General Council. Upon invitation deputations from the General Council will wait upon societies in the Metropolitan district to explain the aims and objects of the Association.

By order of the General Council,

*Robert Shaw*, Chairman

*J. George Eccarius*, Hon. Gen. Sec.

Published as a pamphlet *Rules of the  
International Working Men's Association*,  
London [1867]

Reproduced from the pamphlet

<sup>a</sup> Corresponds to Article 12 in the 1866 French edition where the second phrase is omitted.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Article 10 in the 1866 French edition.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The respective Article 11 in the 1866 French edition reads: "has the right to elect and be elected".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Corresponds to Article 13 in the 1866 French edition; the next two Articles are 14 and 15 respectively.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> This addition is omitted in the 1866 French edition.—*Ed.*

NOTES  
AND  
INDEXES



## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> On September 28, 1864 an international meeting was held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, London. It was organised by the London trade-union leaders and a group of Paris Proudhonist workers jointly with the representatives of German, Italian and other foreign workers then living in London and a number of prominent European democratic émigrés. The meeting resolved to found an International Working Men's Association (later known as the First International) and elected a Provisional Committee which shortly afterwards constituted itself as the leading body of the Association. This body, known as the General Council of the International, was mainly called the Central Council until the end of 1866. Karl Marx was elected to this Committee and later to the Sub-Committee appointed at its first meeting on October 5 to draw up the Association's programme documents. The Sub-Committee, or Standing Committee, subsequently functioned as an executive body and included the President of the Central (General) Council (until autumn 1867, when this post was abolished), the General Secretary and the corresponding secretaries for different countries. Marx did not attend its first meetings, when the Sub-Committee drew up a document consisting of an introductory declaration of principles, written by the Owenite John Weston and edited by the French petty-bourgeois democrat Victor Le Lubez, and the Rules of the Italian workers' societies, drawn up by Mazzini and translated into English by the Italian Luigi Wolff.

This document, edited by Le Lubez, was discussed at the Sub-Committee meeting on October 15 about which Marx was informed too late for him to attend, and at the Provisional Committee meeting on October 18, when Marx first familiarised himself with this material. His critical assessment of it is to be found in his letter to Engels of November 4, 1864 (see present edition, Vol. 42). Circumstances did not allow Marx to prevent the Provisional Committee's approval of the declaration of principles and the Rules, but he convinced the Committee members that the document needed polishing and insisted on referring it back to the Sub-Committee for final editing. On October 20 the Sub-Committee met at Marx's house; at that meeting they managed to edit only the first point of the Rules. By the next meeting of the Sub-Committee on October 27 Marx had completely revised the submitted document. He wrote a new document—the Inaugural Address of the



Working Men's International Association, which was not in the original draft; he altered the Preamble to the Rules, discarding the loosely-phrased declaration of principles, reduced the 40 points of the Rules to 10, and formulated them in a way which expressed the proletarian nature of the organisation then being founded, and eliminated all Mazzinian organisational principles (petty regulation typical of secret societies, etc.). The Sub-Committee approved the Address and the Rules as drawn up by Marx, stipulating, however, that two declarative phrases on "rights and duties" and "truth, justice, and morality" be inserted in the Preamble to the Rules.

On November 1, 1864 both documents were unanimously approved by the Provisional Committee. On the proposal of a Committee member, Whitlock, Marx supplemented the Inaugural Address with a note on carbon and nitrogen as most important elements of food.

The Inaugural Address was first published by *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 160, November 5, 1864 without the sanction of the Central Council and as an offprint to be sent to various newspapers. Marx strongly disapproved of this publication which contained a number of misprints (see this volume, p. 353). In November 1864 the Address and the Rules were published in London as a pamphlet *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association, Established September 28, 1864, at a Public Meeting Held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, London*. On the decision of the Central Council of May 9, 1866 the English version of the Inaugural Address, the Provisional Rules and some other documents were again published as a pamphlet in London in August that year. The Address was also published in *The Miner & Workman's Advocate*, No. 93, December 10, 1864. The German authorised translation entitled "Manifest an die arbeitende Klasse Europas" was published in *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nos. 2 and 3, December 21 and 30, 1864.

During 1865, 1866 and later, various translations of the Inaugural Address appeared: into French in Paris, Geneva and Brussels; into Italian in Genoa and Naples; into German in Leipzig, Geneva, Berlin and Vienna in 1866 and 1868; into Hungarian in Pest in 1868; into Russian in Geneva in 1871; into Spanish and Portuguese in Madrid and Lisbon in 1873. Various German translations continued to be published in Germany and Switzerland (Zurich) in the early 1870s as well.

The Inaugural Address has survived in two manuscript copies written by Mrs. Marx and Jenny Marx (Marx's daughter), and copies of pamphlets with Marx's corrections.

In this volume the document is published according to the English pamphlet of 1864. The most important differences between the English version and the German authorised translation are given in footnotes.

At the end of the pamphlet there was a list of the Central Council members:

"Names and Nationalities of the Central Provisional Council.

"English: *Longmaid, Worley, Leno, Whitlock, Fox, Blackmore, Hartwell, Pidgeon, Lucraft, Weston, Dell, Shearman, Nieass, Shaw, Lake, Buckley, Odger, Howell, Osborne, Carter, Gray, Wheeler, Stainsby, Morgan, Grossmith, Cremer, Dick.*

"French: *Denoual, Le Lubez, Jourdain, Morrissot, Leroux, Bordage, Bocquet, Talandier, Dupont.*

"Italian: *L. Wolff, Fontana, Setacci, Aldourandi, Lama, Solustri.*

"Swiss: *Nusperli, Jung.*

"German: *Eccarius, Wolff, Otto, Lessner, Pfänder, Lochner, Marx, Kaub, Bolleter.*

"Polish: *Holtorp, Rybczinski.*

*George Odger*, President of the Central Council.

*George W. Wheeler*, Honorary Treasurer.

*Karl Marx*, Honorary Corresponding Secretary for Germany.

*G. P. Fontana*, Honorary Corresponding Secretary for Italy.

*J. E. Holtorp*, Honorary Corresponding Secretary for Poland.

*Hermann F. Jung*, Honorary Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland.

*V. Le Lubez*, Honorary Corresponding Secretary for France.

*William R. Cremer*, Honorary General Secretary.»

p. 5

<sup>2</sup> This presumably refers to the articles "The Trade and Navigation Returns" and "Pauperism.—July 1850 and 1849", published in *The Economist*, August 10, 1850.

p. 5

<sup>3</sup> *Garottes*—robbers who strangled their victims. In the early 1860s such attacks often occurred in London and were a subject of special debate in Parliament.

p. 5

<sup>4</sup> *Blue Books*—a series of British parliamentary and foreign policy documents published in blue cover since the seventeenth century.

p. 6

<sup>5</sup> The *Civil War in America* broke out in April 1861. The Southern slaveholders rose against the Union and formed the Confederacy of the Southern States. The war was caused mainly by the conflict between the two social systems: the capitalist system of wage labour established in the North and the slave system dominant in the South. The Civil War, which had the nature of a bourgeois-democratic revolution, passed two stages in its development: the period of a constitutional war for maintaining the Union and the period of a revolutionary war for the abolition of slavery. The decisive role in the defeat of the Southern slaveholders and the victory of the North in April 1865 was played by the workers and farmers. Marx analysed the causes and the nature of war in America in his articles published in the Vienna newspaper *Die Presse* (see present edition, Vol. 19).

The discontinuance of cotton imports from America as a result of the blockade of the Southern States by the Northern fleet caused a crisis in the cotton industry of several European countries. In England, for two or three years beginning in 1862, over 75 per cent of spinners and weavers in Lancashire, Cheshire and other counties were fully or partly unemployed. Despite privation and distress, the European proletariat gave all possible support to the American fighters against slavery.

p. 6

<sup>6</sup> The phrase from Gladstone's speech on April 16, 1863, quoted here by Marx, appeared in almost all the London newspaper reports of this parliamentary session (*The Times*, *The Morning Star*, *The Daily Telegraph*, April 17, 1863) but was omitted in Hansard's semi-official publication of parliamentary debates in which the text was corrected by the speakers themselves. In the magazine *Concordia*, No. 10, March 7, 1872 the German bourgeois economist Brentano used this as a pretext for accusing Marx of unscrupulous misquotation. Marx replied to this libel in his letters to the editor of *Der Volksstaat* on May 23 and July 28, 1872 (see present edition, Vol. 23).

After Marx's death, the same accusation was made in November 1883 by the British bourgeois economist Taylor. The lie to this assertion was given by Eleanor Marx in two letters to the magazine *To-Day* in February and March 1884, and then by Engels in the Preface to the fourth German edition of *Capital* in June 1890 and in the pamphlet *Brentano Contra Marx* in 1891.

p. 7

- <sup>7</sup> The *Ten Hours' Bill*, the struggle for which had been waged for many years, was passed by Parliament in 1847 against the background of sharply intensified contradictions between the landed aristocracy and the industrial bourgeoisie, generated by the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. In revenge on the industrial bourgeoisie, a section of Tory M.P.s supported the Bill. Its provisions applied only to women and children. Nevertheless, many manufacturers evaded it in practice. Engels devoted two special articles to this Bill in 1850 (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 271-76 and 288-300). True, they were written at a time when Marx's economic teaching was not yet sufficiently developed, and in these articles this shows up as a certain underestimation of the struggle for a shorter working day. p. 10
- <sup>8</sup> Marx has in mind the polemical articles by the Chartist leader Ernest Jones, published in the weekly *Notes to the People* in 1851 and 1852 and aimed at Christian socialists and bourgeois advocates of the co-operative principle who asserted that social evils could be eliminated under the existing bourgeois system by setting up workers' co-operative societies. In contrast to them, Jones proved that co-operatives could be a powerful means of social transformation if introduced on a national scale by a working class which had won political power. Jones wrote some of the articles jointly with Marx (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 573-89). p. 11
- <sup>9</sup> At a parliamentary session in 1863, the Irish deputies headed by Thomas Maguire demanded legislative measures limiting landlords' arbitrariness, in particular, the tenants' right to have their expenses on a rented plot compensated when the lease had expired or been terminated. In his speech on June 23, 1863 Palmerston called these demands "communistic doctrines" "subversive of all the fundamental principles of social order". p. 12
- <sup>10</sup> The reference is to the demonstrations by English workers during the American Civil War against their government's interference on the side of the Southern slaveholding states. The massive campaign of the English workers against intervention which became particularly widespread at the end of 1861 and the beginning of 1862 prevented reactionary quarters from drawing Europe into the war on the side of the slaveholders and greatly strengthened the idea of the international solidarity of the proletariat. p. 13
- <sup>11</sup> The *Provisional Rules of the Association* were drawn up by Marx simultaneously with the Inaugural Address, approved by the Sub-Committee on October 27 and unanimously adopted by the Provisional Committee on November 1, 1864. They were published in English together with the Inaugural Address in the pamphlet *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association...* in London in November 1864 and also in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 161, November 12, 1864 and *The Miner and Workman's Advocate*, No. 93, December 10, 1864. The French translation of the Provisional Rules made by the Proudhonists at the end of 1864 contained a few inaccuracies and distortions later used in the struggle against the General Council (see present edition, Vol. 21, K. Marx, "General Council to the Federal Council of the Romance Switzerland", "Confidential Communication"). This translation was reproduced in a number of publications in France, Belgium and Switzerland. The new and improved French translation was made by Charles Longuet, checked by Marx and published together with the Inaugural Address in the pamphlet *Manifeste de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs suivi du Règlement provisoire*, Brussels, 1866. The German translation appeared in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 10, January 18, 1865 and in *Der Vorbote*, Nos. 4 and 5, April and May

1866. The Italian translation was published in *L'Unità Italiana*, February 18, 1865 (Milan) and *Il Dovere*, August 26, 1865 (Genoa). At its sitting on September 5, 1866, the Geneva Congress of the International Working Men's Association confirmed the text of the Rules (General Rules) supplementing it with the Regulations which were confirmed at the sitting of September 8, 1866 and were later called the Administrative Regulations. p. 14

<sup>12</sup> This and the preceding paragraphs of a declarative character were included by Marx in the Preamble to the Rules on the insistence of other members of the Sub-Committee, who discussed the document on October 27. Marx informed Engels about this in his letter of November 4, 1864 (see present edition, Vol. 42). p. 15

<sup>13</sup> The first Congress of the International Working Men's Association scheduled for 1865 in Brussels was held between September 3 and 8, 1866 in Geneva. The decision to postpone the Congress was taken by the Central Council on July 25, 1865 on Marx's insistence. He considered that the local organisations of the International were not yet strong enough in ideological and organisational respects and suggested that a preliminary conference be held in London (see this volume, pp. 375-77). p. 15

<sup>14</sup> The resolutions proposed by Marx on the constitution of the Central Council (later called the General Council), the leading body of the International Working Men's Association, worked out in detail the general principles briefly formulated in points 4, 5 and 6 of the Provisional Rules (see this volume, pp. 15-16).

The first of these resolutions forbade the then widespread practice in England of promoting to the leading bodies of various societies honorary, but actually non-working, members, because this enabled representatives of the propertied classes to influence workers' organisations without putting themselves under obligation to them. The press report did not name the author of this resolution, but it is obvious from the Minute Book of the General Council that all three were moved by Marx.

Between January and April 1865 the Central Council adopted several more resolutions which specified the rights and duties of its members. They were proposed by various Council members, usually supported by Marx and sometimes initiated by him (see this volume, pp. 357 and 364-65).

The resolutions II and III were published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 17

<sup>15</sup> These resolutions were used as a basis for the Address of the Central Council to Working Men's Societies (see this volume, pp. 372-73) made public in the summer of 1865. p. 18

<sup>16</sup> On November 22 the Central Council, on the proposal of its members Dick and Howell, decided to congratulate Abraham Lincoln on his re-election to the presidency. The writing of the letter of congratulation was entrusted to the Sub-Committee.

The text, written by Marx, was approved by the Sub-Committee, unanimously confirmed by the Central Council on November 29, 1864, and sent to President Lincoln through Adams, the American envoy to London. On January 28, 1865 the Council received a reply in Lincoln's name which was read out at the Council meeting on January 31 and published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper* on February 4, 1865 and *The Times* on February 6, 1865. As Marx wrote to Wilhelm Liebknecht in February 1865, of all Lincoln's replies to

congratulations he had received, only the one to the International Working Men's Association was "not merely a *formal* acknowledgement of receipt".

This address to Lincoln was first published in *The Daily News*, No. 5813, December 23, 1864 and then in *The Miner and Workman's Advocate*, No. 95, December 24, 1864, *Reynolds's Newspaper*, No. 750, December 25, 1864, *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 169, January 7, 1865 and in the German newspapers *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 3, supplement, December 30, 1864, *Berliner Reform*, No. 4, January 5, 1865 and *Hermann*, No. 314, January 7, 1865. It was also included in the book, *Life of Abraham Lincoln*, New York, 1865.

In this volume the address has been reproduced from the hand-written copy signed by all members of the Central Council and has been checked with the text in the newspapers. p. 19

<sup>17</sup> The reference is to the Declaration of Independence passed by the delegates of 13 North American colonies at the Congress in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776. The Declaration proclaimed the secession from England and the formation of an independent republic—the United States of America. It formulated such bourgeois-democratic principles as freedom of the individual, equality before the law, sovereignty of the people, exerting great influence on the European revolutionary movement and the French Revolution in particular. However, the democratic rights proclaimed were from the very start violated by the American bourgeoisie and planters who secured their power as a result of the American War of Independence (1775-83), the first American bourgeois revolution, excluded the common people from political life, and preserved slavery. p. 19

<sup>18</sup> See Note 5. p. 20

<sup>19</sup> This is a covering letter to Marx's statement (printed below) to the editor of *Der Beobachter*, a Stuttgart petty-bourgeois democratic newspaper. *Der Beobachter*, No. 268, November 17, 1864, carried an anonymous report from Bradford, the author being Karl Blind. Blind's cowardly attempt to deny his authorship of the anonymous leaflet "A Warning" reprinted in June 1859 by *Das Volk* (London) and the *Allgemeine Zeitung* (Augsburg) and depicting Karl Vogt as a Bonapartist secret agent was censured by Marx in 1860 in his pamphlet *Herr Vogt* (see present edition, Vol. 17). Blind's new article compelled Marx to expose him again as a liar and refute his boasts of enjoying influence in the USA. At the request of Sophie von Hatzfeldt, Lassalle's friend, Marx also came out against Blind's attacks on Lassalle. On December 22, 1864 Marx wrote to Sophie von Hatzfeldt: "It was at your request that I wrote this attack, although its composition did not come easily to me as I did *not* agree with Lassalle's *political tactics*" (see present edition, Vol. 42).

The *Beobachter* editor confined himself to publishing only the covering letter and his own "comments" on Marx's statement. Marx's statement did not appear in the newspaper columns. p. 22

<sup>20</sup> On Marx's motive for writing this statement, see Note 19.

Marx foresaw that the *Beobachter* editor might not publish his statement and sent a copy of it to Sophie von Hatzfeldt for publication in other German papers. Countess Hatzfeldt placed it in the Hamburg *Nordstern*.

A copy of the statement in Mrs. Marx's hand with the author's corrections has survived. p. 23

<sup>21</sup> Marx wrote this article on January 24, 1865 on the occasion of Proudhon's death and at the request of J. B. Schweitzer, the editor of *Der Social-Demokrat*, the newspaper of the Lassalleian General Association of German Workers

(founded in May 1863). Schweitzer invited Marx and Engels to contribute to the paper (started in Berlin on December 15, 1864) as early as November 11 of that year. Absence of specifically Lassallean slogans in its prospectus and Wilhelm Liebknecht's membership of the paper's editorial board encouraged Marx and Engels, who had at that time no other press organs for influencing the working-class movement in Germany, to accept the invitation. Moreover, Marx hoped to use this paper for the criticism of Lassallean dogmas and tactics. Thus, in the article on Proudhon, he revealed the methodological defects of Proudhon's views and indirectly stressed the unfeasibility of Lassalle's kindred reformist and sectarian views. Exposing Proudhon's time-serving behaviour with respect to the Bonapartist order, Marx in fact censured Lassalle and his followers for flirting with Prussian ruling circles. A rough copy in Marx's hand of part of the article has survived.

In addition to Marx's article on Proudhon, *Der Social-Demokrat* published the Inaugural Address and the Provisional Rules of the Working Men's Association and Engels' translation of the old Danish folk song *Herr Tidmann* (see this volume, pp. 5-16 and 34-35).

However, Marx and Engels soon became aware that the *Social-Demokrat* editors did not wish to abandon the Lassallean reformist course and the hopes of a deal with the Prussian Government. This compelled them to break all relations with the paper (see this volume, pp. 80 and 87-90).

The article on Proudhon was reprinted in the first and second German editions of Marx's *The Poverty of Philosophy* edited by Engels and published in 1885 and 1892. The French translation was made by Engels in 1884 and checked by Paul Lafargue; it served as the basis of the translation published in the French 1896 edition of *The Poverty of Philosophy*.

The English translation of the article was first published in K. Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, London, 1910. p. 26

- <sup>22</sup> In the columns of *Le Populaire* and *Le Populaire de 1841* published in the 1830s and 1840s, Étienne Cabet, while publicising projects in the spirit of peaceful utopian communism also criticised the July monarchy regime and helped disseminate democratic ideas. In his works, articles and leaflets, Cabet sharply criticised the capitalist system and this greatly contributed to the political education of the French proletariat. p. 31
- <sup>23</sup> This refers to Proudhon's speech in the French National Assembly on July 31, 1848. Its full text was published in *Compte rendu des séances de l'Assemblée Nationale*, Vol. II, Paris, 1849, pp. 770-82. Proudhon made a few proposals of a petty-bourgeois utopian character, the abolition of loan interest among them, and described the reprisals against the heroic proletarians who had taken part in the Paris insurrection of June 23-26, 1848 as violence and despotism. A detailed assessment of this speech is to be found in "Proudhon's Speech Against Thiers" (present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 321-24). p. 31
- <sup>24</sup> In his speech on July 26, 1848 in the National Assembly, Thiers opposed the proposals to reform credit and taxation which Proudhon had submitted to the Assembly's finance committee. After Proudhon's speech of July 31, 1848, Thiers published his own speech in a separate pamphlet as an attack on his opponent. p. 31
- <sup>25</sup> In *Si les traités de 1815 ont cessé d'exister? Actes du futur congrès* Proudhon opposed the revision of the Vienna 1815 Congress decisions which sanctioned the partition of Poland by Austria, Prussia and Russia and also any support to the Polish national liberation movement. p. 32

- <sup>26</sup> Engels presumably translated this Danish folk song into German from the collection *Et Hundkede udvalde Danske Viser*, published in Copenhagen in 1787, and sent it on January 27, 1865 to be published in *Der Social-Demokrat*. As is seen from Engels' letter to Marx of January 27, 1865 (see present edition, Vol. 42), he wanted to draw the readers' attention to the peasants' revolutionary traditions and, in contrast to Lassalle's disregard of their interests, to stress the importance of the struggle against the survivals of feudalism and the exploitation of the peasants by the nobility.

In 1883, Engels' translation was reprinted in *Der Sozialdemokrat*, the newspaper of the Socialist Workers' Party of Germany, and in 1893 in K. Henckell's *Buch der Freiheit*, Bd. II, Berlin.

The English translation of the Danish folk song was published in English for the first time in the collection: Marx and Engels, *On Literature and Art*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, pp. 427-28. p. 34

- <sup>27</sup> This statement was written by Marx and sent to Engels for his signature on February 6, 1865. By that time, they were convinced that Schweitzer, the newspaper's editor, was continuing Lassalle's policy of flirting with the Bismarck Government and was acting in accordance with Lassalle's dogmas, treating the workers' movement in other countries with nationalist contempt. Marx and Engels regarded their statement as a warning to Schweitzer. It was prompted by an item in *Der Social-Demokrat* of February 1 which was written by the newspaper's Paris correspondent Moses Hess, who libellously accused French members of the International of being in contact with Bonapartists.

The criticism by Marx and Engels compelled the editors to change the newspaper's tone to some extent. Issue No. 21 of February 12, 1865 carried an item by Hess in which he withdrew his assertions. For that reason Marx and Engels did not insist on the publication of the statement; at the same time, as is seen from Marx's letter to Engels of February 13, 1865, they decided to stop contributing to the newspaper for the time being. Marx and Engels announced their final break with *Der Social-Demokrat* on February 23, 1865 (see this volume, p. 80).

The text of the statement sent to Schweitzer has not survived. It is published here according to the rough manuscript attached to Marx's letter of February 6, 1865 to Engels. A passage from the statement was later quoted by Marx in the statement on the reasons for their refusal to contribute to *Der Social-Demokrat*, published in the latter half of March 1865 in the *Berliner Reform* and other newspapers (see this volume, p. 80).

This statement was published in English for the first time in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Correspondence. 1846-1895*. A Selection with Commentary and Notes, Martin Lawrence Ltd., London, 1934. p. 36

- <sup>28</sup> Engels wrote this article to substantiate the tactics of the German working class in the so-called constitutional conflict between the Prussian Government and the bourgeois-liberal majority of the Provincial Diet which, in February 1860, refused to confirm the army reorganisation project proposed by War Minister von Roon. However, the Government soon managed to secure allocations from the Provincial Diet to "maintain the army ready for action" which in fact meant the beginning of the planned reorganisation. When, in March 1862, the liberal majority of the Chamber of Deputies refused to endorse military expenses and demanded a ministry responsible to the Provincial Diet, the Government dissolved the Diet and announced new elections. At the end of September 1862 the Bismarck Ministry was formed. In October it again dissolved the Provincial

Diet and began to carry out the military reform without the sanction of the Diet. The conflict was settled only in 1866 when, after Prussia's victory over Austria, the Prussian bourgeoisie capitulated to Bismarck.

At first Engels agreed to write an article on the Prussian military reform for *Der Social-Demokrat*, but the newspaper's kowtowing before the Bismarck Government made him give up his intention. After consulting Marx, he decided to have his work published as a separate pamphlet. He began writing it late in January 1865, and finished most of it before February 9. Then he sent the manuscript to Marx for review. After making a number of improvements in it on his friend's recommendation, Engels sent the manuscript to the Hamburg publisher Meissner on February 12 and informed Marx about this on the following day (see present edition, Vol. 42).

The pamphlet was published in Hamburg at the end of February 1865 and caused widespread comment in Germany. Its publication was announced in many workers' and democratic newspapers. Wilhelm Liebknecht arranged for it to be discussed in several workers' associations in Berlin. Extracts from the pamphlet appeared in the Social-Democratic press at various times: in the *Barmer Zeitung*, No. 57, March 8, 1865, *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 71, March 25, 1866, the *Sozialdemokratische Monatsschrift*, Nos. 10-11, November 30, 1890 and the *Berliner Volks-Tribüne*, No. 1, March 1, 1891. p. 37

- <sup>29</sup> The mobilisation of the Prussian army in 1850 was caused by the exacerbation of the conflict between Austria and Prussia for supremacy in Germany. Prussia was forced to surrender by the weakness of its army as well as the vigorous opposition of Russia, which supported Austria. The mobilisation of 1859, caused by the Italian War fought by France and Piedmont against Austria, likewise revealed serious defects in the Prussian military system. p. 42
- <sup>30</sup> This refers to the July 1830 bourgeois revolution in France and the revolts that followed it in various parts of Germany (Saxony, Brunswick, Hesse, Bavaria and Hanover). p. 42
- <sup>31</sup> The Prussian land forces, formed during the struggle against Napoleon on the basis of the 1814-15 legislation, consisted of the regular army (troops of the line), its reserve (training and reserve battalions) and the *Landwehr* of the first and the second levy. The *Landwehr* had been formed in Prussia back in 1813 as a people's militia and included members of the older age groups liable to military service who had done three years active service and not less than two years in the reserve and were called up in case of special emergencies. In wartime the *Landwehr* of the first levy was usually included in the field army, while that of the second levy served for the reinforcement of the garrison troops. p. 42
- <sup>32</sup> This refers to the war of Prussia and Austria against Denmark in 1864 over Schleswig and Holstein, duchies subject to Denmark but inhabited mainly by Germans. Austria joined the war in the fear that if its rival, Prussia, fought on its own, it would enjoy all the fruits of victory. Denmark was defeated. Schleswig and Holstein were declared joint possessions of Austria and Prussia, which aggravated the conflict between the two countries. After its defeat in the war with Prussia in 1866, Austria had to renounce its rights to the duchies in Prussia's favour. p. 43
- <sup>33</sup> The *conscription system* was based on general liability for military service, but allowed many deviations, mainly in the form of money redemption and



substitution. The substitution system was widely practised in France where the members of the propertied classes had the privilege of buying themselves out of military service by hiring substitutes. Under the legislation of 1853, substitutes were selected in the main by government bodies and the payment for them went towards a special "army donation" fund. The substitution system was abolished in France in 1872.

Liability for military service determined by *ballot* was practised in the nineteenth century in those West European countries where the number of persons liable for service exceeded the demand. The ballot decided who was to serve, the rest were recruited either as militiamen or, in certain countries, for short-term military training. p. 44

<sup>34</sup> This reserve consisted of men whose conscription was deferred by reason of minor physical defects or special domestic circumstances. It was used for the reinforcement of the army during wartime. p. 46

<sup>35</sup> The *Franco-Austrian cadre-system* of the 1860s was characterised by the predominance of the regular army, whose personnel remained constant for a long time, by a lengthy period of military service and by conscription, in contrast to the Prussian military system based, under the legislation of 1814, on universal liability for military service and a comparatively short period of service. p. 51

<sup>36</sup> A reference to the colonial war of conquest in Algeria, begun by France in 1830 and fought for forty years, and to the Crimean war (1853-56), in which Russia confronted the allied forces of France, Britain, Turkey and Piedmont (Sardinia). For the Italian War of 1859, see Note 29. p. 51

<sup>37</sup> At the *Battle of Jena* (Thuringia) on October 14, 1806 French troops under Napoleon routed part of the Prussian army. On the same day, Marshal Davout defeated the main Prussian forces at *Auerstädt*. The defeat of Prussia, a member of the fourth anti-French coalition (Britain, Russia, Prussia and Sweden) in these two battles (often referred to as the Battle of Jena), led to the occupation of the greater part of Prussia by the French. Hostilities were ended by the Treaty of Tilsit on July 9, 1807, on terms which were harsh and humiliating for Prussia.

On the River *Katzbach* (Silesia) the Silesian army under Blücher, which consisted of the Prussian and Russian troops, defeated the French troops under Marshal Macdonald on August 26, 1813 during the war of the sixth coalition of the European states (Russia, Austria, Prussia, Britain, Sweden, Spain, etc.). This victory contributed to the Allies' successes in the struggle against Napoleon and led to the expulsion of the French army from Germany. At the beginning of 1814, military operations were conducted on French territory, and in March the Allied forces entered Paris. p. 52

<sup>38</sup> The Swiss *Landwehr* consisted of men liable for military service who had completed their term of service in the country's irregular troops periodically called up for training. In Switzerland, as in Prussia, the *Landwehr* served to reinforce the army during the war and was mobilised at the threat of war. p. 52

<sup>39</sup> The original here has "Düppel im Innern" (enemy within), an expression first used with this meaning in a political survey published in the Bismarckian

*Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* on September 30, 1864 and widely current later.

*Düppel* (Danish: Dybbøl)—Danish fortification in Schleswig which the Prussians captured by storm on April 18, 1864 during the Austro-Prussian war against Denmark. p. 52

- <sup>40</sup> In 1849, during the uprisings in South-Western Germany in support of the Imperial Constitution drafted by the Frankfurt National Assembly but rejected by German sovereigns, the Baden troops sided with the insurgents and made up the nucleus of the Baden-Palatinate revolutionary army. The Baden cavalry regiments, however, were the least reliable. Thus, in the battle with the Prussians at Waghäusel on June 21, 1849 the insurgents took to flight owing to the treachery of an officer in command of several Baden dragoon squadrons. p. 54
- <sup>41</sup> The reference is to the "liberal" course announced by Prince William of Prussia (King of Prussia from 1861) when he became regent in October 1858. He made the Manteuffel Ministry resign and called the moderate liberals to power. The bourgeois press dubbed this the policy of the "New Era". It was, in fact, solely intended to strengthen the position of the Prussian monarchy and the Junkers. This soon became clear to the representatives of the liberal opposition whose hopes had been deceived and who refused to approve the government project of a military reform. The constitutional conflict that ensued and Bismarck's advance to power in September 1862 put an end to the "New Era". p. 55
- <sup>42</sup> Engels is referring to the time when a counter-revolutionary Brandenburg government came to power in Prussia in November 1848 (Manteuffel held in it the post of the Minister of the Interior) and soon dissolved the Prussian National Assembly. After Brandenburg's death Manteuffel was appointed Prime Minister in 1850. This government was in power until 1858, and under it all the gains of the 1848 revolution (freedom of the press, of assembly, etc.) were abolished and the moderate constitution "imposed" (granted by the King) under Brandenburg was repeatedly revised in the spirit of further curtailment of the Provincial diets' rights. Taking advantage of the bourgeoisie's cowardly and conciliatory attitude, the government turned the constitutional representative body into a fiction, restoring the police-and-bureaucratic regime and the privileges and power of the landed aristocracy and nobility. p. 56
- <sup>43</sup> The Provincial diets (*Landtags*) were introduced in Prussia in 1823. They consisted of representatives of four estates (princes, nobility, representatives of town and rural communities). Property and other electoral qualifications secured the majority in the Provincial diets for the nobility. The Provincial diets were convened by the King and were competent to deal only with questions of local economy and administration. The district assemblies of estates, with an even more restricted competence, were based on the same principles. Relegated to the background during the 1848-49 revolution, the Provincial diets and district assemblies of estates lost their significance which was not regained until the 1850s, during the period of reaction. p. 56
- <sup>44</sup> Engels formulated this proposition on Marx's advice (see Marx's letter to Engels of February 11, 1865, present edition, Vol. 42). p. 57
- <sup>45</sup> Schulze-Delitzsch, a German bourgeois economist and a leader of the Party of Progress, advocated small savings banks and loan offices, and consumer and

producer cooperatives based on the workers' own means with the aim of diverting workers from the revolutionary struggle against capital. Schulze-Delitzsch advocated harmony of capitalists' and workers' interests, asserting that cooperatives could help improve workers' conditions under capitalism and save small producers and artisans from ruin. p. 57

- <sup>46</sup> A reference to the members of the Party of Progress founded in June 1861 (the most eminent figures were Waldeck, Virchow, Schulze-Delitzsch, Forckenbeck and Hoverbeck). The Party of Progress advocated unification of Germany under Prussia, convocation of an all-German parliament, and a liberal ministry responsible to the Chamber of Deputies. Fearing a people's revolution, it did not support the basic democratic demands—universal suffrage, freedoms of the press, association and assembly. In 1866 the Party of Progress split and its Right wing founded the National Liberal Party, which capitulated to the Bismarck Government. p. 58
- <sup>47</sup> A reference to the war launched by Prussia and Austria on Denmark in 1864 (see Note 32). p. 61
- <sup>48</sup> Frederick William III of Prussia promised a constitution in 1815 when the patriotic feeling caused by the struggle against Napoleonic France was still strong in the country. The promise was never kept. p. 64
- <sup>49</sup> The *Confederates*—representatives of the Confederacy formed by the Southern slave-holding States which seceded from the Union during the American Civil War of 1861-65 (see Note 5). p. 65
- <sup>50</sup> The bureaucratic regulation of industry also continued to operate in Prussia in the mid-1860s. A system of special authorisation (concessions) was introduced in a few branches of industry; unless they were granted, industrial activity was prohibited. This medieval guild legislation inhibited the development of capitalism. p. 65
- <sup>51</sup> The *Imperial Constitution* was adopted by the Frankfurt National Assembly on March 28, 1849. While proclaiming a number of civil liberties and introducing national central institutions, the Constitution nevertheless shaped the united German state as a monarchy. The Prussian-oriented liberal deputies of the Frankfurt Assembly insisted on handing the imperial crown to the Hohenzollerns and King Frederick-William IV was elected "Emperor of the Germans". However, he refused to accept the offer. Apart from the Prussian Government, those of almost all the larger German states (including Saxony, Bavaria and Hanover) refused to recognise the Constitution. Afraid of revolutionary action, liberals and democrats in the Frankfurt National Assembly proved incapable of upholding the Constitution. The people themselves were its sole defender, and in the spring and summer of 1849, they started an armed struggle led by petty-bourgeois democrats. However, the scattered revolts in defence of the Constitution in Dresden, Rhenish Prussia, the Palatinate and Baden were put down by the counter-revolutionary troops.
- Prussian hegemony (Preußische Spitze)*. Frederick-William IV of Prussia first used this expression on March 20, 1848 when he spoke of his readiness to stand "at the head (an die Spitze) of the whole fatherland in order to save Germany". It was used later too to denote Prussia's aspiration for unification of the country under its supremacy.
- Tripartite system*—a plan for the reorganisation of the German Confederation which, along with Austria and Prussia, envisaged the formation of a union

of Middle states. This plan, supported especially by Bavaria and Saxony, was directed against the Austrian and Prussian supremacy and expressed the particularist tendencies of the Middle states which were trying to maintain their independence. p. 67

52 Here Engels cites the demands put forward in the Programme of the General Association of German Workers (founded in 1863). However, on Marx's advice (see Marx's letter to Engels of February 11, 1865, present edition, Vol. 42), he formulated them in his pamphlet in such a way that they could not be interpreted in the spirit of Lassalle's reformist ideas about the possibility of resolving the social problem. As Engels saw it, the demand for workers' associations acquired a revolutionary meaning because the winning of political power by the working class was specified as the prime condition for its implementation. p. 69

53 See Note 7. p. 72

54 A reference to the workers' right to organise trade unions and to go on strike. In January 1865 the Prussian Provincial Diet debated the right of association in connection with the workers' opposition to the trade regulations then in force. Two members of the Party of Progress, Schulze-Delitzsch and Faucher, used the occasion to have the articles restraining capitalism repealed. They proposed to revoke Article 181, which forbade employers to resort to lockouts, and also demagogically demanded the cancellation of Article 182 concerning the punishment of workers for incitement to strike. The workers in turn wanted the repeal of Article 183 which made them obtain police permission to form associations, and of Article 184 banning strikes.

On February 14, 1865 the Prussian Provincial Diet annulled Articles 181 and 182 and left the workers' demand for freedom of association unsatisfied. p. 72

55 An allusion to Lassalle's followers, who favoured flirting with the Bismarck Government, the nobility and the Junkers. p. 74

56 The *Lay of Hildebrand*—partly extant German eighth-century epic. p. 76

57 By the time of writing this statement, Marx and Engels had become fully convinced that the political line of *Der Social-Demokrat* could not be set right. The proof of this was Schweitzer's letter to Marx of February 15, 1865 (for details see this volume, pp. 89-90) and his series of articles *Das Ministerium Bismarck* in which Bismarck's policy of unifying Germany under Prussia's supremacy was openly supported. The appearance of these articles enabled Marx and Engels to publicise and explain to the masses their break with the newspaper.

Marx wrote this statement on February 18, 1865 and sent it to Engels, who fully approved it and returned it to Marx with his signature; on February 23, 1865 Marx sent the statement to the editors of *Der Social-Demokrat*.

Marx took measures to make Schweitzer publish the statement. He instructed Liebknecht to place it with the *Berliner Reform* in case Schweitzer refused to publish it. Marx also sent two copies to Karl Siebel, asking him to print the statement in the *Rheinische Zeitung* or *Düsseldorfer Zeitung* two days after receipt. The statement was published in many papers, among them the *Barner Zeitung* and *Elberfelder Zeitung* (No. 60) on February 26, *Düsseldorfer Zeitung* (No. 59) on February 28, *Berliner Reform* (No. 51), *Neue Frankfurter*

*Zeitung* (No. 60), *Breslauer Zeitung* (No. 102), *Rheinische Zeitung*, first supplement, *Staatsbürger-Zeitung* (No. 60) on March 1; *Bonner Zeitung* (No. 51), *Hermann* (No. 29) on March 3; *Der weiße Adler* (No. 29) on March 9 and *Nordstern* (No. 300) on March 11, 1865. Schweitzer had to publish this statement in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 29, on March 3, 1865. It was preceded by a few lines from the editors which show that Liebknecht also refused to contribute. Similar statements were soon made by Georg Herwegh, Friedrich Wilhelm Rüstow and Johann Philipp Becker.

The statement by Marx and Engels evoked a broad response among advanced German workers. In March 1865 it was approved of by the Berlin Printers' Association where Liebknecht made a report on Marx's and Engels' break with the newspaper. *Der Social-Demokrat* lost a considerable part of its subscribers, especially among Berlin workers.

The English translation of this statement was first published in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Correspondence. 1846-1895*. A Selection with Commentary and Notes, Martin Lawrence Ltd., London, 1934. p. 80

<sup>58</sup> See Note 46. p. 80

<sup>59</sup> This notice was published anonymously in a number of German papers with the help of Wilhelm Liebknecht, Karl Siebel and Karl Klein. It was printed in the *Berliner Reform* (No. 53), *Düsseldorfer Zeitung* (No. 62), *Elberfelder Zeitung* (No. 62) and *Rheinische Zeitung* (No. 62) on March 3, 1865; *Oberrheinischer Courier* (No. 56) on March 7, *Osnabrücker Zeitung* (No. 250) on March 9 and *Neuer Hannoversche Anzeiger* (No. 70) on March 11, 1865. p. 81

<sup>60</sup> Early in 1865 a conflict arose among the Paris members of the International: a group of Proudhonist workers headed by Henri Tolain and Charles Limousin, on the one hand, and, on the other, a French lawyer and bourgeois republican Henri Lefort, who claimed to be the founder and leader of the International Working Men's Association in France. Those close to Lefort accused Tolain and other members of the Paris Administration of being in contact with the Bonapartists (Marx and Engels exposed this insinuation in the statement to *Der Social-Demokrat*, see this volume, p. 36). Nevertheless, wishing to draw into the International the workers grouped around Lefort, Marx supported the Central Council resolution of February 7, 1865, on Lefort's appointment as "Counsel for the literary defence" of the International in France. Those present at the meeting of the Paris Section, however, lodged a protest against this decision, and sent Tolain and Fribourg to London on February 28 to speak on this point at the Central Council meeting. The Council referred the problem to the Sub-Committee which discussed it on March 4 and 6. Marx proposed a draft resolution which has survived in his notebook (see this volume, p. 330). When Marx drew it up, he tried to protect the French organisation of the International from attacks by bourgeois elements and to strengthen the leadership of the Paris Section by bringing in revolutionary proletarians.

This draft formed the basis of the relevant Central Council resolutions adopted on March 7, 1865 (published below). The resolutions also criticised certain Proudhonist dogmas defended by members of the Paris Administration.

The text of the resolutions has survived in the Council Minute Book and as a handwritten copy which was appended to Marx's letter to Engels of March 13, 1865 and also contained the private instruction to Schily.

The document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 82

- <sup>61</sup> Accused of contacts with Bonapartist elements, Tolain tendered his resignation, which was discussed by the Central Council on February 7, 14 and 21, 1865. The Council dissociated itself from these charges. p. 82
- <sup>62</sup> On February 24, 1865, the Paris Section of the International called a meeting over the appointment of Lefort as the Association's "Counsel for the literary defence" in Paris. The meeting protested strongly against this appointment, believing that Lefort would exploit this to seize leadership in the Paris Section. The meeting adopted a resolution drafted by Limousin which showed, however, the sectarian position of the French Proudhonists in relation to the intellectuals. It stressed that if the purely working-class character of the Association was to be preserved, only workers should hold leading positions in it. The resolution, signed by 32 members of the Paris Section, was brought to London by Tolain and Fribourg. p. 82
- <sup>63</sup> In a letter to Hermann Jung of March 13, 1865 Marx expressed his regret that as a result of the debate in the Central Council "too many concessions to Lefort" had been made in Resolution II (see present edition, Vol. 42). p. 82
- <sup>64</sup> This Proudhonist demand was also put forward by the French delegation at the Geneva Congress of the International in 1866, but was rejected.  
During the discussion of the General Rules and Regulations, Tolain proposed that the relevant point should stress that a delegate to the Congress had to be a person directly engaged in manual labour. His proposal was vehemently rejected by the English delegates. Cremer and Carter emphasised that the International owed its existence to many citizens not engaged in manual labour. They particularly noted the services of Marx who, as Cremer pointed out, had made the triumph of the working class his life's work. p. 82
- <sup>65</sup> The coopting of Pierre Vinçard, working-class journalist and veteran of the 1848 Revolution, to the Paris Administration was meant to make the French members of the International familiar with the revolutionary and socialist traditions of the French working class of the 1840s. However, Vinçard did not accept the appointment for personal reasons (see this volume, p. 365). p. 82
- <sup>66</sup> In a letter of March 20, 1865 Schily informed Marx that he had refused to accept his appointment as the Central Council representative on the Paris Administration. However, he continued informally to help Marx and the Council in consolidating the International's organisation in Paris. p. 83
- <sup>67</sup> The reference is to the *Crédit au travail* Bank founded in Paris in 1863 by the petty-bourgeois socialist Jean Pierre Beluze to grant credits to producer and consumer co-operatives and to draw workers' savings to promote the co-operative movement. The bank lasted until 1868. p. 83
- <sup>68</sup> That this synopsis was written by Marx is clear from his letter to Engels of March 18, 1865 (see present edition, Vol. 42). A newspaper clipping with the text of this synopsis marked in Mrs. Marx's hand "Londoner Anzeiger. 17. März, 1865" has survived. An illegible word at the end of the clipping is deciphered as "erschöpfend" (exhaustive) in Mrs. Marx's hand. p. 84
- <sup>69</sup> See Notes 28 and 46. p. 84
- <sup>70</sup> On March 18, 1865 Marx informed Engels about his review (see present edition, Vol. 42). It had originally been intended for the *Londoner Anzeiger*, but

was sent to another emigrant paper, *Hermann*, where it was printed unsigned on March 18, 1865. p. 85

- 71 This statement was written by Marx in connection with the campaign launched by Schweitzer against Marx and Engels after their break with the newspaper (see their statement of February 23, 1865, this volume, p. 80). In *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 31, March 8, 1865, Schweitzer falsified the relations of Marx and Engels with Lassalle using Karl Blind's article published in the *Neue Frankfurter Zeitung* on March 5 in which attacks were made on Marx and Engels.

Marx sent his statement to several newspapers simultaneously. Apart from the *Berliner Reform*, the statement was published in the *Düsseldorfer Zeitung*, No. 79, March 20, *Staatsbürger Zeitung*, No. 79, March 20 and *Hermann*, No. 325, March 25, 1865. p. 87

- 72 Marx is referring to his letter to Liebknecht of February 2, 1865 which has not survived. Its contents are given in Marx's letter to Engels of February 3, 1865 (see present edition, Vol. 42) and show that Marx protested against the Lassalle cult in the columns of *Der Social-Demokrat* and the attempts to justify directly or indirectly his flirtation with the Bismarck Government. p. 89

- 73 Judging by the excerpts quoted by Marx in his letter to Engels of February 18, 1865, he severely criticised the political tactics of the Lassalleans in his letter to Schweitzer of February 13, 1865. He explained the importance of associations, the role of trade unions in organising the working class for the struggle against the bourgeoisie. Following Lassalle, Schweitzer refused to recognise the importance of strikes and trade unions in the workers' struggle against capital and put forward the Lassallean demand for a universal suffrage and producer associations as the only panacea for resolving the social problem in a peaceful reformist way; moreover, like Lassalle, Schweitzer encouraged the workers to hope for assistance from the Prussian Government. p. 89

- 74 This statement was prompted by Schweitzer's new attacks on Marx; in particular, he tried in the columns of *Der Social-Demokrat* (No. 37) and the *Berliner Reform* (No. 37) to represent Marx's explanation of his break with *Der Social-Demokrat* as motivated by his personal hostility to Lassalle. Apart from the *Berliner Reform* Marx may have sent this statement to the Hamburg *Nordstern*. The original of this statement and the covering note to the editor of that newspaper have survived. The note reads: "Herr K. Bruhn, Editor of the *Nordstern*."

Sir, you would much oblige me by publishing the following lines. Yours truly, K. Marx."

The *Nordstern* did not publish this statement. It appeared in the *Berliner Reform*, No. 78, April 1, 1865 and was reprinted in the *Allgemeine deutsche Arbeiter-Zeitung*, No. 119, April 9, 1865. p. 91

- 75 Marx wrote this article in reply to Bernhard Becker, President of the Lassallean General Association of German Workers, who spoke at a meeting of the Association's Hamburg branch on March 22, 1865. His speech, published in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 39, on March 26, slandered the International Working Men's Association and also Marx, Engels and Liebknecht. On March 27, 1865 Becker was stigmatised by Liebknecht at the meeting of the Association's Berlin branch. The rank-and-file members of this organisation, greatly discontented with Becker, resolved to expel him and recommended other organisations to follow suit. Similar meetings were held in many other branches. In June 1865

Becker was compelled provisionally to delegate his presidential powers to his deputy Fritzsche and he completely renounced them the following November.

Marx wrote this article on his return from Holland where he had a rest at his uncle's, Lion Philips, at Zalt-Bommel from March 19 to April 8, 1865. Apart from the *Berliner Reform* the article was published in the *Rheinische Zeitung*. p. 92

<sup>76</sup> Marx added Szemere's name from memory. It is possible, however, that the Hungarian correspondent in Paris mentioned here was Gustav Zerffi (Bangya's secret accomplice in the police service, something of which Marx was totally unaware) and that Bertalan Szemere was the third person, as mentioned below, who helped to expose Bangya. p. 93

<sup>77</sup> An allusion to the fact that the post of President of the General Association of German Workers was bequeathed to Bernhard Becker by Lassalle, the first President of this organisation. p. 94

<sup>78</sup> Marx has in mind a letter sent to him by Liebknecht from Berlin on about January 20. p. 95

<sup>79</sup> Marx is referring to his letter to Lassalle of June 10, 1859 (see present edition, Vol. 40) occasioned by his pamphlet *Der italienische Krieg und die Aufgabe Preußens. Eine Stimme aus der Demokratie* which was published anonymously and in which Lassalle advocated the unification of Germany under Prussia's supremacy. Marx wrote to tell him that the views expressed in the pamphlet differed radically from his own opinion and that of his London friends, and let Lassalle know that he might criticise these views in public. p. 95

<sup>80</sup> A reference to the bourgeois-democratic International Association founded in London in 1855 by French, Polish and German refugees jointly with the Chartists. The Association, which existed till 1859, maintained contacts with some Belgian democrats and with petty-bourgeois German emigrants in the USA. It published its own *Bulletin de l'Association Internationale* from March 1857 to March 1858. p. 96

<sup>81</sup> An ironical allusion to what Becker himself said at the meeting of the Hamburg branch of the General Association of German Workers on March 22, 1865. He complained that as Countess von Hatzfeldt's secretary he also had to perform the duties of a servant and buy food. p. 96

<sup>82</sup> On March 1, 1865 a mass meeting was held in St. Martin's Hall, London, to mark the anniversary of the Polish national liberation insurrection of 1863-64. In its special resolution of February 21, 1865 the Association's Central Council called upon its members and adherents to lend support to the meeting and contributed much to preparing and conducting it. The British bourgeois press, the London liberal *Daily News* included, covered the speeches of bourgeois radicals (Beales, Leveson and others) at the meeting, but passed over in silence a resolution submitted on behalf of the International and the speeches of Peter Fox and Georg Eccarius, the Central Council members. A full report of the meeting appeared in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 177, March 4, 1865 and it was used by Marx when writing this note intended for the Zurich *Der weiße Adler*, which reproduced in issue No. 30 of March 11, 1865 a garbled report from the British bourgeois newspapers.

The original of this note has survived. It was enclosed in a letter which Marx sent to Hermann Jung on April 13, 1865 (see present edition, Vol. 42)



who, in his capacity of Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland, dispatched it to the newspaper with a covering letter. With minor changes the note was printed in *Der weiße Adler*, No. 48, April 22, 1865 over Jung's signature.

The English translation of the note was first published in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 97

- <sup>83</sup> On April 14, 1865 US President Abraham Lincoln was assassinated by the actor John Wilkes Booth, an agent of Southern planters and New York bankers. Andrew Johnson became President. The Central Council took a decision on May 2, 1865 to send an address to the American people on this occasion. At the Council meeting on May 9 Marx read out the Address he had written. It was approved and passed to President Johnson through Adams, the American envoy to England. The Address was published in *Reynolds's Newspaper*, No. 771, May 21, 1865 and the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 7536, June 1, 1865, and its German translation in the *Chicago, Sonntags-Zeitung*, on June 4, 1865. p. 99
- <sup>84</sup> A reference to the statement made by William Seward at a meeting in Rochester on October 25, 1858. He spoke about "an irrepressible conflict", which, according to him, had to turn the United States either into a "slave-holding nation" or a "free-labour nation". On April 14, 1865, when Lincoln was assassinated, Seward, then US Secretary of State, and his son were both seriously wounded. p. 100
- <sup>85</sup> On April 15, 1861, to counter the hostilities opened by the Confederacy of the Southern States, the Lincoln Administration declared the recruitment of 75 thousand volunteers, planning to put down the revolt in three months; the American Civil War did not, however, end until 1865. p. 100
- <sup>86</sup> The reference is to the *100 Years' war* (1337-1453) between France and England and the all-European *Thirty Years' war* between the Catholic states and the Protestant countries supported by France (1618-48). By the *23 Years' war*, Marx meant wars of European coalitions against the French Republic and Napoleonic France which lasted, with short intervals, from 1792 to 1815. p. 100
- <sup>87</sup> This is Marx's report read at the Central Council meetings on June 20 and 27, 1865. Being a further step in the elaboration of his economic theory, it was at the same time, thanks to its popular form, a model of how to present such material to advanced workers.

Marx was prompted to make this report by the speeches of the Central Council member, John Weston, the Owenite. At the meetings of April 11, May 2, 20 (the minutes of this meeting have not survived) and 23, 1865, Weston sought to prove the uselessness of a general rise in wages for the workers and hence concluded that the corresponding efforts on the part of the trade unions would have deleterious consequences. The problems raised by Weston became the subject of discussion in the Central Council in May-August 1865. On May 20 and 23 Marx made preliminary remarks, and on June 20 and 27 countered Weston's views with an extended scientific substantiation of the working-class tactics of economic struggle and elucidated a number of key points in the Marxist political economy. Other speakers at these and subsequent meetings (Eccarius and Cremer) expressed their solidarity with Marx's report and disagreement with Weston's views; they recommended the publication of the discussion, Marx's report included.

As is seen from Marx's letter to Engels of June 24, 1865 (see present edition, Vol. 42), Marx thought that in principle the publication of the report

would be expedient, but was afraid that this would prematurely anticipate his *Capital* on which he was working hard at the time. These considerations, the excessive burden of theoretical studies connected with the writing of *Capital* and the various affairs of the International prevented Marx from publishing his work which has survived in manuscript form. Notes for the report have also been preserved in his notebook (see this volume, p. 338).

The report was first published in London in 1898 by Marx's daughter Eleanor Marx-Aveling under the title *Value, Price and Profit* with a preface by Edward Aveling. The manuscript had no title and opened with the words "Read to the Central Council on Tuesday, 20th June 1865". It was divided by the author into 14 sections marked with Arabic numerals. The introduction and first six sections had no headings in the manuscript; these were provided by Aveling. In this volume all the headings have been preserved, but have been enclosed in square brackets to distinguish them from those given by Marx himself.

Marx's work became widely known under a different title — *Wages, Price and Profit*. It was provided by the German translator who published it in *Die Neue Zeit* in 1898. However, the logical presentation of the theoretical problems shows that the title provided by the Avelings in the first publication is more appropriate. That is why it is used in this publication. p. 101

<sup>88</sup> At that time the Central Council debated the date and the agenda of the International's Congress, which, in keeping with the Provisional Rules, was planned for September 1865 in Brussels. The report of the Standing Committee, approved by the Central Council on July 25, 1865, proposed to have a conference in London in September that year instead of the Congress. It was to discuss the agenda of the Congress, which was postponed until the following year (see Note 13). This agenda contained points about workers' international aid in the struggle (including strikes) against capital, and about the role of the trade unions (see this volume, pp. 375-77). p. 103

<sup>89</sup> Tradition has it that the Roman patrician Menenius Agrippa persuaded the plebeians who had rebelled and withdrawn to the Mons Sacer in 494 B.C. to submit by telling them the fable about the other parts of the human body revolting against the stomach because, they said, it consumed food and did not work, but afterwards becoming convinced that they could not exist without it. p. 106

<sup>90</sup> The reference is to the Ten Hours' Bill of 1847 (see Note 7), which came into force on May 1, 1848. In August 1850 Parliament introduced an additional factory act which prolonged the working day for women and adolescents to ten and a half hours on the first five days of the week and reduced it to seven and a half hours on Saturday. p. 109

<sup>91</sup> This refers to the laws passed by the Convention on May 4, September 11 and 29, 1793 and March 20, 1794 which introduced maximum prices on grain, flour and other consumer goods, together with maximum wages. p. 110

<sup>92</sup> Marx attended the 31st annual meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in September 1861 at Manchester when he was there on a visit to Engels. The meeting was addressed by William Newmarch, President of the Economic Science and Statistics Section, publisher of Tooke's *History of Prices* mentioned below. Marx is referring to his speech. See *Report of the Thirty-First Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Manchester in September 1861*, London, 1862, p. 230. p. 110

- <sup>93</sup> The extensive demolition of dwelling houses of the agricultural labourers in England in the middle of the nineteenth century took place in the midst of the rapid growth of capitalist industry and the reorganisation of agriculture along capitalist lines which was accompanied by relative overpopulation in rural areas. This can be explained to some extent by the fact that the amount of taxes paid by the landlords for the benefit of the poor largely depended on the number of the poor people residing on their land. The landlords intentionally demolished the houses they did not need but which could still be used as shelter by the "surplus" agricultural population (for details, see Marx's *Capital*, Vol. I). p. 111
- <sup>94</sup> *Society of Arts*—a bourgeois educational and philanthropic society founded in London in 1754. In 1869 Marx joined it (see Marx's letters to Peter Le Névé Foster, May 28, 1869, Vol. 43). p. 112
- <sup>95</sup> The *Corn Laws* were repealed in June 1846. They imposed high import duties on agricultural produce in the interests of the landowners so as to maintain high prices on the home market. The repeal of the Corn Laws was a victory for the industrial bourgeoisie, who opposed them under the slogan of free trade. p. 112
- <sup>96</sup> See Note 5. p. 112
- <sup>97</sup> A reference to the so-called cotton crisis caused by the discontinuance of cotton exports from America during the Civil War there. On the cotton crisis, see Note 5. p. 115
- <sup>98</sup> A reference to the wars which England waged as a member of the European coalitions against the French Republic and Napoleonic France. During these wars, which lasted, with intervals, from 1792 to 1815, the British ruling circles established a brutal regime of terrorism in their country, several revolts were put down and laws were adopted banning workers' associations. p. 141
- <sup>99</sup> A reference to the stand taken by the representatives of British capitalist and official circles when the Ten Hours' Bill of 1831 for children and adolescents was debated in Parliament in February and March 1832. p. 141
- <sup>100</sup> *Juggernaut (Jagannath)*—a title of Krishna, the eighth avatar of Vishnu. The cult of Juggernaut was marked by sumptuous ritual and extreme religious fanaticism which manifested itself in the self-torture and suicide of believers. On feast day some believers threw themselves under the wheels of the chariot bearing the idol of Vishnu—Juggernaut. p. 142
- <sup>101</sup> According to the Poor Laws, which were introduced in England in the sixteenth century and remained in force at the beginning of the nineteenth century, a special tax to support the poor was collected in each parish. The parishioners unable to provide for themselves and their families, received support through the poor-box. p. 145
- <sup>102</sup> In Vol. I of *Capital*, Marx devoted a special chapter (Ch. XXXIII) to the analysis and critique of this colonisation theory, using as an example the works of Edward Gibbon Wakefield, who was one of its main originators. p. 146
- <sup>103</sup> This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962.  
The *London Conference of the International* was held from September 25 to 29, 1865. It was convened on Marx's insistence, for he considered that the

Association's sections were not yet strong enough to succeed in holding a general congress as stipulated by the Provisional Rules. The conference was attended by 9 delegates from France, Switzerland and Belgium and the Central Council members. A meeting was held in St. Martin's Hall on September 28, 1865 to celebrate the first anniversary of the founding of the Association.

The Conference heard the Central Council's report, its financial statement, and also delegates' reports on the situation in individual sections. The main point discussed was the agenda and the procedure for convening the forthcoming congress. It was decided to hold it in Geneva in May 1866 (later the Central Council postponed it until early September 1866). Though the Proudhonists demanded that the Polish question should be struck off the agenda of the Congress and that the right of any member of the Association to participate in it be recognised the Conference retained in the agenda the point on the restoration of Poland's independence and recognised only elected delegates as competent members of the Congress. Other proposals of the Council concerning the programme of the Congress were also approved. The London Conference of 1865 which was prepared and conducted under Marx's guidance played an important part in the formation and organisational shaping of the International.

p. 150

- <sup>124</sup> Marx submitted this resolution at the Council meeting after he had agreed with Weston's proposal to begin discussing the agenda of the forthcoming Geneva Congress drawn up by the London Conference.

This resolution was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962.

p. 151

- <sup>105</sup> Engels wrote this series of articles between the end of January and April 6, 1866, at Marx's request in connection with the controversy that developed in the International at the 1865 London Conference and after it over the inclusion of the demand for Poland's independence in the agenda of the forthcoming Geneva Congress. In order to substantiate the position of the Central Council on the nationalities question, it was necessary, on the one hand, to criticise the nihilism displayed in this vital matter by the Proudhonists, and their allegations that such political problems as the liberation of the oppressed nations had nothing to do with the working class and diverted it from its aims; on the other hand, it was necessary to reveal the demagogic essence of the so-called principle of nationalities which helped the Bonapartist circles to use national movements in their interests. This series of articles remained unfinished.

During Engels' lifetime they were translated only into Polish and published in the London *Przedświt*, No. 7, 1895.

p. 152

- <sup>106</sup> On May 15, 1848, the Paris workers led by Blanqui, Barbès and others took revolutionary action against the anti-labour and anti-democratic policy pursued by the bourgeois Constituent Assembly which opened on May 4. The participants in the mass demonstration forced their way into the Assembly premises, demanded the formation of a Ministry of Labour and presented a number of other demands, including aid to the fighters for Poland's independence. An attempt was made to form a revolutionary government. The National Guards from the bourgeois quarters and the regular troops succeeded, however, in restoring the power of the Constituent Assembly. The leaders of the movement were arrested and put on trial.

p. 152

- <sup>107</sup> The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, published under Marx's editorship in Cologne in 1848 and 1849, resolutely championed Poland's independence, whose liberation it associated with the overthrow of the Tsarist regime in Russia, then one of the main bulwarks of the feudal and absolutist reaction in Europe. p. 152
- <sup>108</sup> A reference to the national liberation insurrections of 1830-31 and 1863-64 in Poland put down by Tsarist Russia, and the 1846 insurrection in the so-called free city of Cracow, which was under the joint protectorate of Austria, Prussia and Russia by decision of the 1815 Vienna Congress. After the suppression of the Cracow insurrection by Austrian troops, the city was annexed to the Austrian Empire. p. 152
- <sup>109</sup> Engels has in mind point 9 on the agenda of the forthcoming congress of the International which was discussed at the London Conference (see this volume, p. 376). On the London Conference, see Note 103. p. 153
- <sup>110</sup> Engels is referring to a series of articles on the Polish question written by the Proudhonist Hector Denis and published in the *Tribune du peuple*, the newspaper of the International's Belgian sections, between March and July 1864, and also to the accusations levelled at the Central Council in the *Echo de Verviers* in December 1865 (see this volume, pp. 388-89, 392-400). p. 153
- <sup>111</sup> Poland was partitioned in 1772, 1793 and 1795 between Russia, Prussia and Austria. Austria participated in the first and the third partitions.  
The partition treaties were signed in St. Petersburg on August 5, 1772, January 23, 1793 and October 24, 1795. p. 154
- <sup>112</sup> A reference to *Young Europe*, a secret organisation of bourgeois revolutionaries founded in 1834 in Switzerland on Mazzini's initiative. It included national organisations, among them Young Italy and Young Poland. Their aim was the national unification and national independence of their respective countries and the establishment of a republican system. p. 155
- <sup>113</sup> Engels' views on the historical destiny of small nations and nationalities were not borne out in reality. Engels held that, as a rule, small nations were not capable of independent national existence and were bound to be absorbed, in the course of centralisation, by larger, more viable nations. Correctly noting the tendency towards centralisation and the creation of large states, which is inherent in capitalism, Engels did not give due consideration to another tendency which was not so manifest at the time, namely, the struggle of small nations against national oppression, for their independence and the establishment of their own states. History has shown that many small nations proved capable of independent national development and played a considerable role in the progress of humanity. Engels' later works on the nationalities question, on the history of Ireland in particular, show that his own view on the problem had changed. p. 157
- <sup>114</sup> *Ruthenes (Ruthenians)*—the name given in nineteenth-century West-European ethnographical and historical works to the Ukrainian population of Galicia, the Bukovina and the Sub-Carpathian Ukraine, which was separated at the time from the bulk of the Ukrainian people. p. 157
- <sup>115</sup> The unification of Poland and Lithuania was laid down by the Krevo Union of 1385—a dynastic alliance of the two states. p. 158
- <sup>116</sup> In the 1230s the Russian lands were invaded by the Tatars and Mongols. Their further advance to the West was weakened and halted by the resistance of the

subjugated peoples. After many years of hard oppression, Russian troops under Dmitry, Grand Duke of Moscow, routed the forces of the Golden Horde on Kulikovo plain in 1380 and thus shook the foundation of Mongol domination. The final liberation was won in 1480 under the Grand Duke of Moscow Ivan III. He also scored great successes in uniting the Russian lands into a single centralised state. p. 159

<sup>117</sup> In June 1605 Moscow was captured by the Poles and Lithuanians who supported their figurehead, the False Dmitry, in his claims to the Russian throne. In May 1606 he was overthrown as a result of a popular uprising. In September 1610 Moscow again fell into the hands of Polish invaders who dropped all pretences this time. In October 1612 Moscow was set free by people's volunteers under Minin and Pozharsky. p. 159

<sup>118</sup> *United Greeks*—members of the Uniat Church formed by the synod of Brest in 1596 (Brest Union). It recognised the supremacy of the Pope and the main Catholic dogmas but preserved the Orthodox rite and the Slavonic liturgy. The Uniat Church found adherents mostly among the Belorussians and Ukrainians in Poland. p. 160

<sup>119</sup> Marx wrote this address on the instructions of the Central Council in connection with the importation into Scotland of German and Danish tailors to be used as strike-breakers. This issue was discussed at the Central Council meeting of May 1, 1866. Friedrich Lessner informed the meeting that London manufacturers also intended to have recourse to German workers. For this reason the German tailors living in London formed a committee headed by Lessner and Haufe and took a decision to act jointly with the Council in order to frustrate the plans of the manufacturers and their agents in Germany. The Central Council sent two representatives to Edinburgh who persuaded the newly-arrived workers to cancel their contracts and return home.

On Marx's request, Lessner and Haufe sent him on May 3 details about the events in Edinburgh.

"A Warning" written by Marx on May 4 was published in several German newspapers.

The author's rough and fair copies of this document have survived.

At the same time Lessner and Haufe published a leaflet which set forth the aims and tasks of the German tailors' London Committee and contained an appeal to German workers in London to collect funds. In July 1866 the committee issued a second leaflet, also signed by Lessner and Haufe, and addressed to the tailors in Germany.

This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 162

<sup>120</sup> A reference to the trade union which was formed in London in March 1866 when the London journeymen tailors went on strike. It had an executive committee and, jointly with the Central Council, successfully directed the tailors' strikes. In April 1866 this union joined the International. Their delegate, Matthew Lawrence, took part in the Geneva Congress. p. 162

<sup>121</sup> In accordance with its decision of March 27, 1866 the Central Council made an appeal to the tailors, asking them to refrain from going to England in view of the tailors' strike there. The appeal was published in several local papers of the

International, among them the Belgian *Tribune du Peuple*, No. 17, April 29, 1866, the Swiss *Vorbote*, No. 4, April 1866 and *Journal de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs*, No. 5, April 8, 1866 and also *La Rive Gauche*, No. 15, April 15, 1866. p. 162

- <sup>122</sup> Engels devoted this series of articles to the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 which rounded off the long rivalry between Austria and Prussia and predetermined the unification of Germany under the supremacy of Prussia. Several German states—including Hanover, Saxony, Bavaria, Württemberg and Baden—fought on Austria's side. Prussia formed an alliance with Italy. In June and July military operations were conducted on two fronts: in Bohemia and in Italy. After a grave defeat at Sadowa on July 3 Austria began peace negotiations and signed a treaty in Prague on August 23. Austria conceded Schleswig and Holstein to Prussia, paid small indemnities to her and gave the province of Venetia to Italy. The German Confederation, which was founded in 1815 by decision of the Vienna Congress and embraced over 30 German states, ceased to exist, and the North German Confederation was founded in its place under Prussia's supremacy. As a result of the war, Prussia annexed the Kingdom of Hanover, the electorate of Hesse-Cassel, the Grand Duchy of Nassau and the free city of Frankfurt-am-Main.

In the first articles, Engels expressed the assumption that the Austrians might win the war, but withdrew it as soon as information on military operations enabled him to obtain a more accurate knowledge of the real balance of forces. Engels had made his preliminary forecast proceeding from the interests of achieving Germany's unification in a revolutionary way, believing that the defeat of militarist junker Prussia would be a contributory factor.

*The Manchester Guardian* published articles Nos. I and II under the heading "Notes on the War in Germany", and Nos. III-V under that of "Notes on the War". p. 164

- <sup>123</sup> The reference is to the quadrangle formed by the fortresses of Peschiera, Mantua, Verona and Legnago in Northern Italy. The Austrians, who were in possession of these strongholds, fortified them thoroughly after the 1848 revolution. On its military and strategic importance see Engels' "Po and Rhine" (present edition, Vol. 16, pp. 227-30). p. 164
- <sup>124</sup> See Note 31. p. 164
- <sup>125</sup> See Note 37. p. 165
- <sup>126</sup> Engels is referring to the tactics used by the Austrians in the war against France and Italy in 1859 (for details, see Engels' articles "The Campaign in Italy", "A Chapter of History", "The Battle of Solferino" and others, present edition, Vol. 16). p. 166
- <sup>127</sup> See Note 32. p. 166
- <sup>128</sup> The *Battle of Custoza* (Northern Italy) was fought by the Italian army under Victor Emmanuel II and the Austrian troops under the Archduke Albrecht on June 24, 1866. The Austrians won. The rout of the Italian army, however, had no impact on the general outcome of the Austro-Prussian war, in which Austria was defeated and lost her last possession in Northern Italy, the Province of Venetia. She had already lost Lombardy in 1859 following the defeat in the war with France and Piedmont. p. 173

<sup>129</sup> In the *battles of Lonato and Castiglione* (Northern Italy) on July 29 and August 5, 1796 during Bonaparte's Italian campaign of 1796-97, the French troops defeated the Austrians under General Wurmser.

The *Battle of Solferino* on June 24, 1850 was the last great battle in the Austro-Italian-French war of 1859. The allied French and Piedmontese forces defeated the Austrians. p. 173

<sup>130</sup> A reference to the *Battle of Custoza* on July 23-25, 1848 (below Engels calls it the "first battle of Custoza") in which the Austrian army under Radetzky defeated the Piedmontese forces. The latter were forced to withdraw from Lombardy, freed from the Austrians in March 1848 after a popular uprising. Austrian rule was ultimately established there after a new defeat of Piedmont in March 1849. p. 173

<sup>131</sup> *Garibaldi's "Thousand"*—a detachment of revolutionary volunteers who, under Garibaldi's command, landed in Sicily in 1860 to help the uprising there. The nucleus of this detachment consisted of the men of Garibaldi's corps who successfully fought against the Austrians in Northern Italy in the war of 1859. Garibaldi's expedition of 1860 brought about the liberation of Sicily and Southern Italy from the Neapolitan Bourbons. p. 176

<sup>132</sup> Engels is writing about the occupation of Hanover, Hesse-Cassel and Saxony by the Prussian troops at the beginning of the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 and the flight of the rulers of those states. p. 178

<sup>133</sup> On July 3, 1866 a decisive battle in the Austro-Prussian war was fought at Königgrätz (Hradec-Kralove), near Sadowa. The Austrian troops were defeated. p. 181

<sup>134</sup> At the *Battle of Ligny* (Belgium) on June 16, 1815, the Prussian army under Blücher, marching to join up with the Anglo-Dutch army of Wellington, was defeated by Napoleon. But Blücher's troops escaped from their pursuers commanded by Marshal Grouchy and reached the battlefield of Waterloo (near Brussels) at the decisive moment on June 18, thereby determining the outcome of the battle in favour of the Allies. This decided the final victory of the seventh anti-French coalition (Britain, Russia, Austria, Prussia, Sweden, Spain and other states). p. 182

<sup>135</sup> The Central Council attached great importance to the preparations for the Geneva Congress and on July 17, 1866, it took a decision to discuss at its meetings the questions which were included in the programme of its work at the London Conference of 1865 in order to determine and specify its own stand on these questions. On July 31, 1866, the proposals concerning the programme of the Geneva Congress were submitted by Marx in compliance with that decision and in the name of the Standing Committee.

In the minute book of the General Council and the report published in *The Commonwealth*, the text of the proposals alternates with a short summary of the debates and notes on their adoption. These are omitted in the present edition and marked with a space. p. 183

<sup>136</sup> The French version of the programme was published in *Le Courrier français*, June 24, 1866, and *La Rive Gauche*, No. 27, July 8, 1866. Here Marx suggests that Point 12 in the French version of the programme concerning the expediency of benefit societies for material and moral support to the orphans



of the Association's members should be put at the beginning of the programme. When Marx was drawing up the "Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional Central Council", he inserted this point in the first section (see this volume, p. 185). p. 183

- <sup>137</sup> This schedule was one of the first of those submitted by Marx for the statistical inquiry into the condition of the working class. With some editorial alterations, it was included in the second section of the "Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional Central Council. The Different Questions". Eugène Dupont, a member of the Central Council, reported on it at the Geneva Congress. p. 183

- <sup>138</sup> This document was drawn up by Marx in August 1866, when final preparations for the Geneva Congress were being made. It was written in English (a few last pages of Marx's rough manuscript beginning with the words "everyday necessities", Section 6, second paragraph, have survived) and translated into French by Paul Lafargue.

The *Geneva Congress* of the International took place between September 3 and 8, 1866. It was attended by 60 delegates from the Central Council, various sections of the International and workers' associations in Britain, France, Germany and Switzerland. Hermann Jung was elected its chairman. Marx's "Instructions" were read as the official report of the Central Council. The Congress became a scene of struggle between Marx's followers and the Proudhonists who enjoyed a third of the votes and countered the "Instructions" with their own programme on all the items on the agenda. Opponents of the revolutionary class struggle, who denied the importance of strikes and trade unions, the Proudhonists sought to confine the activities of the International to mutual aid in the sphere of credit and commodity exchange and to cooperative societies. They advocated the principles of "home education". In heated debates with the Proudhonists, Jung, Eccarius, Dupont, Carter and other supporters of the Central Council succeeded in having most of the points in the "Instructions" adopted in the form of Congress resolutions on international action by the working class, a reduction of working hours, on children's and women's labour, and on cooperative labour, trade unions and standing armies. The Proudhonists managed to have their resolutions passed only on issues of secondary importance (international workers' credit societies, etc.). Their attempt to introduce the principle that no person engaged in mental labour should be admitted as an official in the Association also failed; only over the Polish question did they manage to have a vague compromise resolution passed instead of the relevant point in the "Instructions".

The Geneva Congress approved the Rules (based on the Provisional Rules drawn up by Marx) and the Regulations of the International Association. The Congress marked the end of the organisational period in the life of the International as an active proletarian organisation.

The "Instructions" were published, among other reports on the Geneva Congress and its documents, first in German in the article "Der Kongreß der Internationalen Arbeiterassociation in Genf", in the journal *Der Vorbote*, Nos. 10 and 11, October and November 1866; then in English in *The International Courier*, Nos. 6/7 and 8/10, February 20 and March 13, 1867 and *The Working Man*, March 1 and April 6, 1867; and in French in *Le Courier international*, Nos. 8/10 and 11, March 9 and 16, 1867. Later, the document was reprinted in full or in part in other press organs of the International as well. Certain points of the "Instructions" (in the form of the Congress

resolutions) were printed in the pamphlet *Die Internationale Arbeiterassoziation* by W. Eichhoff, Berlin, 1868 and in *The International Working Men's Association, Resolutions of the Congress of Geneva, 1866, and the Congress of Brussels, 1868*, London, 1869 (put out on decision of the General Council and prepared under Marx's supervision). p. 185

<sup>139</sup> The general scheme of statistical inquiry into the situation of the working class (see Note 137) as suggested by Marx was unanimously accepted by the Geneva Congress. In practice, however, the collection of data and their publication in the form of Central Council reports were extremely difficult in view of the lack of material means and the negligence of the local organisations. The subsequent congresses of the Association—in Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869)—confirmed the need to carry out the Geneva Congress resolution on the workers' statistics, and the London Conference of 1871 included point "c" of the second section of the "Instructions" in the Administrative Regulations of the Association (see present edition, Vol. 23). p. 187

<sup>140</sup> When the Civil War ended, the movement for the legislative introduction of an eight-hour working day intensified in the USA. Leagues of struggle for the eight-hour day were set up all over the country. The National Labor Union (see Note 339) declared at its inaugural convention in Baltimore in August 1866 that the demand for the eight-hour day was an indispensable condition for the emancipation of labour. p. 187

<sup>141</sup> The British trade unions took an active part in the general democratic movement for the second electoral reform in 1865-67.

In the spring of 1865 the Central Council of the International initiated, and participated in, the setting up of a Reform League in London as a political centre of the mass movement. The League's leading bodies—the Council and the Executive Committee—included the Central Council members, mainly trade-union leaders. The League's programme was drafted under Marx's influence. Unlike the bourgeois parties, which confined their demand to household suffrage, the League advanced the demand for manhood suffrage. This revived Chartist slogan secured it the support of the trade unions, hitherto indifferent to politics. The League had branches in all the big industrial cities. However, the vacillations of the radicals in its leadership and the conciliation of the trade-union leaders prevented the League from following the line charted by the Central (General) Council of the International. The British bourgeoisie succeeded in splitting the movement and a moderate reform was carried out in 1867 which granted franchise only to the petty bourgeoisie and the upper layers of the working class. p. 191

<sup>142</sup> During the Civil War, the American trade unions actively supported the Northern States in their struggle with the slaveholders; in the spring of 1864 the trade unions opposed the reactionary Hastings-Folger Bill on strikes. p. 191

<sup>143</sup> The Conference of trades' delegates was held in Sheffield from July 17 to 21, 1866. It was attended by 138 delegates representing 200,000 organised workers. The battle against lockouts was the main question at the Conference. Its resolution, calling trade unions to become affiliated to the International Working Men's Association, was published in a book, *Report of the Conference of Trades' Delegates of the United Kingdom, held in Sheffield, on July 17th, 1866 and*

*Four Following Days*, Sheffield, 1866. In Marx's draft manuscript, a newspaper clipping with the text of the resolution was pasted in.

p. 192

- <sup>144</sup> *The Holy Alliance*—an association of European monarchs founded in 1815 to suppress revolutionary movements and preserve feudal monarchies in European countries. Later, this expression was used to denote a coalition of counter-revolutionary powers.

p. 193

- <sup>145</sup> This resolution was submitted by Marx at a meeting of the General Council (as the Central Council was officially named according to the Rules adopted at the Geneva Congress) on September 18, 1866, which heard the report of its delegates to the Geneva Congress (see Note 138) on the latter's work and results. The Council's official representatives at the Congress were James Carter, George Odger, Johann Georg Eccarius and Hermann Jung. The Congress was also attended by other Council members, including Eugène Dupont as delegate for the French section in London, Matthew Lawrence for the Operative Tailors' Association in London and William Randal Cremer for the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners in London.

p. 195

- <sup>146</sup> Marx made this speech at a meeting held in Cambridge Hall, London, on January 22, 1867 to mark the fourth anniversary of the Polish insurrection of 1863-64. The meeting was organised by the General Council of the International jointly with the Central London Section of the United Polish Exiles. Marx took an active part in preparing and organising this meeting (see this volume, p. 414). On March 12 the Central London Section of the United Polish Exiles expressed gratitude to the General Council for the organisation of the meeting and to Marx, among other speakers, for his report.

A detailed report of the meeting, Marx's speech included, was published in the Polish-language newspaper *Głos Wolny*, Nos. 129 and 130, January 31 and February 10, 1867. Moreover, the editors noted that "the speech, remarkable for its accurate observations and logical conclusions, is given word for word".

A draft manuscript in English has survived. Presumably it was in the possession of Marx's daughter, Laura Lafargue, who made it available to the editors of *Le Socialisme* for the publication of a French translation in No. 18 for March 15, 1905. The English text was published in *Cahiers de l'Institut de Science économique appliquée*, No. 4 (109), Paris, 1961. Some passages in the manuscript were crossed by Marx with a vertical line. Collation of the manuscript with the publication in Polish shows that Marx did not omit the crossed-out passages, but merely changed their placing. With the exception of these alterations and some minor amendments to the text, the English original and the Polish translation, which may have been made from the lost fair copy, coincide almost word for word.

In this volume the speech is reproduced from the draft manuscript in English with allowances made for the rearrangements by the author and reproduced in the Polish version. The most important discrepancies of meaning are given in the footnotes.

p. 196

- <sup>147</sup> "To horse, gentlemen!"—Nicholas I pronounced these words on learning about the February revolution in France in 1848.

p. 196

- <sup>148</sup> Marx has in mind the hostile position of the majority in the all-German National Assembly in Frankfurt (convened in May 1848 to work out an all-German constitution) in regard to the Polish national liberation movement

in the Grand Duchy of Posen, a dependency of Prussia. The debates on this subject held on July 24-27 resulted in the Assembly giving consent to the punitive police measures of the Prussian authorities in Posen and charging the government "to guarantee the security of Germans residing in Posen". For details, see Engels' series of articles, "The Frankfurt Assembly Debates the Polish Question" (present edition, Vol. 7). p. 197

<sup>149</sup> In 1866-67, after the suppression of the Polish insurrection of 1863-64, the Russian Government promulgated "Regulations on the Gubernia and Uyezd Administration in the Kingdom of Poland" and a number of ukases aimed at the abolition of local Polish institutions and the consolidation of the administrative apparatus—the chief means of national oppression. The number of gubernias was increased, the prerogatives of the governors appointed by the Russian Government were extended, supreme bodies (State Council and others) were abolished, different administrative departments (post, communications) were subordinated to the respective ministries in St. Petersburg. p. 198

<sup>150</sup> A reference to the Anglo-Dutch loan to Russia, the agreement on which was concluded on November 4, 1866. p. 198

<sup>151</sup> The *Vienna Congress* of European monarchs and their ministers (September 1814-June 1815) established a system of all-European treaties after the Napoleonic wars. The decisions of the Congress helped to restore the feudal system and a number of old dynasties in states that had been subjugated by Napoleon and to preserve the political dismemberment of Germany and Italy, sanctioned the annexation of Belgium by Holland and the partition of Poland, and planned measures to combat the revolutionary movement. With this aim in view, the main participants in the Congress shortly afterwards founded the Holy Alliance (see Note 144) which Marx mentions below. p. 199

<sup>152</sup> *Congress Poland*—that part of Poland which by decision of the Vienna Congress of 1814-15 was annexed to Russia under the official name of the Kingdom of Poland, its capital Warsaw included. p. 199

<sup>153</sup> Marx sent this refutation to Ludwig Kugelmann in Hanover on February 18, 1867 with a request to have it published there in the *Zeitung für Norddeutschland* or any other local newspaper. Marx was particular about this because he intended in a few weeks to take his manuscript of Vol. I of *Capital* to Germany, to the Hamburg publisher Otto Meissner.

Instead of this statement, the *Zeitung für Norddeutschland* published the following item on February 21, 1867: "According to a statement sent by Herr Karl Marx from London, the English newspapers' announcement (see the *Zeitung für Norddeutschland*, No. 5522) that he intends to take an active part in the preparations for a future insurrection in Poland and with this aim in view plans to travel all over the Continent, is a fabrication." p. 202

<sup>154</sup> On June 4, 1867, during preparations for the regular Lausanne Congress of the International, the General Council empowered a special commission to draw up an address containing its programme. When this document was considered at the Council meeting on July 9, Marx submitted a proposal concerning the first point on the Congress agenda (Resolution I). It was reproduced in the "Address of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association. To the members and affiliated societies" adopted at this meeting and published in London as a leaflet. By decision of the Council, the "Address" was also published in French, the translation being

done by Paul Lafargue and edited by Marx. Its text was considerably improved in comparison with the English (see this volume, pp. 421-23).

By having this resolution passed and distributed in English, French and other languages, Marx sought to direct the work of the future congress to the consolidation of workers' international solidarity in the struggle for their class interests, in contrast to some French members of the International who wanted to direct the Congress along Proudhonist lines. With this aim, as early as February 1866, the Paris Section worked out for the Congress its own agenda, which was permeated with Proudhonist ideas about mutual aid societies in the sphere of credit and commodity exchange being the main lever of social transformation. This agenda was reproduced in the Address of the Paris section to all workers' associations, published in *Le Courrier français*, No. 25, July 20, 1867. This compelled Marx to submit, at the General Council meeting of July 23, a resolution against the separatist actions of the section and in defence of the Council's prerogatives to draw up the Congress programme.

p. 203

- <sup>155</sup> The *League of Peace and Freedom* was a pacifist organisation set up in 1867 with the active participation of Victor Hugo, Giuseppe Garibaldi and other democrats. Voicing the anti-militarist sentiments of the masses, the League's leaders did not reveal the social sources of wars and often confined anti-militarist activity to mere declarations. The inaugural Congress of the League was to open on September 9 (originally on September 5) in Geneva and was specially timed to coincide with the end of the Lausanne Congress of the International (September 2-8, 1867). At the General Council meeting of August 13, Marx spoke against the International's official participation in the League's Congress, since this would mean solidarity with its bourgeois programme; but he recommended that some members of the International should attend the Congress on their own in order to make it adopt revolutionary-democratic decisions (see the record of Marx's speech in this volume, pp. 426-27). Concluding his speech, Marx submitted this resolution, which the Council adopted. In the Minute Book of the General Council, the speech and resolution are reproduced in the form of a clipping from *The Bee-Hive* carrying a report of the Council meeting.

The Lausanne Congress ignored the General Council's resolution and, influenced by petty-bourgeois elements, resolved officially to take part in the Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom. The Congress of the League, however, attended by several General Council and some other International members revealed great differences between the proletariat and the abstract, pacifist approach to the struggle for peace. Marx's tactics in regard to the League was fully approved at the Brussels Congress of the International in 1868, which opposed official affiliation to the League but called upon the working class to combine efforts with all progressive anti-military forces.

p. 204

- <sup>156</sup> This review is the first in the series of articles written by Engels to break the "conspiracy of silence" with which official bourgeois scholars met the publication of Volume One of Marx's *Capital* on September 14, 1867.

Even before the work was published, Engels had decided "to attack the book from the bourgeois point of view", as he wrote to Marx on September 11, 1867, in order to draw the attention of the general public. Marx liked this idea and called it "the best military means" (see present edition, Vol. 42). The reviews Engels wrote for a number of bourgeois newspapers looked as if they

had been penned by an unbiased bourgeois scholar who did not share the views of the author of the book but was compelled to acknowledge its scientific soundness and merits. The review for the *Zukunft* was in a similar vein, having been written, as Engels said, in such a way that any bourgeois newspaper could publish it. In the reviews intended for the democratic and proletarian newspapers, Engels sought to popularise the content of *Capital* without any resort to disguise.

With Ludwig Kugelmann's assistance, the review was published in the *Zukunft* on October 30, 1867, unsigned. The next day the newspaper editor, Guido Weiß, dispatched off-prints of it to Marx. In this volume the review is published according to Engels' manuscript, which has survived. p. 207

- <sup>157</sup> Engels sent this review, together with that for the *Zukunft*, to Kugelmann on October 12, 1867, for publication in one of the bourgeois newspapers. Kugelmann's attempt to have it published in the *Rheinische Zeitung* failed because one of the editors, Heinrich Bürgers, a former Communist League member who by that time had become a liberal, refused to accept it. The review has survived in manuscript form (one page is missing) and was first published in German in 1927 in *Marx-Engels-Archiv*, Bd. 2, and in Russian the same year in the magazine *Letopisi marksizma*, No. IV.

The English translation was first published in the collection: Engels, *On Marx's "Capital"*, Cooperative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the USSR, Moscow-Leningrad, 1936. p. 210

- <sup>158</sup> Several workers' candidates of the democratic Saxon People's Party, which had a strong proletarian wing, stood for election to the North German Imperial Diet on August 31, 1867 (for demagogic reasons, the Bismarck Government, when passing the Constitution early in 1867, introduced universal suffrage, but deprived women, soldiers and servants of the right to vote. The party succeeded in getting four deputies elected, among them August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht, and two deputies were elected from the Lassallean General Association of German Workers. p. 210
- <sup>159</sup> A reference to the law of August 15, 1867, which brought new industries under the factory bills (including that of 1847) on the ten-hour working day (see Notes 7 and 90). p. 212

- <sup>160</sup> This review was published in the *Elberfelder Zeitung*, No. 302, November 2, 1867, with the assistance of Carl Siebel, a German poet and distant relative of Engels. The initial letter of his name was placed before the title. p. 214

- <sup>161</sup> This review was published, with Carl Siebel's assistance, in the *Düsseldorfer Zeitung*, No. 316, November 16, 1867, unsigned.

As is seen from Engels' letters to Marx of November 8 and 10, 1867, he handed it over to Siebel on November 9 in Liverpool when Siebel was on a visit to England. Moreover, Engels gave him two more reviews to be published in Germany: one in the *Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt*, the other, to judge by Siebel's letter to Engels of November 13, 1867, not in the *Barmer Zeitung*, as Engels wrote to Marx on November 10, but in the *Rhein- und Ruhrzeitung*. The text of these reviews has not been discovered. p. 216

- <sup>162</sup> Marx wrote this article in connection with a speech made by the Lassallean Hofstetten at a meeting of the General Association of German Workers on November 24, 1867. The report of this meeting was printed in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 139, first supplement, November 29, 1867. Hofstetten had borrowed separate passages from Marx's *Capital* rewriting them almost word

for word, distorting their meaning and mentioning neither the work nor its author.

Marx's article was published unsigned in the supplement to the *Zukunft*, No. 291, December 12, 1867.

The translations of passages quoted by Marx from the first German edition of Volume One of *Capital* are given here close to the English edition of 1887 edited by Engels (page references in square brackets are to that edition). These passages are to be found in Chapter X, "The Working Day" and one in Chapter XV, "Machinery and Modern Industry". p. 219

<sup>163</sup> Quoted from the resolution of the Geneva Congress of the International Working Men's Association (September 1866), which was drawn up on the basis of Marx's "Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional Central Council. The Different Questions". Here the resolution reproduces the text of the "Instructions" word for word (see this volume, p. 187). p. 223

<sup>164</sup> In his letter to Engels of December 7, 1867, Marx expressed a number of ideas about the nature of the review of Volume One of *Capital* for the Stuttgart newspaper *Der Beobachter*, making use of the anti-Prussian sentiments of its editor Karl Mayer, a petty-bourgeois democrat (see present edition, Vol. 42). Engels reproduced almost word for word the corresponding passages from the letter in his review, which was published, with Ludwig Kugelmann's assistance, in *Der Beobachter*, No. 303, December 27, 1867, unsigned. p. 224

<sup>165</sup> A reference to an additional note to Section I of Chapter VI in the first German edition of Volume One of *Capital* at the end of the book. When preparing the second German edition (1872), Marx omitted this note and it did not appear in the subsequent authorised editions. p. 225

<sup>166</sup> This review was published, with Ludwig Kugelmann's assistance, in the *Staats-Anzeiger für Württemberg*, No. 306, December 27, 1867, unsigned. On July 4, 1868 it was reprinted in the supplement to *Hannoverscher Courier*, No. 4232; on Kugelmann's request, 25 separate off-prints of this publication were made for distribution among bourgeois economists. Later, the review was also reprinted by the *Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung*, No. 122, October 5, 1890. p. 227

<sup>167</sup> The *Customs Union (Zollverein)*—a union of German states, which established a common customs frontier, was set up in 1834 under the aegis of Prussia. Brought into being by the need to create an all-German market, the Customs Union subsequently embraced the majority of the German states except Austria and a few of the smaller states. After the foundation of the North German Confederation in 1867 customs agreements were concluded between the Confederation and the South-Western German non-member states. The Customs Union existed until the complete political unification of Germany under Prussian supremacy in 1871.

The new treaties of the Customs Union concluded on May 16, 1865 and July 8, 1867 marked a turn from protectionism to free trade. p. 228

<sup>168</sup> This review was published, with Paul Stumpf's assistance, in the *Neue Badische Landeszeitung*, No. 20, January 21, 1868. The title was preceded by the initials "St." p. 229

<sup>169</sup> This review differs essentially from the reviews of Volume One of *Capital* intended for the bourgeois newspapers. It was intended for the readers of the

workers' newspaper and aimed at popularising Marx's work among them and explaining its importance for the working-class movement.

The review was published unsigned in the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, Nos. 12 and 13, March 21 and 28, 1868. Later, it was reprinted in the Leipzig newspaper the *Volksstaat* (Nos. 28 and 29, April 5 and 8, 1871) and in *Der Botschafter* (Nos. 8, 15 and 16, April 8, June 17 and 24, 1871), and its French translation in the Brussels newspaper, *La Liberté* (Nos. 47 and 50, June 6 and 9, 1870). In this volume, the figures in square brackets refer to the page numbers of the 1887 English edition of *Capital*.

The review was published in English for the first time in Marx and Engels, *Selected Works* in two volumes, Vol. I, Cooperative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the USSR, Moscow-Leningrad, 1935. p. 231

<sup>170</sup> See Note 7. p. 235

<sup>171</sup> See Note 158. p. 236

<sup>172</sup> This review, written by Engels in May and June 1868, was intended for the *Fortnightly Review* in which Marx and Engels hoped to publish it with the assistance of Professor Edward Beesly. He was a radical who sympathised with the working class and took part in the inaugural meeting of the International at St. Martin's Hall, London, on September 28, 1864. Engels planned that this review would consist of two articles at least. He had finished the first of them by June 28, 1868 and handed it over for examination to his friend, the lawyer Samuel Moore, the future translator of *Capital* into English. It was decided to publish the review over his signature. However, despite Beesly's application, the liberal editor of the journal, John Morley, did not accept the review, as became known at the beginning of August. In view of this, Engels did not write the continuation. The first article has survived in manuscript form and was first published in Russian in the magazine *Letopisi marksizma*, No. I, 1926.

The English translation was first published in the collection: Engels, *On Marx's "Capital"*, Cooperative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the USSR, Moscow-Leningrad, 1936.

The correspondence between Marx and Engels shows that during the spring and summer of 1868 they often exchanged views on the content and form of the review. Marx gave his advice and even versions of separate passages (see Marx to Engels on May 23, 1868, present edition, Vol. 43). It was assumed that Lafargue would translate it into French for *Le Courrier français* (see Marx to Engels on February 1, 1868).

In this review, Engels gives several quotations from Volume One of *Capital* in his own translation into English, but it was not used in preparing the English edition (translators Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling), published under Engels' editorship in 1887, and it differs substantially from the corresponding passages in that edition. The discrepancies are also explained by the fact that the 1887 English edition took account of the author's changes made in the German edition of 1872, and that of 1883 from which the English translation was made. In this volume the quotations are given in Engels' translation of 1868; to facilitate finding these passages in the book itself, the editors have supplied page references to the 1887 English edition in square brackets. p. 238

<sup>173</sup> A reference to the champions of the so-called currency principle, one of the trends in bourgeois political economy which advocated the quantitative theory of money. Representatives of this school—Jones Loyd (Lord Overstone), Robert Torrens, George Arbuthnot and others—stated that the value and price



of commodities are determined by the quantity of money in circulation, that the guarantee of stable currency is the obligatory backing of banknotes by gold and that their issue is regulated according to the import and export of precious metals, regarding violation of these "laws" as the decisive cause of economic crises. The attempts of the British Government to rely on the "currency principle" theory (Bank Act of 1844, etc.) failed, thus proving its scientific infeasibility and its impracticability (see critique of this theory in Marx's *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*). p. 238

- <sup>174</sup> In the second German edition of the book (1872), the first chapter ("Commodities and Money") was turned into Part I, consisting of three chapters. In the English edition of 1887 Part I also consists of three chapters: Chapter I.—Commodities, Chapter II.—Exchange, and Chapter III.—Money, or the Circulation of Commodities. p. 239
- <sup>175</sup> Engels is referring to the passage in which Marx demonstrates the fallacy of the allegations by the vulgar economist N. W. Senior that the capitalist's profit was produced by the labourer in the last hour of his working day and of his justified objections on this ground to the legal limitation of working hours (see *Capital*, 1887, Part III, Chapter IX, Section 3). p. 250
- <sup>176</sup> The *Règlement organique*—the first constitution of the Danubian principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia. It was introduced by P. D. Kiselev, head of the Russian administration, in 1831, during the temporary occupation of the principalities by Russian troops under the Treaty of Adrianople of 1829, which concluded the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29 and confirmed the autonomy of Moldavia and Wallachia from the Sultan of Turkey. In accordance with the *Règlement*, legislative power in each principality belonged to the assembly elected by big landowners, while executive power was in the hands of the hospodars elected for life by the representatives of landowners, the clergy and towns. The *Règlement* ensured a dominant position for the boyars and the high clergy by retaining the feudal practices, including *corvée*. At the same time it envisaged certain bourgeois reforms (abolition of inland customs barriers, separation of court from administration, etc.). p. 252
- <sup>177</sup> The publication of Engels' reviews of Volume I of *Capital* and the reprinting of Marx's preface to it (in excerpts or in full) by a number of bourgeois newspapers (*Die Zukunft*, No. 206, September 4, 1867; *Der Beobachter*, No. 210, September 7, 1867; *Hamburger Nachrichten*, No. 218, September 13, 1867; *Hamburger Börsenhalle*, No. 17848, February 14, 1868) and working-class and democratic newspapers (*Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 105, September 6, 1867; *The Bee-Hive*, No. 308, September 7, 1867; *Vorbote*, Nos. 9-10, September-October 1867; *Le Courrier français*, No. 106, October 1, 1867; *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 1, January 4, 1868 and others) made bourgeois economists break the "conspiracy of silence" and comment on the book in the press. Their first reviews, not yet numerous, often contained slanderous fabrications about the author of *Capital*. In particular, they alleged that Marx had borrowed the determination of the magnitude of value by the socially necessary labour-time from the French vulgar economist Frédéric Bastiat. This accusation was made in an anonymous review in the *Vierteljahrsschrift für Volkswirtschaft und Kulturgeschichte*, Jrg. 5, Bd. 20, 1868, and in another review by an unknown author which was signed "h" in the *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland*, No. 28, July 4, 1868. This item is Marx's reply to these reviews; it was not published during his lifetime and has survived in manuscript form. p. 260

- 178 The *National Liberals*—members of the party formed by the German, principally Prussian, bourgeoisie in the autumn of 1866 after a split in the Party of Progress (see Note 46). Its policy showed that a considerable part of the liberal bourgeoisie had abandoned its claims to extend its political prerogatives and had capitulated to Bismarck's Junker government as a result of Prussia's victory in the Austro-Prussian war and the establishment of her supremacy in Germany. p. 261
- 179 *Demagogues* in Germany were participants in the opposition movement of intellectuals in the 1820s. The name became current after the Karlsbad Conference of Ministers of the German states in August 1819, which adopted a special decision against the intrigues of "demagogues". p. 261
- 180 *Synopsis of Volume One of "Capital"* by Marx has survived as an unfinished manuscript covering only two-thirds of the book. Engels evidently wanted to use it in writing articles, reviews and, possibly, a pamphlet to popularise Marx's work. The time of its writing is suggested by Engels' letter to Marx of April 17, 1868, in which Engels wrote that he was summarising the book (see present edition, Vol. 42), and by Engels' remark "for the *Fortnightly Review*" made on one of the last pages of his manuscript (see this volume, p. 306). The comment shows that Engels intended to use this passage in the second part of his review for that journal. But when he learned from Marx's letter of August 10, 1868 that the editors had rejected the first part of his review (see Note 172), he gave up his intention. The synopsis may therefore have been written in the spring and summer (approximately April-early August) of 1868.
- The synopsis was first published, in Russian, in *Marx-Engels Archives*, Book IV, 1929. In the language of the original it appeared in 1933 as a separate edition prepared by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU. It was published in English for the first time in the collection: Engels, *On Marx's "Capital"*, Cooperative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the USSR, Moscow-Leningrad, 1936. p. 263
- 181 After the publication of Volume One of *Capital*, Marx made substantial alterations and additions to some sections of the book and changed its structure. As a result, instead of the six chapters and the supplement to Chapter I, the second (1872) and subsequent German editions are in seven parts consisting of 25 chapters. In the 1887 English edition edited by Engels, the structure of the volume conforms to that of the 1872-75 French authorised edition. In both editions, the text is divided into eight parts consisting of 33 chapters. p. 265
- 182 In *Capital* Marx pointed out that among the reasons for the extreme poverty of the rural population under Louis XIV was the "conversion of taxes in kind into money taxes". Marx was referring to P. Boisguillebert's "Dissertation sur la nature des richesses, de l'argent et des tributs" published in Paris in 1843 in the collection *Économistes financiers du XVIII-e siècle*, and also to Vauban; but he did not mention the source: it was probably his "Projet d'une dime royale" in the same collection. p. 274
- 183 Engels refers to the attempts of vulgar economists, in particular by John MacCulloch, to gloss over the source of capitalist profit and to depict the relations between capitalists and workers as an equal exchange of services. These attempts were criticised by Marx. p. 283

- <sup>184</sup> A reference to the future third volume of *Capital* which was written mainly in 1864-65. The volume was prepared for the press by Engels after Marx's death and published in 1894. p. 286
- <sup>185</sup> On the *Règlement organique* see Note 176. p. 287
- <sup>186</sup> This question was examined by Marx in *Capital*, Vol. III, Chapter V: "Economy in the Employment of Constant Capital". p. 294
- <sup>187</sup> In *Capital* Marx illustrates the above propositions by quotations from the following works: A. Ferguson, *An Essay on the History of Civil Society*, Edinburgh, 1767, pp. 280-81; J. D. Tuckett, *A History of the Past and Present State of the Labouring Population*, Vol. I, London, 1846, p. 148; A. Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Edinburgh, 1814, Book V, Chapter 1, Art. II. p. 299
- <sup>188</sup> In 1844 the Preston manufacturer Robert Gardner reduced the working day at his factories from 12 to 11 hours, but achieved the same production results by increasing the speed of the machines and labour intensity. p. 304
- <sup>189</sup> As Marx noted, the introduction of the ribbon and lace looms, invented in Germany, caused great unrest in the second half of the seventeenth century among the weavers of the Netherlands, the German states and Britain. There were cases when the authorities were compelled to pass laws prohibiting or limiting the use of this machine.  
*Luddites*—British workers and artisans who, because of their backwardness and lack of class consciousness, took part in a movement for the destruction of textile machinery in the second half of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century. They are called so after Ned Ludd, a workman who is said to have been the first to smash a stocking frame in reply to his master's arbitrariness. Severe measures were taken against the Luddite movement, which was a spontaneous reaction by the workers to the consequences of the industrial revolution which were so disastrous for them. A law was passed in 1812 under which the destruction of machinery was punishable by death. p. 305
- <sup>190</sup> Marx meant James Mill, John MacCulloch, Robert Torrence, N. W. Senior, John Stuart Mill—the bourgeois economists who sought to justify the consequences inflicted on the working class by the capitalist use of machinery. p. 306
- <sup>191</sup> In his second article for the *Fortnightly Review*, Engels intended to examine Marx's views on the role of machinery as a means to increase surplus-value by raising labour productivity. p. 306
- <sup>192</sup> In view of the anniversary of the Polish insurrection of 1830-31, the Central Council of the International resolved at its meeting of November 29, 1864 to issue an address to the Polish people on behalf of the British members of the International Working Men's Association. Peter Fox, a Council member and leader of the British National League for the Independence of Poland, was instructed to write it. A democratically-minded journalist, Fox, however, shared the naïve belief of many democrats at that time, and also trade-union leaders, in the "Poland worship" of Western ruling circles, in particular the Bonapartist Second Empire in France. The address submitted by Fox alleged that the traditional policy of France was favourable to Poland's independence. The address led to a discussion at the Sub-Committee's meeting of December 6 and

at the Central Council's meetings of December 13 and 20, 1864 and January 3, 1865.

Marx took an active part in the discussion. He criticised Fox's report at the Sub-Committee's meeting of December 6, of which he informed Engels in a letter on December 10, 1864 (see present edition, Vol. 42), and at the Council's meetings of December 13 and January 3 (see this volume, pp. 354 and 356). Marx showed, particularly in his speech on January 3, 1865, that the French ruling circles, both under absolutism and under the bourgeois regimes right up to the time of Napoleon III, had always sought to exploit the Polish question in the selfish interests of the ruling classes and that their policy was not favourable to the cause of Poland's independence, of which the sole defenders were the representatives of the revolutionary proletariat. Marx's arguments made the Central Council adopt a decision to enter the appropriate amendments in Fox's address.

When preparing his speeches, Marx collected, in December 1864, material for his polemics with Fox and then used it for the draft speech published here. It reproduced in more concise and polished form the greater part of Marx's preparatory material, but the history of Franco-Polish relations was brought only to 1812. Marx elucidated their later development in his speeches, in particular on January 3, on the basis of preparatory material in which their history was traced up to 1848. The corresponding small part of the MS with preparatory materials is published in this volume, in Note 229.

Words and expressions, crossed out by Marx, and the vertical lines drawn by him in the left margins of the MS, usually opposite quotations, are not reproduced. Some paragraphs are numbered by Marx, the rest (in brackets) by the editors. Obvious slips of the pen in the dates have been corrected without comment.

p. 311

<sup>193</sup> The *Treaty of Westphalia* concluded the Thirty Years' War (1618-48) in which the Spanish and Austrian Habsburgs and the Catholic German princes, supported by the Pope, fought against the Protestant countries: Bohemia, Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands, and a number of German states which adopted Reformation. In 1635 Catholic France, a rival of the Habsburg Empire, joined the Protestant coalition. Germany was the main arena of the struggle, and the Treaty of Westphalia set the seal on its political dismemberment.

p. 311

<sup>194</sup> Marx is referring to a secret treaty between Louis XIV and Charles II concluded in Dover in 1670 against the Republic of United Provinces. The conclusion of the treaty envisaged large money subsidies for Charles II. As a result, Britain was involved in a predatory war against Holland unleashed by Louis XIV in 1672. But in 1674 Britain concluded a peace treaty with Holland and withdrew from the anti-Dutch coalition.

p. 311

<sup>195</sup> This refers to *Memoir on Russia, for the Instruction of the Present Emperor. Drawn up by the Cabinet in 1837*, published in *The Free Press* on July 13, 1859. This document, which was claimed to be an instruction for the heir to the Russian throne, the future Emperor Alexander II, was reprinted from the conservative newspaper *Preußisches Wochenblatt zur Besprechung politischer Tagesfragen*, Nos. 23, 24 and 25, July 9, 16 and 23, 1855. As was later established, it was a forgery.

p. 311

<sup>196</sup> *Courland* or the *Duchy of Courland*—a state in the Baltic area formed in 1561 as a result of the disintegration of the Livonian order. It was a vassal state of the

- Kingdom of Poland (Rzecz Pospolita). In 1705, during the Northern War, Courland was occupied by Russian troops who drove out the Swedes. The marriage of Anna Ivanovna (Peter I's niece and the future Empress) and the Duke of Courland in 1710 enabled the Tsarist government to consolidate its power in Courland, which formally became part of the Russian Empire in 1795. p. 312
- <sup>197</sup> The *pragmatic sanction*—a law of succession in the Habsburg Empire issued in 1713 by Charles VI. It envisaged the indivisibility of the Habsburgs' lands and the possible transfer of the Austrian crown to Maria Theresa, daughter of Charles VI. p. 312
- <sup>198</sup> During the War of the Polish Succession, *Danzig (Gdańsk)* supported Stanislaus Leszczinski in his claims to the throne. The town was besieged by Russian troops (from January 17 to May 27, 1734). A French squadron sent to aid the Poles considered that a landing would be useless, and Danzig capitulated on May 29, 1734. p. 312
- <sup>199</sup> Marx is referring to the preliminary peace treaty of Vienna concluded on October 3, 1735 between Austria and France with its allies (the final treaty was signed in Vienna in November 1738). Under this treaty, which ended the War of the Polish Succession, August III was recognised as King of Poland while Leszczinski received Lorraine, which was to go to France after his death. The younger, Spanish line of the Bourbons gained possession of Southern Italy (Kingdom of the Two Sicilies), for which Austria was compensated by other Italian lands. Russia and other states joined the Vienna treaty. p. 312
- <sup>200</sup> A reference to the Belgrade peace treaties of September 1 and 18, 1739, which were concluded, with France's mediation, between Russia and Austria on the one hand and Turkey on the other and which put an end to the war between these countries lasting from 1735 to 1739. Russia regained Azov (but undertook to remove the earthworks) which it had lost under the Pruth Russo-Turkish Treaty of 1711 (mentioned in the text below; it also contained an article by which Russia was forbidden to interfere in Polish affairs) and received the right to build a fortress on the Don. Austria was to return Serbia, part of Bosnia and Little Wallachia to Turkey. p. 313
- <sup>201</sup> The *Seven Years' War* (1756-63)—a war of Britain and Prussia against Austria, France, Russia, Saxony and Sweden. In 1756 and 1757 Prussian troops under Frederick II won a number of victories over Austrian and French troops, but the gains were nullified by the Russian successes in Prussia in 1757-60. As a result of the war, France ceded many of its colonies (including Canada and almost all its possessions in the East Indies) to Britain, while Prussia, Austria and Saxony had in the main to recognise the pre-war frontiers. p. 313
- <sup>202</sup> The *War of the Austrian Succession* (1740-48) was caused by the claims of some European states, primarily Prussia, to the Austrian Habsburgs' possessions which, after the death of Charles VI, passed to his daughter Maria Theresa, there being no male heir. Prussia's allies were France, Bavaria, Saxony (at the beginning) and other states. England, which strove to weaken France—its commercial and colonial rival—fought on the side of Austria, also supported by the Netherlands, Sardinia (Piedmont) and Russia. As a result of the war, Prussia seized and annexed Silesia, but the main Habsburgs' possessions remained in the hands of Maria Theresa. p. 313

- <sup>203</sup> The *Treaty of Oliva*, signed on May 3, 1660 (near Gdańsk) between Sweden, on the one hand, and Poland (Rzecz Pospolita), Austria and Brandenburg, on the other, ended the war between these states in the latter half of the 1650s. The treaty confirmed the transfer of a number of Polish lands in the Baltic area to Sweden and the earlier Polish-Brandenburg treaties under which Poland renounced its supreme rights to the Duchy of Prussia (formerly belonging to the Teutonic order) annexed to Brandenburg in the early seventeenth century as a Polish fief. France acted as mediator in concluding the treaty. p. 315
- <sup>204</sup> Poland did not take part in the Seven Years' War (see Note 201), but August III, as the Elector of Saxony, fought against Prussia. Troops of the two belligerents passed through Polish territory devastating the country. p. 315
- <sup>205</sup> Under the *Treaty of Wehlau* of September 19, 1657, which formalised an alliance of Poland and Brandenburg against Sweden (until then Brandenburg fought on the side of the Swedes against Poland), the King of Poland renounced his supreme rights to the Duchy of Prussia and pledged himself to render military aid to Brandenburg. p. 315
- <sup>206</sup> A treaty of friendship and alliance between Russia and Prussia, signed on April 14, 1764, envisaged joint action by the two parties in the Polish question. p. 316
- <sup>207</sup> The *Confederation of Bar*, formed in Bar (Podolia) on February 29, 1768, represented chiefly the conservative Polish nobility (szlachta) who wanted to preserve the privileges of the Catholic Church, and opposed the granting of equal rights to other believers (Orthodox and Protestant), the reform of the political system and the limitation of feudal freedoms. At the same time the Confederation opposed Russia's interference in the home affairs of Poland, and this attracted patriotic elements to it despite its reactionary programme. Various groups of magnates within the Confederation waged a fierce struggle for supremacy. Internal struggle in Poland (1768-72) enabled the neighbouring countries to reach an agreement on the first partition of Poland (see Note 111). p. 316
- <sup>208</sup> The *Treaty of Kudjuk Kainardji* (Kuchuk Kainarji), signed between Russia and Turkey on July 21, 1774, put an end to the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-74, in which Turkey was defeated. By that treaty Russia obtained the Black Sea coast between the Dnieper and the Southern Bug with the fortress of Kinburn, and also Azov, Kerch and Jenikale, and secured independent status for the Crimea, facilitating its incorporation into Russia. Russian merchant ships were granted the right of free passage through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. The Sultan was to grant a number of privileges to the Greek Orthodox Church in Turkey. p. 316
- <sup>209</sup> A reference to the battle of July 5-7, 1770 between the Russian fleet, which had undertaken an expedition from the Baltic Sea into the region of the Greek archipelago in the Mediterranean, and the Turkish naval forces. On July 5, the Russians defeated them in the Chios Straits, trapped their ships in the Bay of Tschesmé (western coast of Asia Minor), and in the small hours of July 7 almost entirely destroyed the Turkish fleet there. This victory played an important role in the outcome, advantageous for Russia, of the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-74. p. 317

- <sup>210</sup> Relying on his own army and France's financial and diplomatic support, Gustavus III of Sweden staged a coup d'état on August 19, 1772. The regime of an aristocratic oligarchy was in fact replaced by absolute monarchy.  
p. 317
- <sup>211</sup> The *Directory* consisted of five directors one of whom was re-elected every year and was the leading executive body in France, founded under the 1795 Constitution after the fall of the Jacobin revolutionary dictatorship in the summer of 1794. The Directory existed until November 9-10, 1799 (18-19 Brumaire according to the Republican calendar), when General Napoleon Bonaparte staged a coup d'état and established a dictatorship in France. He concentrated all government power in his hands as a first Consul and was proclaimed Emperor in 1804.  
p. 318
- <sup>212</sup> The *Congress of Verdun (1792)*, at which Britain and Holland were represented, was convened on the initiative of Prussia and Russia. Frederick William II, defeated in the struggle against the French Republic, sent a Note to the Congress on October 25, demanding that his losses should be compensated by Polish lands.  
p. 318
- <sup>213</sup> Marx is referring to the so-called Targowicze Confederation, a reactionary association of Polish magnates set up in the spring of 1792 to abrogate the progressive reforms of the four-year Sejm (1788-92) which restricted the arbitrary rule of the aristocracy. The confederates' treacherous activities weakened Polish resistance to Prussian and Russian troops and facilitated a second partition of Poland by these states in 1793 (see Note 111). The Polish people reacted to the partition and national betrayal by the liberation uprising of 1794 under the leadership of Tadeusz Kościuszko.  
p. 318
- <sup>214</sup> Prussia and France started unofficial negotiations on a separate peace treaty in July 1794. At first, France insisted that Prussia should return Polish lands, but at subsequent talks and in the Basle Peace Treaty of April 5, 1795 (mentioned below in the text) it recognised the partition of Poland and guaranteed Prussia its possessions on the eastern frontier in exchange for territorial concessions in the west and Prussia's withdrawal from the anti-French coalition.  
p. 319
- <sup>215</sup> A reference to the Russo-Turkish war of 1787-91 that ended in a Russian victory. As a result, the Crimea's annexation to Russia was confirmed and Russia's south-western frontier was established along the Dniester.  
p. 319
- <sup>216</sup> *Comité du Salut Public*—the central body of the French revolutionary government (April 1793-July 27, 1794).  
p. 320
- <sup>217</sup> The *Treaty of Campo Formio* was concluded by General Bonaparte and Austria's representatives on October 17, 1797, after the Leoben armistice agreement in April. The treaty formalised Austria's withdrawal from the first anti-French coalition, its relinquishment of its possessions in Northern Italy where the Cisalpine Republic was formed under French protectorate, and also other concessions (Belgium was virtually ceded to France, etc.).  
p. 321
- <sup>218</sup> An inaccuracy in the text: General Vielhorski commanded the Polish legion in the Mantua garrison defending the city against Austrian and Russian troops during the war between France and the second European coalition (Britain, Austria, Russia, Naples, Turkey, etc.). Mantua capitulated to the Austrian command on July 27, 1799.  
p. 322

- <sup>219</sup> The *Great Army (Grande Armée)*—the main body of French armed forces operating in the main theatres of the Napoleonic wars. Apart from French troops, it included contingents from countries conquered by Napoleon (Italy, Holland and German states) and also Polish legions. p. 322
- <sup>220</sup> At the *Battle of Marengo* (Northern Italy) on June 14, 1800 Napoleon's army defeated the Austrian troops.  
In the *Battle of Hohenlinden* (Bavaria) on December 3, 1800 the French army under Moreau defeated the Austrians.  
The outcome of these two battles was of great importance for France's victory over the forces of the second European coalition. p. 322
- <sup>221</sup> The *Treaty of Lunéville*, concluded between France and Austria on February 9, 1801, confirmed in the main the terms of the Campo Formio Treaty of 1797. The conclusion of the Lunéville Treaty marked the virtual collapse of the second anti-French coalition. p. 322
- <sup>222</sup> A reference to the Franco-Russian negotiations opened by Paul I's representatives in Paris in January 1801 with a view to concluding a peace treaty with France. The Treaty was signed in Paris on October 8, 1801 during the reign of Alexander I. p. 322
- <sup>223</sup> The *Treaty of Amiens* was signed on March 27, 1802 by Napoleonic France and Britain. It was actually a brief truce in their struggle for supremacy, which was resumed in May 1803. p. 323
- <sup>224</sup> The Polish legions, reformed into infantry demi-brigades of the French army, were sent to Haiti (St. Domingo, French West Indies) to suppress a local liberation uprising. Most of the legionaries died of diseases or were killed fighting the insurgents. p. 323
- <sup>225</sup> The *treaties of Tilsit*—peace treaties signed on July 7 and 9, 1807 by Napoleonic France and member countries of the fourth anti-French coalition, Russia and Prussia, which were defeated in the campaigns of 1806 and 1807. In an attempt to split the defeated powers, Napoleon made no territorial claims on Russia and even succeeded in transferring part of the Prussian monarchy's eastern lands to that country. He concluded an alliance with Alexander I when the two emperors met in Erfurt in the autumn of 1808. The treaties imposed harsh terms on Prussia, which lost nearly half its territory to the German states dependent on France, was made to pay indemnities, and had to reduce its army. Russia, like Prussia, had to break the alliance with Britain and join Napoleon's Continental System, or Continental Blockade, which was to its disadvantage. Napoleon formed the vassal Duchy of Warsaw on Polish territory seized by Prussia during the partitions of Poland. Frederick August of Saxony, a French figurehead, was proclaimed Duke. Napoleon planned to use the duchy as a springboard in the event of war with Russia. p. 323
- <sup>226</sup> The *Ionian Islands*, annexed by France under the Treaty of Campo Formio (1797), were seized by the allied fleet of Russia, Turkey and Britain during the war of the second European coalition against France (1798-1801). The islands were under Russia's control until the Tilsit Peace of 1807, which recognised France's sovereignty over them. The Vienna Congress of 1814-15 established Britain's protectorate over the Ionian Islands. p. 324
- <sup>227</sup> Marx is referring to a term of the Schönbrunn Peace Treaty (signed in the Schönbrunn Palace, Vienna), which was concluded on October 14, 1809 by



France and Austria, a member of the fifth anti-French coalition, after Austria lost the campaign of that year. The war was carried on by the other countries fighting Napoleon—Spain and Portugal, where a national liberation struggle against the French invaders began in 1808, and Britain. Under the Schönbrunn Treaty, of the territories obtained during the Polish partitions which Austria had to cede, Western Galicia was to be annexed to the Duchy of Warsaw and the Tarnopol district to Russia. In this way Napoleon sought to aggravate the Austro-Russian contradictions and to prevent these two countries from restoring the alliance between them. p. 325

228 The convention signed by Chancellor Rumyantsev and Napoleon's Ambassador Caulaincourt in St. Petersburg on January 4, 1810 was not ratified because the St. Petersburg Court refused to give its consent to the marriage of the Grand Princess Anna Pavlovna and Napoleon. p. 326

229 The *100 days*—the period between Napoleon's arrival in Paris from Elba on March 20, 1815 and his second deposition on June 22 of the same year after his defeat at Waterloo on June 18.

The manuscript breaks off with the words "100 days". An idea of what Marx said next can only be partly gleaned from the concluding text of his preparatory materials for the polemics against Fox, written by Marx in English and French and reproduced below. French quotations are translated into English; longer passages are placed in asterisks; the explanations in square brackets have been provided by the editors.

[...] Napoleon told the deputies of Warsaw that he did not want a *national* war. He took possession of the old Polish provinces *in his name*, not *in that of Poland*. The Polish army he disperses amongst the *Grand Army*.

It was, therefore, not the *disaster of Napoleon* which caused him to abandon Poland, but it was his *renewed betrayal* of Poland, *that caused his disaster*.

The enthusiasm in Poland was above all checked by the infamous conduct of the troops under the kings of Westphalia [Jerôme Bonaparte] and Naples [Joachim Murat]; under *Vandamme* etc. They were worse than *Russians*.

In Lithuania, besides, the *grandeés* were brought over by George Adam *Czartoryski* to Alexander's side. Hence no national demonstrations and movements, when the French entered.

\*Fearing even that the Poles may start a war with Russia in their own interests, Napoleon dispersed their 80,000 troops in his Great Army—this is what produced a very pernicious effect on this campaign.\* With a *reconstituted Poland he might* have restored himself from his disasters and waited upon the return of good weather on the *lines of the Niemen, Bug and Narew*.

Nobody will wonder at Napoleon's tremendous blunder. *Charras* (colonel) has shown in his *Histoire des cent jours* that that despot rather than have a truly *national and revolutionary war* in France after his defeat at Waterloo, preferred to succumb to the Coalition.

At the same time not to forget: \*"Poland was literally ravaged by the half-million soldiers composing the Great Army, whom it was obliged to feed"\* [Sawaszkiwicz, op. cit., p. 96].

Those who want to be informed upon the details as to this point ought to read: "*Abbé de Pradt, Histoire de l'Ambassade dans le Grand Duché de Varsovie en 1812, 2<sup>nd</sup> edit. Paris, 1815.*" This Abbé was Napoleon's ambassador at Warsaw at that time. The *secret instructions* which *de Pradt* received from Napoleon, amounted to this: "he should arouse in the Poles a patriotic enthusiasm and

excite them to the most extensive war preparations, but avoid giving any nourishment to the hope of a restoration of Poland."

Is "*Sawaskiewicz*" wrong when he says:

\*"The Poles fought abroad exclusively in the interests of France. Never did France undertake a single war in the interests of Poland: on the contrary it always sacrificed its ally for the sake of its own, ill-understood interests"\* [op. cit., p. 85].

#### Restoration.

3 January 1815. Secret treaty of Austria, France, England against Russia and Prussia. (*Restoration of Poland* one of the articles.) (Brought about by Talleyrand.)

(It cannot be denied that the correspondence between *Castlereagh* and *Alexander*, respecting the kingdom of Poland, Vienna, October, November 1814 (laid before the House of Commons 1847) does great honour to Castlereagh.)

This treaty paralysed and annulled by Napoleon's return from Elba. Talleyrand, the only Anti-Russian minister of the Restoration, fell in disgrace.

In 1821 at Hanover agreement between *Metternich* and *Castlereagh* at Hanover.

*Richelieu*, the French Premier under Louis XVIII, Russian minister.

*Chateaubriand* (see his *Congrès de Vérone*) afterwards tool of Alexander.

*Pignac* made treaty with Russia for the partition of Turkey, and the cession of the left bank of the Rhine to France, when the *Revolution of July* (1830) took place.

By the *secret despatches*, found after Grand duke's Constantine flight from Warsaw, and published in the "*Portfolio*", 1836, it is seen—see f. i. *despatch of Pozzo di Borgo, Paris, December, 1815*—that Russia considered *Metternich* (Austria) as the only serious impediment in her way, but that she was also not quite content with England.

In an account to Nesselrode Pozzo di Borgo says: "*Metternich* addressed himself to England with the view of arming her against the Emperor, and he repeats his attempts at every phase which events present to him. He accredits the idea that all the governments are exposed to internal revolutions, because Russia would compel the Sultan to observe treaties; and he succeeds in intimidating many of them. He tampered with the French ministry, and it resisted, and he raises up internal broils because of that resistance. On the one hand he flatters the Bonapartists, and encourages them to revive the memory of the son of Napoleon [*Herzog von Reichstadt*]; on the other, he appropriates to himself the *Gazette de France* and the *Quotidienne*, pretended representatives of true royalism and jesuitism; and these papers, so-called Christian, become Turk, overwhelm the public with a deluge of insults and falsehoods against us. These truths, Count, escape no one here. *The French ministry* is convinced of them, it repeats and confirms them to me constantly."

#### Louis Philippe.

A single night's sleep on the velvet cushions of the Tuileries was enough to chase all liberal aspirations from the mind of Louis Philippe.

In an *autograph* and *submissive appeal to the father of all the Russias* he prostituted both his dignity and the revolution by representing himself as an involuntary instrument in the current of events, and apologised for the charter he had promised to France.

It was characteristic of the man—before the *Polish Revolution*: he did not scruple to encourage the refugees of Spain, led by Mina, Valdes, and Torrijos

against the bigotted Bourbon king [Ferdinand VII], who refused to acknowledge his dignity, and whose minister had issued a formal circular, condemnatory of the July revolution. These refugees paid dearly for their confidence placed in the French cabinet. Provided with arms and money, and incited to war by the most unequivocal assurances, they were afterwards permitted to be pursued by the Spanish army across the French frontiers, there to be hewn down or carried off.

*Outbreak in Warsaw 29 November 1830.* Prince Metternich indulged in a scheme for the reconstruction of Poland, in favour of an Austrian prince, and broached it to England and France; but as Louis Philippe would not act without England, and as Palmerston proved true to the Czar [Nicholas], the whole was quashed in embryo.... The ambitious designs of the Emperor Francis on Poland soon vanished, before the disturbed state of Italy.

Louis Philippe's conduct was the more infamous, since the Polish insurrection had saved France from a new Anti-jacobin war; since Prussia's convention with Russia against France, and her active measures against Russian Poland, and the *general state in Germany* allowed *Louis Philippe* to act without any regard whatever to England. He might have forced Palmerston, because England herself then in a revolutionary upheaving, and the Whig ministry, as Peel told them, lived only upon the "*French Alliance*".

The Russians, on the news of the revolution, of the barricades in Paris, determined to march upon France ... one of their first measures was to strengthen the *Russian* (not Polish) garrison of Warsaw with fresh Russian troops, in order to facilitate the movement of Constantine's *Polish* army towards the French frontier. Now, this location of Russian garrisons in Warsaw and elsewhere, was one of the gross violations of their promised constitution.... Some of their bravest young men flew to arms and attacked the Russian garrison and ere long the Polish population rose and joined them as if with one heart.

1831. Louis Philippe in his crown speech: "that the nationality of Poland shall not perish". The French chamber of deputies answered in the same strain.

Afterwards Sébastiani: \* *order is reigning in Warsaw.*\*

(Casimir Périer told the chamber on 7 March 1832, that Poland had not lost her treaty rights; on 26 February had Russia issued her *statute*, which made a Russian province of Poland.)

The Polish nation (that is to say the *diplomatic clique*) relied on the French "compliments". An intimation was given to the Polish generals, that if they delayed attacking the Russian army for 2 months, their security would be guaranteed. The Polish generals did delay—that fatal delay, and Poland was ruined, not by the arms of Russia, but by the promises of France (and Austria).

Lafayette communicated *against the denials of Guizot, Thiers, Périer, Sébastiani*, to the chamber of deputies the documentary proofs; 1) that the Poles had broken the Russian coalition against France; 2) that Louis Philippe had caused the Poles to prolong their resistance for 2 months; 3) that it had quite been in the power of France, by one firm declaration, as they had made it on behalf of Belgium, to prevent the Prussian help which in fact decided the Russian victory.

\* *Sitting of the Chamber of Deputies of 16 January 1831:*

Lafayette: "The war was prepared against us; Poland was to form an advanced guard; the advanced guard turned against the main body."

Mauguin: "Who arrested the movement of Russia? It was Poland. They wanted to hurl her against us; she became our advanced guard, and we are

leaving her! Well! Let her die! Her children are accustomed to die for us" (B. Sarrans, *Lafayette et la Révolution de 1830*, Paris, 1832, t. 2, pp. 157, 160-61).

19 and 20 September 1831. The Minister of Foreign Affairs [Sébastieni] vigorously defended himself against the accusation that he had advised the Polish government to postpone the struggle for another 2 months, so as to give France time to intervene in favour of Poland. Lafayette exposed him as a liar by producing documents confirming this fact.

After a few explanations concerning the *conduct* of the French consul [Durant] in Warsaw, who, before taking his oath to the new, insurrectionist government, had dared to ask the permission of the Emperor of Russia, \*he shows that the French cabinet by his advice first paralysed the means of defence, and afterwards prolonged *the insurrection upon* false pretences. He read:

1) Official *declaration of Czartoryski*, when *Foreign Minister of the insurrectional government*:\* "Having placed our confidence in them" \*(the cabinets)\*, "we did not make use of all the internal and external resources... had it not been for the promises of the cabinets, we could have struck a blow which could have proved decisive; but we thought that we must wait a little"\* [Lelewel, *Histoire de Pologne*, t. 1, p. 359]. (Lelewel says that the diplomatic clique by suppressing the *Patriotic Society*, opposing the *emancipation* of the peasants, and proclaiming the *Constitutional Monarchy*, spoiled everything.)

2) Lafayette read a letter, signed by General Kniaziewics and L. Plater d.d. Paris, 20 September 1831, where it is said: \*"that it was the Minister of Foreign Affairs who suggested, on July 7, that we should send a messenger to Warsaw whose travelling expenses he had covered; that the purpose of sending this messenger was, as His Excellency *Count Sébastiani* told us, to convince our government to wait another 2 months because it was the time necessary for negotiations". "To the dictation of the French government,\* the Polish Embassy at Paris wrote to Czartoryski \*'that in 2 months the affairs will be arranged and that they should bide their time until then'"\* [B. Sarrans, op. cit., t. 2, pp. 255-56, 324].

*Sébastieni!*

The Polish Refugees, disembarked from Prussia on the island Aix, were reduced to misery. The French government would not allow them any other asylum than Algiers. They say in their petition to *Louis Philippe*, Aix, 21 September 1832:

"Orders are announced as proceeding from Your Majesty, to organize a Polish battalion of us, in conformity with the ordinance of March 10, 1832. The stipulations contained in it, we consider to be repugnant to our custom, our honour, and our glory. A Polish soldier has never ranked among mercenaries; he has fought but for his domestic hearth, for his liberty, and for the freedom of his neighbours, and for that of France.... We learn with regret that France is interdicted to us. We did not hesitate to present a petition to Your Majesty's ministers with respect to what we called *our transportation to Algiers*.... Sire, you would not permit, we trust, *that an expedition, not unlike that formerly sent to St. Domingo*, should annihilate the last wrecks of ill-fated Poland" [*Polonia*, London, 1832, No. 3, pp. 170-71].

*Lelewel's expulsion* from France.

#### Republic of 1848

Russia interferes in the Danubian principalities and in Hungary. \*That was sufficient.\*

Blanqui—and under Louis Philippe the men of the rue Transnonain [worker participants in the Republican uprising in Paris in 1834]—were true friends of Poland. But their acts do not belong to the traditions of the *French Foreign Office!* p. 327

- 230 Marx made this report at the Central Council meeting of January 24, 1865 on the basis of Wilhelm Liebknecht's letter to him of January 21. Marx wrote the draft for the report between the lines of Liebknecht's letter. In the Minute Book of the General Council, Marx's speech was recorded in shorter form (see this volume, pp. 356-57). When speaking about the affiliation of the General Association of German Workers to the International Working Men's Association, Marx did not have sufficient information about the sectarian position of the Lassallean leadership of the General Association. Their sectarianism hindered the affiliation no less than the police bans then in force in Prussia and other German states (the Prussian law of 1850 on associations which forbade the workers officially to join any society abroad, and so on).

This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 328

- 231 The International Working Men's Association held a conference instead of a congress in London in September 1865 (see Note 103). p. 328

- 232 Marx made these notes for his speeches at the meetings of the Standing Committee (Sub-Committee) on March 4 and 6, 1865 when it discussed a conflict between the founders of the Paris Section, the Proudhonist workers Tolain, Fribourg and Limousin, and a group of bourgeois republicans represented by the lawyer Lefort (see Note 60).

The notes, which have been preserved in Marx's Notebook, were made on the basis of a long letter to him of February 25-28, 1865 from the German refugee Victor Schily, the Central Council's representative in Paris. References in brackets are to pages of this letter. The notes were written in German and English and were followed by the original draft resolution on the conflict in the Paris Section (see this volume, p. 330).

The original of these notes was first published in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 329

- 233 Marx made a slip of the pen here: "February 24" instead of "February 23". Hence the events of February 24, in particular the Council's evening meeting, were erroneously attributed to February 25. An exclamation mark suggests that Marx himself was puzzled by this date. p. 329

- 234 It is evident from Schily's letter to Marx that in the morning of February 24 Lefort expressed his apprehension that the Paris Administration might be "deceived by Bonapartists". A guarantee against this, he believed, was his appointment as "literary defender" of the International Working Men's Association in Paris. p. 329

- 235 This document has survived in Marx's Notebook and is the Central Council's draft resolutions submitted by Marx to the Standing Committee (Sub-Committee). The latter discussed the conflict in the Paris Section at its meetings of March 4 and 6, 1865, at which the French delegates Tolain and Limousin were also present. The draft formed the basis of the final text of the resolution on the split in the Paris Section. The resolution itself was adopted, on the Standing Committee's proposal, by the Central Council on March 7, 1865 (see this volume, pp. 82-83).

This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 330

<sup>236</sup> See Note 65. p. 330

<sup>237</sup> See Note 66. p. 330

<sup>238</sup> On March 12, 1865, Hermann Jung, who had been instructed to write notes for the information of the International's members in France about the conflict in the Paris Section, asked Marx to help him. Marx agreed and on March 18 he met Jung and handed over to him a memorandum written on three sheets of paper. The result of their talk was the text on the back of the first sheet, written partly by Marx and partly by Jung.

In his memorandum Marx showed that the essence of the conflict was in the bourgeois democrats' encroachments on the class character of the international proletarian organisation and drew attention to the French refugee Le Lubez, who constantly supported the bourgeois republican Lefort. Marx, in particular, noted Le Lubez's striving to coopt Lefort's supporters into the Paris Administration and his opposition to the Central Council's decision on this issue adopted on March 7, 1865. Le Lubez and his followers were rebuffed and he was forced, in early April 1865, to give up the post of Corresponding Secretary for France (see this volume, p. 364).

This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 331

<sup>239</sup> The protest against the official appointment of Schily as the Central Council's representative in Paris came from the French bourgeois-democratic refugees, members of a Masonic lodge in London. They also belonged to the French Section in London which had several representatives on the Central Council. The protest was read out at the Council meeting on March 14, but was waived on the insistence of Marx who informed all the present at the meeting of Schily's intention to reject the appointment (see this volume, p. 363). p. 331

<sup>240</sup> See Note 62. p. 332

<sup>241</sup> This note is a summary of Ernest Jones' letter to Marx of March 16, 1865 concerning the participation of the International's representatives in an electoral reform conference to be convened in Manchester by the Liberals. Marx, who advocated drawing the broad mass of workers into the campaign for a democratic reform, encouraged all the measures of the Central Council that were directed to this end. He sought to enlist the support of Ernest Jones, an active participant in the campaign for universal suffrage in Manchester, who exposed the attempts of bourgeois liberals and radicals to lend a moderate character to the reform. At the Central Council meetings of February 14 and 28 Marx read Jones' letters on this campaign (see this volume, pp. 358, 359). Marx could not personally inform the Council of Jones' letter of March 16 because of his forthcoming departure for Holland. Jung presumably acquainted Cremer with Marx's summary of Jones' letter. On Cremer's proposal the Central Council carried on March 21 a resolution instructing its deputation to the Manchester conference to demand manhood suffrage. Marx wrote down the summary of Jones' letter on the back of one of the three sheets of his memorandum to Hermann Jung about the conflict in the Paris Section (see Note 238).

This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 337

- <sup>242</sup> The national Reform Conference, sponsored by the liberal National Reform Union, was held in Manchester on May 15 and 16, 1865. Most of its delegates were representatives of the bourgeoisie. They refused to include the demand for universal manhood suffrage in the conference's resolutions as proposed by the International's Central Council member Cremer, who was supported by Ernest Jones and some delegates of the radical Reform League (see Note 141). Edmond Beales, President of the Reform League, and other radicals adopted an indecisive attitude to the nature of the reform. As a result, the conference carried a moderate resolution to extend the franchise to householders and house tenants who paid poor-rates. p. 337
- <sup>243</sup> These notes were made by Marx in his Notebook for the report he delivered in the Central Council on June 20 and 27, 1865 (see this volume, pp. 101-49). They are a version of the last part of the report, the basic conclusions of which were formulated as resolutions proposed to the Council. On the final text of the concluding part of the report, see this volume, p. 149.  
This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 338
- <sup>244</sup> Marx kept a record of the Central Council meeting of January 16, 1866 on a separate sheet of paper. The text of the minutes entered in the Minute Book by Cremer differs somewhat from that of Marx.  
This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 339
- <sup>245</sup> *Fenians*—Irish revolutionaries who called themselves after the warriors of ancient Ireland. Their first organisations appeared in the 1850s in the USA among the Irish immigrants and later in Ireland itself. The secret Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood, as the organisation was known in the 1860s, aimed at establishing an independent Irish republic by means of an armed uprising. The Fenians, who represented the interests of the Irish peasantry, came mainly from the urban petty bourgeoisie and intelligentsia. They adhered to conspiracy tactics. The British government sought to suppress the Fenian movement by severe police reprisals. In September 1865 it arrested several leaders of the movement, including the editors of the banned newspaper *The Irish People*, Thomas Clarke Luby, John O'Leary, and Jeremiah O'Donovan Rossa, and sentenced them to long terms of imprisonment (O'Donovan Rossa for life). The Central Council of the International came out in defence of the arrested Fenians. In particular, on January 2, 1866 the Council adopted a decision, on Fox's motion, to reprint in the International's newspaper, *The Workman's Advocate*, the appeal of Mrs. O'Donovan Rossa and Mrs. Clarke Luby, published in Irish newspapers, to raise funds for the Irish political prisoners. The appeal is mentioned below in these Minutes. p. 339
- <sup>246</sup> A reference to a meeting to celebrate the third anniversary of the Polish insurrection of 1863-64. Initiated by the International Working Men's Association and Polish refugees, the meeting was held in St. Martin's Hall, London, on January 22, 1866. The resolution, moved by Fox and seconded by Marx, expressed solidarity with the cause of Poland's liberation. p. 340
- <sup>247</sup> Engels wrote these notes during his trip to Sweden and Denmark in July 1867. In a letter of June 26, 1867 he informed Marx that he and his wife Lydia (Lizzy) Burns intended to undertake this trip via Hamburg and Schleswig (see present edition, Vol. 42). Engels' notes on hotel bills, ship tickets and other travel documents allow us to trace the route and the length of stay in various

places. From July 7 to 9, Engels and his wife were in Göteborg, from July 11 to 13 in Stockholm, on July 14 in Malmö, from July 15 to 18 in Copenhagen, and on July 20 they were already in Flensburg, Germany. They returned to Manchester early in August 1867.

Engels' notes, written on three separate sheets of paper, have been preserved. Appended to them is a larger sheet with the plan of a fortress (apparently Karlsborg mentioned in the text) drawn by Engels. At the end of the first paragraph Engels drew a man's head. p. 343

<sup>248</sup> An allusion to the negotiations in Malmö between Denmark and Prussia in 1848 during the war over the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. The negotiations resulted in the conclusion of an armistice on August 26, the terms being favourable to the Danes. Guided by dynastic and counter-revolutionary considerations, Prussia's ruling circles acted to the detriment of the national liberation of Schleswig and Holstein, which sought to break away from the Danish monarchy and join the German Confederation. Engels wrote a number of articles on the Malmö negotiations and armistice for the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 411-15 and 421-25). p. 348

<sup>249</sup> The Minutes of the weekly (apart from extraordinary) meetings of the International's leading body—the General Council (originally known as the Committee, elected by the inaugural meeting of September 28, 1864, then the Provisional Central Committee or Council or simply the Central Council)—during its residence in London from 1864 to 1872 made up five Minute Books. They were usually kept by persons who were active as the Council's Secretary at the given moment. Some Minutes have been preserved as rough copies written on separate sheets of paper and pasted onto the corresponding pages of the Minute Book. Sometimes newspaper cuttings containing the printed report of a certain meeting were pasted into the Minute Book. As a rule, the Minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed at the beginning of each meeting.

The first Minute Book covers the period from October 5, 1864 to August 21, 1866 and the records in it are very brief. The second book contains the Minutes from September 18, 1866 to September 1, 1868. Here, as in the subsequent books, the records are more detailed.

The section "Appendices" contains extracts from the first and second Minute Books of the General Council showing the most important aspects of Marx's activity in it, including his speeches, the brief summaries of which become understandable only in the context of the corresponding passage in the Minutes. The more detailed extant records of his speeches for the given period are published in this volume as separate documents.

This document was published in English for the first time in the collection, *Founding of the First International*, Moscow, 1935. p. 351

<sup>250</sup> All the materials from the Minute Book of the General Council included in the Appendices to this volume were published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866 and 1866-1868*, Moscow, 1962 and 1964. p. 353

<sup>251</sup> Marx is referring to the publication of the "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association" in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 160, November 5, 1864, with misprints in the text (see Note 1). p. 353

<sup>252</sup> The National Government of Poland was set up in May 1863, during the national liberation insurrection of January 1863-May 1864. Moderate and



radical elements predominated in it alternately. This government headed the struggle of the Polish insurgents until mid-October 1863, when it handed over leadership to a military dictator. It had its representatives abroad from among Polish refugees who continued to regard themselves as such even after the defeat of the insurrection.

On the discussion of Fox's address in the International, see Note 192.

p. 354

<sup>253</sup> The reference is to the "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association" published in *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nos. 2 and 3, December 21 and 30, 1864, under the title "Manifest an die arbeitende Klasse Europa's". The German translation of the Address was made by Marx. p. 356

<sup>254</sup> A reference to Joseph Weydemeyer's letter of January 2, 1865 in reply to Marx's letter of November 29, 1864, in which Marx wrote about the foundation of the International Working Men's Association. Weydemeyer was glad to hear the news and informed Marx of his intention to publish the Inaugural Address of the Association in the local workers' newspaper, *St. Louis Daily Press*, as well as in the democratic newspaper *World*. p. 357

<sup>255</sup> A group of bourgeois republicans who claimed to be the leaders of the French organisation of the International, accused Tolain and other members of the Paris Administration of being in contact with Bonapartist circles. The underlying reason for these rumours was the conflict which was maturing in the Paris Section and which became the subject of discussion at many Central Council meetings (see this volume, pp. 82-83, 329-36 and Note 60).

The proposal temporarily to postpone the sending of membership cards to Paris was made by Marx at this meeting, as his letter to Engels of January 25, 1865 indicates (see present edition, Vol. 42). p. 357

<sup>256</sup> A reference to the editorial in a January issue of *St. Louis Daily Press*; the same issue published excerpts from the "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association". Marx received the newspaper from Weydemeyer on January 31, 1865. p. 357

<sup>257</sup> A discussion ensued on the participation of the Central Council's delegation in the preliminary electoral reform conference to be convened in the London Tavern on February 6, 1865 by a group of radicals. The conference was to prepare a larger meeting to be held in St. Martin's Hall on February 23, 1865 with a view to founding a mass organisation for the reform campaign (see Note 141).

The minutes of the meetings do not reveal the character of the debates and the content of Marx's speech. However, his letter to Engels written on February 1, 1865 shows that he managed to convince some Council members who objected to participation in the preliminary conference and the mass meeting to be convened by the radicals to give up their sectarian views. Marx proved the importance of the workers' joint action with the radicals in the reform campaign and, moreover, explained the terms on which an effective bloc with them was possible (recognition of the demand for universal suffrage, and participation of Central Council representatives in the leading bodies of the mass reform organisation which was being established). The tactical platform proposed by Marx was approved by the Council (see present edition, Vol. 42). p. 358

<sup>258</sup> Marx based his first information on a letter from Ernest Jones dated February 13, 1865. He then read Jones' letter of February 10, 1865 in reply to his own

letter of February 1. In the latter, which has not survived, Marx outlined a plan to draw the broad sections of British workers into the electoral reform movement under the leadership of the Central Council. In his reply, Jones expressed his agreement with the measures outlined and stressed, in particular, the need to put forward a slogan of radical reform in contrast to the moderate programme of the liberal National Reform Union in Manchester. p. 358

<sup>259</sup> Marx read a letter to him from Ernest Jones of February 25, 1865. Jones had written about the success of the reform movement in Manchester and welcomed the mass meeting in London on February 23 which declared the formation of the Reform League. He invited delegates of the League to Manchester to take part in a mass meeting in support of the demand for universal suffrage. p. 359

<sup>260</sup> The only extant report of Marx's speech, delivered in early February 1865 at the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the German Workers' Educational Society in London, when Marx criticised the idea of the bourgeois state giving assistance to workers' associations and other Lassallean and Proudhonist dogmas, was made by Johann Georg Eccarius and is rather unsatisfactory. In his letters to Wilhelm Liebknecht on February 23 and to Engels on February 25 (see present edition, Vol. 42), Marx drew their attention to mistakes in the report and emphasised that some ideas in it were completely the opposite of what he had said. This particularly applied to the last sentence about the impossibility of joint action by the proletariat and the bourgeoisie against reactionary regimes. Marx attributed these blunders in Eccarius' report to ill health.

*The German Workers' Educational Society in London* was founded in 1840 by German worker refugees, members of the League of the Just. After the foundation of the Communist League in 1847, representatives of its local communities played the leading role in the Society, which had branches in various working-class districts in London. In 1847 Marx and in 1849-50 Engels took an active part in the Society's work, but in September 1850 they temporarily withdrew because the Willich-Schapper sectarian-adventurist group had increased its influence in the Society. In the late 1850s, when Marx's followers (Georg Eccarius, Friedrich Lessner and Karl Schapper, who had rejected his sectarian views, and others) prevailed again, Marx and Engels resumed their activities in the Educational Society. When the International Working Men's Association was founded, the Society became its German section in London. Eccarius, Kaub, Lessner, Lochner, Bolleter and other members of the Society joined the Central Council of the International Association and played an important part in its activities. The Society existed until 1918, when it was closed by the British government. p. 360

<sup>261</sup> See Note 46. p. 360

<sup>262</sup> Marx was put in touch with the Hamburg publishing house of Meissner und Behre through former member of the Communist League Wilhelm Strohn, a commercial clerk from Bradford who often went to Hamburg on business. At the end of January 1865 Strohn and Otto Meissner agreed on the terms on which the book was to be printed. The text of the agreement was sent to Marx by Meissner in his letter of March 21, 1865. The date of the agreement was not indicated. Meissner left it to Marx's discretion to decide how the manuscript was to be delivered to him: by instalments or as a whole.

- Marx could avail himself of the agreement only in two years' time. In April 1867 Marx personally handed in the manuscript of the first volume of *Capital*. The first edition appeared in September of that year.
- The term of the agreement giving Meissner the right to put out subsequent volumes and reprint the book was observed during Marx's lifetime and after his death. Until 1914 the German edition of all three volumes of *Capital* was published by Meissner und Behre. p. 361
- 263 On the conflict in the Paris Section, see this volume, pp. 330-36 and Note 60. p. 363
- 264 Schily informed Marx of his refusal to accept the appointment as the Council's official representative on the Paris Administration in a letter dated March 20, 1865. p. 363
- 265 Marx acted as Corresponding Secretary for Belgium, while remaining Corresponding Secretary for Germany, until November 6, 1866, when these functions were entrusted to the Council member Alexander Besson. p. 364
- 266 Marx meant Charles Longuet, editor of the democratic weekly *La Rive Gauche* which published the International's documents (it began to appear in Paris on October 20, 1864). Longuet was sentenced to eight months' imprisonment for publishing articles against the Second Empire, and the paper was banned as of March 12, 1865. Publication was resumed on May 14, 1865 in Brussels and continued until August 15, 1866. p. 364
- 267 On the discussion of the question of wages in the Central Council and Marx's report "Value, Price and Profit", see Note 87. p. 364
- 268 A reference apparently to one of the two letters Jones wrote to Marx, on April 22 and 24, 1865, in which he informed Marx of the headway being made by the electoral reform movement in Manchester. p. 365
- 269 It soon became clear that Léon Fontaine, a Belgian democrat, had not established contacts with the workers, although he was empowered to do so, and had taken no steps to publicise the International in Belgium. In the letter, which Marx read at this meeting, Fontaine tried to justify his inactivity. The first section of the International in Belgium was founded on July 17, 1865 with the participation of the Belgian socialist César De Paepe. p. 365
- 270 Late in March 1865, the Leipzig Compositors' Union declared a strike in reply to the employers' refusal to meet the compositors' demand for higher wage rates. It involved nearly 650 people. On April 15, the Berlin Compositors' Union, of which Wilhelm Liebknecht was one of the leaders, sent a letter to the Central Council asking it to support the Leipzig compositors. This letter is quoted in the report of the given Council meeting published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 185, April 29, 1865. p. 365
- 271 Marx communicated the news about the reorganisation of the Paris Administration on the basis of Schily's letter to him of April 27, 1865. As a result of the reorganisation, the Administration strengthened its ties with workers and drew several new members, among them Louis Varlin and Zéfirin Camélinat, into its activities. p. 365
- 272 On the Reform Conference in Manchester see Note 242.  
The leading bodies of the Reform League (see Note 141)—the Council and the more narrow Executive Committee—were elected at the end of March

1865. The Executive included six Central Council members (Cremer, Leno, Nieass, Odger, Howell and Eccarius). Howell was elected the League's honorary secretary. In view of the forthcoming conference in Manchester, the League issued an address to the working classes to campaign for manhood suffrage.  
p. 366
- 273 An extraordinary meeting of the Central Council to discuss problems raised by Weston was held in the evening of May 20. The minutes of this meeting are not extant. In a letter to Engels, dated May 20, 1865 (see present edition, Vol. 42), Marx gave the substance of Weston's views and his chief objections to them. As can be seen from the letter, Marx considered it important to counter Weston's erroneous theses with a scientific theory on the questions concerned, and to explain in popular form several basic propositions from his own economic teaching. Marx did not therefore confine himself to opposing Weston at this and subsequent meetings, but prepared a special report which he read in the Council on June 20 and 27, 1865 (see Note 87).  
p. 366
- 274 Written by Marx, the Address of the Central Council was printed in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 7536, June 1, 1865, under the heading "To Andrew Johnson, President of the United States". The heading was preceded by the words: "The Working Men of Europe to President Johnson".  
p. 366
- 275 The Provisional Rules of the International Working Men's Association envisaged the convocation of a congress in Belgium in 1865 (see this volume, p. 15). However, Marx soon realised that the local organisations were not yet strong enough and that the International as a whole was not ready for a congress. He managed to convince Central Council members of the need to convene a conference in London, instead of a congress, on July 25, 1865. The Council approved the report of the Standing Committee on this question (see this volume, pp. 375-77).  
p. 367
- 276 On July 11, 1865 the Central Council did not discuss this question. On July 18 the desire was once again expressed to publish the materials of the debate in the press, in particular in the columns of *The Miner and Workman's Advocate*. However, the report of the debate was not printed. The German refugee Karl Kaub made an attempt to resume the discussion of the question at the Council meeting on August 15 when he read his paper refuting Weston's theses. This was the last report on the subject recorded in the Minute Book of the General Council.  
p. 368
- 277 The Central Council adopted a decision to issue such cards at its meeting on February 7, 1865 (see this volume, p. 358). This particular copy was filled in on behalf of the London Operative Bricklayers' Society by its Executive Council. The date of affiliation to the International (the 21st of February 1865) was inserted, most probably, retrospectively, because the card was issued only in the summer of 1865, as can be seen from the list of corresponding secretaries in the printed card. The list included E. Dupont, elected Corresponding Secretary for France on April 11, 1865 and L. Lewis who became a member of the Central Council on May 30, 1865 and was elected Corresponding Secretary for America on June 6.  
p. 369
- 278 The address was drawn up on the basis of the Central Council's resolutions, drafted by Marx, on the terms of the admission of workers' organisations to the International (see this volume, p. 18). The leaflet with the address was

published in the summer of 1865, not before June 6 (when Lewis was elected Corresponding Secretary for America). p. 372

- 279 In view of the enquiries coming into the Central Council about the time of the Congress of the International, it was decided on June 13, 1865 to refer the question to the Standing Committee. The Committee's report reflected the viewpoint of Marx who held that it was too early to convoke the congress in 1865 and suggested holding a preliminary conference in London. The programme for the London Conference, included in this report in amended form, was reproduced in two leaflets issued by the Central Council in August and September 1865 and was also printed in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 200, August 12, 1865. The announcement of the conference was published in *The Workman's Advocate*, Nos. 130-33, September 2, 9, 16 and 23, 1865. The preparations were also discussed at the Council's subsequent meetings (see this volume, p. 384).

This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 375

- 280 An aliens act was passed in Belgium as early as 1835 and was renewed every three years. Despite widespread protests by the Belgian press and the public, this law was renewed for the tenth time at the end of June 1865. p. 375
- 281 At the end of July 1865 John Bredford Leno, proprietor of *The Miner and Workman's Advocate*, a weekly newspaper published in London from 1863, proposed placing it at the service of the Central Council of the International. The proposal was supported by the Council members. They discussed the matter at the Council meetings of August 8 and 15, at which Marx was not present, since he was busy working on *Capital*. But he was informed about the details of the discussion by Eccarius, who wrote to him on August 16, 1865.

On August 22, after the regular Council meeting, the shareholders of the Industrial Newspaper Company, established to finance the newspaper, held their foundation meeting. The meeting, which was attended by Marx, approved the address to the working men of Great Britain and Ireland, written by Council members earlier, and the Company's Prospectus, both published here, in the Appendices. On September 25, 1865, the London Conference declared the paper, which on September 8 had assumed the name of *The Workman's Advocate*, an official organ of the International Association. At the beginning of November 1865 the paper became the full property of the Industrial Newspaper Company. In February 1866 it was renamed *The Commonwealth*. Marx was a member of the Company's Board and remained on it until June 1866. However, the growing influence of reformist elements in the paper's Editorial Board and the vacillation and conciliatory policy on the part of the trade-union leaders on the Company's Board did not let Marx and his followers avert the transformation of this working-class paper into an organ supporting the policy of bourgeois radicals. It was published until July 20, 1867.

p. 378

- 282 On September 11 Marx wrote to Wilhelm Liebknecht in Hanover inviting him to attend the London Conference of the International as a delegate from Germany (see present edition, Vol. 42). Liebknecht replied that he would not be able to come but would send a report on the working-class movement in Germany.

Liebknecht's report in English was not, however, read by Marx at the conference because it devoted too much attention to Marx personally, as he himself explained to Liebknecht in a letter of November 21, 1865. The report

- has survived in manuscript form (see *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962, pp. 251-60). p. 384
- <sup>283</sup> A reference to the ceremonial evening to celebrate the first anniversary of the International to be held on September 28, 1865 in St. Martin's Hall, London. It was part of the London Conference programme. Jones had promised to attend, but was unable to leave Manchester. p. 384
- <sup>284</sup> The London Conference of the International was held from September 25 to 29, 1865 (see Note 103). The afternoon sittings were attended by the Standing Committee members together with the nine Continental delegates (from France, Switzerland and Belgium), the evening sittings—by all members of the Central Council and Continental delegates. The Conference minutes were recorded by Cremer, Le Lubez and Howell. However, neither these minutes nor the report of the Conference in *The Workman's Advocate*, No. 134, September 30, 1865, fully show Marx's role at the Conference, especially in the polemics with the Proudhonists when the agenda was being worked out for the future Geneva Congress of the International. In particular, the minutes of the afternoon sitting of September 27, which discussed the question of inclusion in the congress agenda of Point 9 of the Central Council's programme on the restoration of Poland's independence, have not survived. The Appendices to this volume feature extracts from the minutes of the afternoon sitting of September 26 which contain a more detailed record of Marx's speeches at the conference than any other minutes. p. 385
- <sup>285</sup> See Note 280. p. 385
- <sup>286</sup> The first congress of the International Working Men's Association met in Geneva on September 3-8, 1866; the decision to change the date of the Congress was adopted by the Central Council on May 1, 1866. p. 386
- <sup>287</sup> During the discussion of the agenda for the Geneva Congress, the main point of dispute between Marx's supporters and the Proudhonist-minded French, Belgian and other conference participants was whether or not to include the question of Poland's independence. The Proudhonists were against it, saying that political questions detract the workers from social problems. The discussion of the Polish question at the evening sitting of September 26 was adjourned to September 27. The minutes of the afternoon sitting for that day, at which Marx presumably refuted the Proudhonists' arguments, have not been preserved. At the evening sitting, the majority of delegates voted for the inclusion of the Polish question in the agenda as formulated in Point 9 of the draft worked out by the Central Council (see this volume, p. 376). p. 386
- <sup>288</sup> By decision of the London Conference, a congress of the International Working Men's Association was initially to take place in Geneva in May 1866. Later the convocation was postponed until September. p. 388
- <sup>289</sup> For the reactionary laws in Prussia prohibiting workers' organisations to join the International, and for the Lassallean leaders' opposition to this, see Note 230. Early in 1865 Marx proposed individual membership which enabled German workers to circumvent these laws. The International Association's members in Germany got in touch with the Central Council directly or through the German Section founded by Johann Philipp Becker in Geneva. This is how the contact was established with the workers in Mainz, Berlin, Solingen and other towns. Marx based his communication to the Central Council meeting about the headway being made by the Association in Germany on Liebknecht's

- letter to him of November 16 and on one from Theodor Metzner, Sigfrid Meyer and August Vogt of November 13, 1865. p. 388
- 290 The appeal to the workers of Switzerland to join the International was issued by the German Section in Geneva in November 1865. An abridged version in English was published in *The Workman's Advocate*, No. 145, December 16, 1865. p. 388
- 291 On December 16 and 18, 1865 the Belgian democratic newspaper *L'Echo de Verviers*, Nos. 293 and 294, published an anonymous article which gave a distorted picture of the Central Council's activities and the work of the London Conference of 1865. Its author was the French petty-bourgeois republican Pierre Vésinier, a refugee in Belgium and the spokesman for petty-bourgeois elements in the French branch in London who opposed Marx and the Central Council. This branch was founded in the autumn of 1865 and included, besides petty-bourgeois refugees (Le Lubez, Félix Pyat and others), proletarian elements (Eugène Dupont, Hermann Jung and Paul Lafargue) who later broke away from its petty-bourgeois wing.
- Vésinier's article was discussed in the Central Council on December 26, 1865 and on January 2 and 9, 1866. On the instructions of the Council, Vésinier's slanderous attacks were refuted by Hermann Jung, who was helped by Marx to write a letter to the editor of *L'Echo de Verviers* (see this volume, pp. 392-400). p. 388
- 292 Wilhelm Liebknecht informed Marx in a letter of January 18, 1866 that the Leipzig Workers' Educational Society was willing to form a branch of the International. He also wrote that Hofstetten, an editor of *Der Social-Demokrat*, had tried again to get himself, Marx and Engels to contribute to the paper. Marx's letter to Engels of February 10, 1866 shows that Marx strongly objected to these attempts by the Lassalleans to use his name and that of Engels, and severely criticised Liebknecht for his conciliatory attitude (see present edition, Vol. 42). p. 389
- 293 The "*People*" (*Peuple*)—a Belgian atheist society consisting mainly of progressive intellectuals who advocated utopian socialism. It published a newspaper, *La Tribune du Peuple*, which became the organ of the International Working Men's Association in Belgium in August 1865 (officially in January 1866) when the society joined the International. p. 389
- 294 Jenny Marx's letter of January 29, 1866 to Joseph Philipp Becker, leader of the German sections of the International in Switzerland, contained information for the journal *Der Vorbote*, organ of the International Association in Switzerland of which he was the editor. In this case, as in the next (see this volume, p. 439), it was, presumably, Marx who, being ill at the time, asked his wife to send this kind of information. Trying to support this periodical, Marx also asked Liebknecht, Kugelmann and his other friends and associates to supply it with material.
- The item published in *Der Vorbote* and the corresponding passage in the letter coincide. The introductory words and the last two paragraphs were added by the editors. p. 390
- 295 A reference to atheist societies active in England in the 1860s. A considerable influence on this movement was exerted by Charles Bradlaugh and other bourgeois radicals who were grouped around *The National Reformer* and were disseminating reformist ideas among the workers. p. 391

- <sup>296</sup> See Note 245. p. 391
- <sup>297</sup> This letter was the Central Council's reply to Vésinier's slanderous article (see Note 291). It was written by Jung and, by the Council's decision of February 6, 1866, was sent to the editor of *L'Echo de Verviers*. The letter was edited by Marx, as is evident from Jung's letters to him of February 15 and 26, 1866.  
The English translation of the letter was first published in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 392
- <sup>298</sup> See Notes 141 and 272. p. 394
- <sup>299</sup> The *German Workers' Educational Society in London*—see Note 260.  
Marx, Eccarius, Lessner, Kaub, Schapper and other Council members, who were also members of the London Educational Society, took part in the London Conference of 1865. p. 395
- <sup>300</sup> The *Society of December 10 (Société du Dix Decembre)*—the secret Bonapartist society founded in 1849 and so called to commemorate the election of Louis Bonaparte, the Society's patron, to the Presidency of the French Republic on December 10, 1848. It consisted mainly of declassed elements. The Society played an active part in the Bonapartist coup d'état of December 2, 1851 which established the counter-revolutionary regime of the Second Empire headed by Napoleon III. Marx described the Society in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 149-51). p. 397
- <sup>301</sup> The *Grütli Society (Société du Grütli)*—a Swiss reformist organisation founded in 1838 as an educational association of artisans and workers. The name emphasised the Society's national character: legend has it that representatives of three Swiss cantons met on the meadow of Grütli (or Rütli) in 1307 and concluded an agreement on joint struggle against Austrian rule. p. 398
- <sup>302</sup> Marx's speech in the Central Council on March 13, 1866 testifies to his battle with the bourgeois democrats who tried to misrepresent the genuinely proletarian class nature of the International. Louis Wolff, a follower of Mazzini, withdrew from the Council in the spring of 1865 (he was later exposed as a police agent). On March 6, 1866 he came to the Council meeting—Marx was not present—and made a speech criticising the letter to *L'Echo de Verviers* (see this volume, pp. 392-400). He alleged that the letter had wrongly described Mazzini's attitude to the International and its programme documents. In this way, he wanted to make the Council recognise that these documents were based on Mazzini's principles. Influenced by reformist-minded British members, the Council passed a resolution in which it virtually apologised to Mazzini and Wolff himself for "harsh words" used about them in the letter. On March 10, the corresponding secretaries Dupont, Jung, Longuet and Bobczynski met in conference at Marx's place and decided that Marx would protest against the March 6 resolution at the next Council meeting. At its meeting on March 13, after Marx's speech supported by some members of the Council, the latter cancelled this resolution, and this was recorded in the minutes of the Council meeting of March 27.  
This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 401
- <sup>303</sup> About Marx's work on the Inaugural Address and Provisional Rules of the International Association, see Note 1.  
The Statutes submitted by Louis Wolff on October 8, 1864, at the first sitting of the committee elected to work out the International's programme



documents, had been written by Mazzini for an association of Italian workers' societies which he planned to set up. Written from the bourgeois-democratic standpoint, this draft was used as a basis for the *Fraternal Bond between the Italian Workmen's Associations* published in *Il Giornale delle Associazioni Operaie* in July 1864 and adopted at a congress of Italian workers in Naples at the end of October 1864. p. 401

<sup>304</sup> This statement by De Paepe was not recorded in the minutes of the London Conference of the International. p. 401

<sup>305</sup> The *Schiller Institute*, founded in Manchester in November 1859 in connection with the centenary of Friedrich Schiller's birth, strove to be the centre of cultural and social life of the German émigrés. Engels was critical of the Institute noted for its tendency to formalism and pedantry, and initially kept aloof from it. But when certain changes were introduced into its Rules, he became a member of its Directorate in 1864. Later, as the President of the Institute, Engels devoted much time to it and exercised a considerable influence on its activities.

In September 1868, while Engels was away from Manchester, the Institute invited Karl Vogt who was slandering the proletarian revolutionaries, to deliver a lecture. Engels felt that his political reputation would be compromised if he remained President and so he left the Directorate. In April 1870 he was again elected a member of the Directorate of the Schiller Institute, but did not take an active part in it. p. 402

<sup>306</sup> On May 3, 1866 Marx received from the German Tailors' Committee in London material on German journeymen tailors being used as strike-breakers by Dutch and British employers. On May 4 he wrote the piece "A Warning" and sent it to Liebknecht on behalf of the Central Committee to be published in German papers (see this volume, pp. 162-63 and Note 119). p. 405

<sup>307</sup> At the end of 1865, Paul Lafargue was expelled from the Medical Faculty of Paris University for his political statements against the regime of the Second Empire. He soon took an active part in the work of the International and on March 6, 1866 was elected member of the Central Council. As a contributor to the newspaper *La Rive Gauche*, Lafargue wrote for it a survey of the progress of the International Working Men's Association, drawing on Marx's oral information and probably on material received from him. The survey was first read out at a Central Council meeting on June 12, 1866 (see this volume, p. 411). *La Rive Gauche* of June 17, 1866 published it together with the French translation of the Inaugural Address of the Association made by Charles Longuet at Marx's request. p. 406

<sup>308</sup> A mass meeting of electoral reformers held in St. Martin's Hall, London, on February 23, 1865 proclaimed the foundation of the Reform League (see Note 141). A special committee was formed, in which the Central Council members were in the majority (15 out of 29; Lafargue's figures are incorrect), to negotiate with the radicals about a joint campaign for electoral reform and the organisational structure of the League. p. 407

<sup>309</sup> On February 20, 1866 the Central Council of the International discussed the harsh treatment of the Irish political prisoners in the Pentonville prison. The facts about this treatment penetrated into the opposition papers and were communicated to Peter Fox, a Central Council member, by the wife of the condemned Fenian leader, O'Donovan Rossa (see Note 245). The Council resolved to send a delegation to the Home Secretary George Grey demanding

the mitigation of the prison regime. When Grey refused to receive the delegation the Council decided on March 6, 1866 to make all the available material public. A document exposing the British authorities was drawn up by Fox and published with the signature of the Council's President, George Odger, in *The Commonwealth*, No. 157, March 10, 1866, under the heading "The Irish State Prisoners. Sir George Grey and the International Working Men's Association".  
p. 407

310 In his letters to Marx of May 25 and June 5, 1866 Liebknecht wrote that the leaders of Saxon workers' associations were prepared to join the International and asked for membership cards.  
p. 411

311 When the Austro-Prussian war began (see Note 122), the Central Council held a discussion on the International Working Men's Association's attitude towards it. The discussion began on June 19 and continued on June 26, July 3 and 17, 1866. The terse minutes convey the essence of the debate rather superficially, in particular Marx's speeches on June 19 and July 17. A more detailed impression of his first speech and the general trend of the discussion can be obtained from his letter to Engels of June 20, 1866 (see present edition, Vol. 42). The letter shows that Marx opposed the abstract pacifist approach to war taken by some participants in the working-class movement, the inability to understand the concrete historical nature of war, and the belittling or disregard of the question of German as well as of Italian unity being decided in the Austro-Prussian war, and the national question as a whole. This position was adopted, in particular, by the French Council members, Paul Lafargue and Charles Longuet, who failed to overcome the Proudhonist nihilist attitude towards national problems and who declared that nations and national demands were "outmoded prejudices". On the other hand, the reformist-minded British trade unionists were inclined to identify the policy of the ruling circles of Prussia and Italy with the national interests of the German and Italian peoples. When defining the International's tactics during the Austro-Prussian war, Marx sought to warn the proletarian organisation against a one-sided approach. Marx and his followers thought it expedient for the International to pursue a neutral policy, bearing in mind that the world proletariat favoured the unification of Germany, as well as Italy, by revolutionary-democratic means and that in the 1866 war the struggle for unification in these two countries had been mixed up with the dynastic and narrow selfish strivings of the ruling circles. It was in this spirit that the resolution was drawn up and adopted by the Central Council on July 17.  
p. 411

312 The resolution was published in *The Commonwealth*, No. 176, July 21, 1866 and *La Rive Gauche*, No. 29, July 22, 1866.  
p. 411

313 The Italian workers' societies did not succeed in being represented at the Geneva Congress. Italian delegates attended the congresses of the International Working Men's Association beginning with the Lausanne Congress (September 1867).  
p. 412

314 This decision was adopted during the discussion of the agenda for the Geneva Congress envisaged by the Central Council's resolution of July 17, 1866. In compliance with this decision, the Geneva Congress resolved on September 8, 1866 that London should remain the seat of the Central (General) Council of the International Working Men's Association in 1866-67.

Preparations for the Geneva Congress continued at the Council's subsequent meetings. On July 31, in particular, Marx moved a number of proposals on

- behalf of the Standing Committee concerning the agenda for the Congress, and later drew up "Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional Central Council. The Different Questions" (see this volume, pp. 183-94). p. 412
- <sup>315</sup> The notice concerned the dispute between Manchester employers and tailors. In August 1866, Manchester employers locked out over 700 tailors who were demanding shorter working hours and the regulation of rates for different operations in view of the widespread use of machinery in the clothing trade. The tailors applied for support to the Executive Committee of the London Operative Tailors' Protective Association, whose President, Matthew Lawrence, represented it on the General Council (the name became current after the Geneva Congress). On September 12 a preliminary agreement was reached between the employers and the workers and the latter returned to their work. p. 412
- <sup>316</sup> By nominating Marx for the post of President of the General Council, the British Council members made a kind of challenge to the French Proudhonists, who tried at the Geneva Congress to have the view accepted that persons not engaged in manual labour should neither be admitted to workers' organisations nor hold official posts in them. p. 412
- <sup>317</sup> Marx is presumably referring to Clause 4 of the Administrative Regulations adopted by the Geneva Congress. It stipulated that the general rules for paying dues also applied to members of the societies affiliated to the International (see this volume, p. 445). p. 412
- <sup>318</sup> Jules Gottraux, a Swiss-born subject of Great Britain and a member of the International, was detained by the French police on the French-Swiss frontier on September 30, 1866 when he was returning to London from his trip to Switzerland. The police confiscated some letters, printed matter, and other material entrusted to him by the International's leaders in Geneva to be handed over to the General Council. The seized documents included the preliminary report on the work of the Geneva Congress which had been drawn up by Council member Frederick Card and published in French in Geneva as a pamphlet. (Later, this gave rise to a false rumour that the French authorities had confiscated the Congress minutes, which in reality had by that time been brought to London by Hermann Jung.) The General Council lodged a complaint with the French Minister of Home Affairs about this act of arbitrariness and demanded the return of the seized documents. And when he refused to reply to the complaint, written by Fox on the Council's instructions, the General Council decided to use the fact to publicly expose the regime of the Second Empire (see also the record of Marx's speech at the General Council meeting of November 27, 1866). At the beginning of December the Council addressed the British Foreign Secretary asking him to make a corresponding demarche to the French government, which forced the French authorities to return, on December 21, the materials taken from Gottraux. Fox wrote a special article on the actions of the Bonapartist authorities. It was published in *The Commonwealth* on January 12, 1867 and in *The Working Man* on February 1, 1867. p. 413
- <sup>319</sup> The *Mémoire* of the Paris Section for the Geneva Congress containing a detailed exposition of Proudhonist views, was supported by the Lyons and Rouen sections and was read as the report of the French delegates at the congress on September 4. The full text of the *Mémoire* was published in

Brussels in September 1866 under the title *Congrès de Genève. Mémoire des délégués français*. p. 413

- 320 On February 28, 1867 Marx made a speech at the celebration of the 27th anniversary of the German Workers' Educational Society in London (see Note 260). Besides German workers, the celebration meeting was attended by French members of the International in London and participants in the British working-class movement. The meeting was addressed by General Council members Peter Fox, Georg Eccarius and other speakers.

An account of the meeting, including the record of Marx's speech, was made by Friedrich Lessner and sent to Johann Philipp Becker to be published in *Der Vorbote*. p. 415

- 321 On April 3, 1867 the joint meeting of the Council of the Reform League (see Note 141) and delegates of the local branches adopted a resolution moved by Odger congratulating the people of North Germany on the introduction of universal suffrage in the elections to the North-German Imperial Diet. The resolution also expressed thanks to Bismarck "for the frank, manly and noble expressions on the happiness and general prosperity which must accrue to a nation governed on the principle of universal suffrage".

On Marx's initiative, the resolution was discussed at the General Council meetings on April 16 and 23, 1867. Marx himself could not attend the meetings because on April 10 he left for Germany where the first volume of *Capital* was being printed, and did not return to London until May 19.

However, Lafargue and Lessner who spoke at the meetings managed to have the resolution adopted in which the General Council of the International condemned Odger's laudation of Bismarck and disavowed itself from his appraisal of the "services" of the Chancellor of the North-German Confederation. p. 416

- 322 See Note 305. p. 417

- 323 At its meeting on June 4, 1867 the General Council appointed a committee to draw up an address to the affiliated societies and members of the International in connection with the second Congress of the International Working Men's Association to be held in Lausanne in September. Fox, Marx, Jung, Eccarius and Dupont made up the committee. However, as he was busy reading proofs of Volume I of *Capital*, Marx was unable to take part in drawing up the English text of the address, which was approved by the Council meeting on July 9. At the same meeting Paul Lafargue was instructed to translate the address into French. This decision was adopted in view of the fact that the Proudhonist leaders of the Paris sections prepared their own agenda of the Congress in violation of the General Council's prerogative to define its programme (see this volume, p. 203 and Note 154).

The French address edited by Marx differed greatly from the English text. It was published in London in July 1867 as a leaflet and reprinted by some newspapers (*La Voix d'Avenir*, No. 31, August 4, 1867; *Le Courrier international*, No. 28/29, July 30, 1867; *La Tribune du Peuple*, No. 8, August 31, 1867). The German translation of the French address made by Johann Philipp Becker was included by him in the pamphlet *Einladung zum zweiten Kongress der Internationalen Arbeiter Association am 2-8. September in Lausanne* and reproduced in *Der Vorbote*, No. 8, August 1867. p. 421

- 324 In February 1867, during the strike of Belgian miners and iron-workers of the Charleroi coalfield (Hainaut Province), near a colliery in Marchiennes, there

was a clash between soldiers on guard and the strikers, which resulted in a number of workers killed and wounded. On March 13, *The International Courier* published the General Council's address with a protest against the massacre in Marchiennes and a call on the British miners and iron-workers to aid the widows and those who had suffered. p. 421

325 This refers to the strikes of the Paris bronze-workers and tailors in February and March 1867. Thanks to the support of the General Council which organised among the English workers a collection of funds for the Paris strikers, they succeeded in making the employers introduce fixed wage rates. The broad scope of the strike started on April 1, 1867 by Paris journeymen tailors, and the International's support to them compelled the French government to interfere and take reprisals against the strikers. Their Mutual Aid Association was dissolved and its leaders were prosecuted and fined. p. 421

326 The Royal Commission to Make Inquiry Respecting the English Trade Unions was set up in February 1867 because the ruling classes were anxious about their growing activity and hoped the inquiry would help to outlaw the trade unions or at least restrict the scope of their activity. At the same time an anti-trade-union campaign was launched in bourgeois newspapers. The trade unions, supported by the General Council of the International, reacted to this by holding meetings all over the country and convening a national conference in London on March 5-8, 1867. The Royal Commission failed to make any serious charges against the trade unions, but it hindered the process of their full legalisation (defence of their funds by law, recognition of their right to fight strike-breakers, to post pickets and to support strikes organised by other trade unions). p. 422

327 Marx made this speech in reply to the attacks on the trade unions started by the bourgeois press in connection with the appointment of the Royal Commission to investigate trade union activities (see Note 326), in particular to the allegations of bourgeois newspapers that by organising strikes the trade unions hindered the development of major English industries and reduced their competitive power in the world market.

The statistical errors in the Blue Book have been reproduced, whereas the errors in the newspaper report have been corrected to conform with the Blue Book.

In the Minute Book of the General Council, Marx's speech is given in the form of the corresponding clipping from *The Working Man*, with minor corrections pasted in. It is preceded by the record of Marx's information about the affiliation to the International of the New York Communist Club (the Club was set up in 1857 by German revolutionary emigrants, with former members of the Communist League among them) and also of a kindred association in Hoboken. Marx took this information from Friedrich Adolph Sorge's letter of July 10, 1867. Sorge himself became a prominent organiser of sections of the I.W.A. in the USA. p. 424

328 See Note 4. p. 424

329 The Inaugural Congress of the bourgeois-pacifist League of Peace and Freedom (see Note 155) was originally to be held in Geneva on September 5, 1867. The League's Organising Committee, which had enlisted the support of bourgeois-radical and democratic leaders (John Stuart Mill, the Reclus brothers and others), also counted on the participation in the League's work of

representatives of European proletariat and its international organisation. The Committee consequently invited the sections of the International and its leaders, Marx included, to attend the Congress. At the same time it was decided to postpone the opening of the Congress until September 9, so as to enable delegates of the Lausanne Congress of the International (to be held on September 2-8) to take part.

The International's attitude towards the League of Peace and Freedom was discussed both by the General Council and the local sections. Unlike the advocates of unconditional support of the League's activity, in particular the leaders of British trade unions, Marx, in his speech on August 13, 1867 and the resolution he proposed (see this volume, p. 204), formulated the principles of the International's tactics as regards this kind of bourgeois-democratic movement. These principles envisaged the joint struggle with the democrats against the war threat on condition that the proletarian organisation preserves its class independence, and, in opposition to bourgeois-pacifist illusions, takes a revolutionary proletarian approach to the problems of war and peace.

In a letter to Engels of September 4, 1867 Marx wrote about the wide response to his speech. He also pointed out the extremely concise record of his speeches (Eccarius' report of the Council meeting published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper* on August 17, 1867 and pasted into the Minute Book). He went on to say that this record gave only approximate idea of his speech, which lasted half an hour (see present edition, Vol. 42). p. 426

330 The brief newspaper report of the General Council meeting does not fully express the views of Marx and Engels on the role of the regular standing armies in the nineteenth century. They are given in greater detail in Engels' work "The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party" (this volume, pp. 37-79). p. 426

331 The General Council's report to the Lausanne Congress of 1867 was approved by the Council on August 20 on the basis of Eccarius' draft and additions to it made by Council members. It was read to the Congress on September 3 in French by Guillaume, and in German by Eccarius. The French text was published in the pamphlet *Rapports lus au congrès ouvrier réuni du 2 au 8 septembre 1867 à Lausanne, Chaux-de-Fonds, 1867*.

The English text published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 309, September 14, 1867, is reproduced in this volume.

The English version is more concise than the French. It omitted parts of the report about the French, Swiss and Belgian sections of the International, and a special annual report of the Corresponding Secretary for America (Peter Fox). The part entitled "Continental and American Sections" gave a summary of the state of affairs in a number of countries and referred to the report of the Corresponding Secretary for America as a special document. Unlike the English report, which was unsigned, the French document was signed by the leading Council members, including Marx (the signatures are reproduced in Note 344).

The *Lausanne Congress* of the International was held on September 2-8, 1867. Marx took part in the preparations but, as he was busy reading the proofs of the first volume of *Capital*, was unable to attend: he withdrew his candidature at the General Council meeting of August 13, 1867.

The Congress was attended by 64 delegates from six countries (Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Italy and Switzerland). Apart from the annual report of the General Council, the Congress heard reports from the local

sections which indicated the increased influence of the International on the proletarian masses and the growing strength of its organisations in different countries. The Proudhonist-minded delegates, especially the French, made an attempt to change the orientation of the International's activity and its programme principles. Despite the efforts of the General Council's delegates, they imposed their agenda on the Congress and sought to revise the Geneva Congress resolutions in a Proudhonist spirit. They managed to pass a number of their resolutions, in particular on cooperation and credit, which the Proudhonists regarded as the chief factors in changing society by means of reform.

However, the Proudhonists failed to achieve their main aim. The Congress confirmed the Geneva Congress resolutions on the economic struggle and strikes. As distinct from the Proudhonist dogma on abstaining from political struggle, the Lausanne Congress resolution on political freedom emphasised that the social emancipation of workers was inseparable from political liberation.

The Proudhonists likewise failed to seize the leadership of the International. The Congress re-elected the General Council in its former composition and retained London as its seat. p. 428

<sup>332</sup> Here and below, the Geneva Congress resolutions are given as published in the corresponding sections of the General Council's report of the Congress in *The International Courier*, Nos. 12, 15 and 17, March 27, April 17, May 1, 1867. p. 428

<sup>333</sup> See Note 318. p. 429

<sup>334</sup> A reference to the membership cards (*cartes de membre*). Of the 1,000 copies printed, 800 were sent to France and confiscated by the French police at the frontier; as was the practice, they reproduced the Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International approved by the Geneva Congress of 1866. These cards were printed in London on November 25 by the General Council's decision of September 16, 1866 in reply to a request from the Paris Administration. The Council thought it expedient to undertake this task, fearing that the Paris Administration, which had in the past published the Provisional Rules with Proudhonist distortions, would repeat them in subsequent editions. (And indeed the French Proudhonists did publish a similarly distorted text of the Rules at the end of 1866.) The French text of the Rules for the new publication was prepared by Marx, who drew on the Geneva Congress materials brought by Jung. The Administrative Regulations were translated from German by Paul Lafargue with the help of Marx's daughter Laura, since there was no French text among the above-mentioned materials. The manuscripts of Marx and Lafargue are extant. Marx cut out paragraphs IV and V from the leaflet and pasted them into his manuscript. When preparing the Rules for the press, Lafargue rewrote the second page of Marx's manuscript and repasted the cutting into it. The rewritten passages in Marx's manuscript were crossed out. The publication appeared in London in November 1866 as a separate pamphlet, *Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Statuts et règlements*. p. 430

<sup>335</sup> In October and November 1866, in reply to the basket-makers' refusal to dissolve their trade unions and accept lower wages, the employers declared a lockout and tried to import Belgian workers for use as strike-breakers. The General Council's measures compelled the employers to make concessions. p. 431

- 336 On the General Council's support of the Paris bronzeworkers' strike in February and March 1867, see Note 325.

In April 1867 nearly 7,000 London tailors went on strike demanding fixed rates for all branches of the clothing industry in all the big cities of England. Thanks to assistance organised by the General Council from the workers of France, Belgium, Switzerland and Germany, the strikers held out for several months. p. 431

- 337 A reference to the Act of Parliamentary Reform finally passed by the British Parliament on August 15, 1867. It extended suffrage to persons who lived in towns not less than 12 months and were tenants of houses or flats. In the counties the right to vote was granted to tenants with an annual income of £12. As a result, the number of voters increased from 1,000,000 to 2,000,000. The electoral right extended not only to the middle-class strata of town and country, but also to the comparatively well-to-do upper stratum of the working class. The bulk of the working people of Britain, however, as before, had no right to vote. p. 432

- 338 The *National Reform League* was founded in London in 1849 by Bronterre O'Brien and other Chartist leaders. Its objective was to campaign for universal suffrage and social reforms. In 1866 the League became affiliated to the International. Its leaders Alfred Walton and George Milner joined the General Council and took part in several congresses of the International. p. 435

- 339 Marx informed the General Council about the affiliation of the Communist Club in New York, and also of a group of its supporters in Hoboken, on July 23, 1867 (see Note 327).

The *National Labor Union* was founded in the USA at a congress in Baltimore, in August 1866 with the active participation of William Sylvis, a prominent leader in the American labour movement. The Labor Union established contacts with the International Working Men's Association in October 1866, but its delegate to the next congress of the International, Richard Trevellick, elected by the Union's Congress in Chicago in August 1867, was unable to come to Lausanne. At the last sittings of the Basle Congress of the International (September 1869) Andrew Cameron was the National Labor Union delegate. At its congress in Cincinnati in August 1870, the Union adopted a resolution on its adherence to the principles of the International Association and its intention to join it. However, the resolution was not implemented. Its leaders soon became involved in utopian projects of money reform. In 1870 and 1871, many trade unions withdrew, and in 1872 the Union virtually ceased to exist.

The *International Iron-moulders' Union* was founded in 1859 and finally took shape in 1863 under the leadership of William Sylvis, who became its President. The Union combined the local iron-moulders' associations on a national scale and had its organisations in British Columbia and Canada. It led the strike movement and did much to strengthen other US trade unions. p. 437

- 340 The special report by Peter Fox, the Corresponding Secretary for America at the time, was included, somewhat abridged, in the French version of the General Council's report to the Lausanne Congress. It has also survived as Fox's own manuscript, inserted into the Minute Book of the General Council (Fox read this special report at a Council meeting on August 27, 1867). Fox's report was published in English for the first time in the book *The General Council of the First International. 1866-1868*. Moscow, 1964, pp. 304-10.



The manuscript version of the report stated, among other things, that Marx had given Fox a letter from F. A. Sorge, of July 10, 1867, written in the name of the Hoboken branch of the International Working Men's Association, and also the Statutes of the New York Communist Club, which had become affiliated to the Association. p. 437

<sup>341</sup> A reference to the International Iron-moulders' Union (see Note 339). In a letter from its President, Sylvis, read at the General Council meeting of July 9, 1867, it was stated that the Union had expended \$35,000 in 1866 and \$40,000 in 1867 to support the workers' strikes. p. 437

<sup>342</sup> When a branch secretary of the Boiler-Makers' Society embezzled trade-union funds, the society sued him. In January 1867, the Court of Queen's Bench ruled that the funds of trade unions, as allegedly unlawful organisations, were not entitled to legal protection. This ruling was one manifestation of the campaign launched by the ruling classes against the trade unions, which were demanding the legal rights enjoyed by other societies in Britain.

For the investigation into trade-union activities by a special royal commission, see Note 326. p. 437

<sup>343</sup> For the prosecution of the organisers of the Paris tailors' strike, see Note 325. For the massacre of the Belgian workers in Marchiennes, see Note 324. p. 437

<sup>344</sup> The French text has the following signatures after these words:

"In the name of the General Council:

*Odger*, President

*Eccarius*, General Secretary

*W. Dell*, Treasurer

*Shaw*, Secretary-Treasurer

Corresponding Secretaries:

*E. Dupont* for France

*K. Marx* for Germany

*Zabicki* for Poland

*H. Jung* for Switzerland

*P. Fox* for America

*Besson* for Belgium

*Carter* for Italy

*P. Lafargue* for Spain

*Hansen* for Holland and Denmark."

p. 437

<sup>345</sup> As is evident from Marx's letter to Engels of October 4, 1867 (see present edition, Vol. 42), the proposal to abolish the office of the General Council's President was moved on Marx's initiative.

The abolition of this post, held by George Odger permanently since 1864, reflected the battle being fought by Marx and his followers to isolate, and weaken the position of, the trade-union reformist leaders in the governing bodies of International.

In its resolution on the organisational question, the Basle Congress of the International in 1869 approved this decision of the General Council. p. 438

<sup>346</sup> Wilhelm Liebknecht was elected to the North-German Imperial Diet by one of the Saxon electoral districts. The returns became known on September 20, 1867. p. 438

<sup>347</sup> In early 1867 a conflict arose between the ruling circles of Prussia and France, both claiming the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, which was connected by

personal union with the Netherlands (the King of the Netherlands was the Grand Duke of Luxemburg) and was also a member of the German Confederation. But when the latter was dissolved in 1866, Luxemburg refused to enter the North-German Confederation formed under Prussia's aegis. Napoleon III and the King of the Netherlands struck a bargain over the sale of Luxemburg to France, but Bismarck blocked this by using the Prussian garrison which has been sent to the Duchy when the German Confederation still existed. In May 1867 the Luxemburg question was discussed at an international conference in London which made it incumbent upon both powers to guarantee Luxemburg's former status and neutrality. Prussia was to withdraw its troops from the Duchy. The Luxemburg conflict was accompanied by military preparations and noisy militarist propaganda in these countries and was a stage in the preparations for the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71.

Liebkecht's speech in the North-German Imperial Diet on October 17, 1867 was reproduced in the report of the General Council meeting on October 22, published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 315, October 26, 1867. Marx attached great importance to this speech; he asked Lafargue to translate it into French and send it to France for the publication in *Le Courrier français*.

p. 438

<sup>348</sup> See Note 294.

The manuscript of this letter has not come down to us. Judging by a letter of October 5, 1867, which has survived, from Mrs. Marx to Becker and his reply to her on October 7, this material was sent by her to Geneva on about October 5.

p. 439

<sup>349</sup> For the Lausanne Congress of the International Working Men's Association, see Note 331.

For the congress of the League of Peace and Freedom in Geneva, see Notes 155 and 329.

p. 439

<sup>350</sup> The *Manchester School*—a trend in political economy expressing the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie. It favoured free trade and non-interference by the state in the economy. The Free Traders' stronghold was Manchester, where the movement was led by Cobden and Bright, two textile manufacturers who founded the Anti-Corn Law League in 1838. In the 1840s and 1850s the Free Traders were an independent political group which later formed the Left wing of the Liberal Party.

p. 439

<sup>351</sup> The Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association were approved by the Geneva Congress at its sittings on September 5 and 8, 1866. The Rules were based on the Provisional Rules drawn up by Marx in October 1864 (see this volume, pp. 14-16), into which some changes and additions were inserted. The Administrative Regulations were worked out during the Geneva Congress by a commission of which Ecarius was a member. Both documents were published in German by J. Ph. Becker in *Der Vorbote*, No. 9, September 1866. Subsequently, they were published in French and English in the reports on the Congress or in other forms in the various periodicals of the International.

Marx personally took part in preparing two of these editions. In the autumn of 1866, by the General Council's decision, he and Lafargue worked on a French translation of the Rules and Regulations, which was reproduced in the membership cards. As most of them were seized on the French frontier (for details see Note 334), the edition was not widely circulated.

The following autumn, after the Lausanne Congress, Georg Eccarius, with the knowledge and support of Marx, prepared a new official edition of the Rules and Administrative Regulations in English. On November 5, 1867, the General Council sanctioned the publication of 1,000 copies, presumably delayed for lack of funds. At the Council meeting on December 17, Marx offered to advance his own money for the publication, and the pamphlet was brought out in London at the end of 1867.

In the 1867 English edition the Rules and Regulations were given in the form adopted at the Geneva Congress. Unlike the above-mentioned French edition of 1866, which reproduced the text of the Preamble but gave only the first six paragraphs of the Rules, designated as "articles", and omitted the remaining six paragraphs (perhaps through the carelessness of the publisher who had undertaken to print membership cards containing the Rules and Regulations) the English edition of 1867 gave all 12 paragraphs. In both editions, French and English, the number and sequence of paragraphs in the Regulations did not coincide: the French text has 15 paragraphs, the English has 13. There are also textual differences.

This volume reproduces the text of 1867 English edition of the Rules and Administrative Regulations which was approved by Marx and later used by him in subsequent work on these documents. The most important discrepancies with the 1866 French edition are given in footnotes.

p. 441

## NAME INDEX

## A

- Adams, Charles Francis* (1807-1886)—American diplomat and politician, Republican, the US envoy to London (1861-64).—355
- Aesop* (also *Esop*) (6th cent. B.C.)—semi-legendary Greek fabulist.—25, 244, 279
- Aiguillon, Emmanuel Armand Vignerot-Duplessis-Richelieu, duc d'* (1720-1788)—French statesman, Foreign Minister (1770-74).—317-18
- Alaux, Jules-Émile* (1828-1903)—French journalist.—414
- Aldovrandi, P.*—member of the Association of Mutual Progress (Mazzini organisation of Italian workers in London); member of the Central Council of the International (October 1864-April 1865).—20, 353
- Alexander I* (1777-1825)—Emperor of Russia (1801-25).—199, 323-26
- Alexander Ludwig Georg, Prince of Hesse* (1823-1888)—Austrian general; at first commanded a brigade and later a division in the Italian war of 1859 and an allied corps in Austria during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—172, 179
- Alexander of Darmstadt*—see *Alexander Ludwig Georg, Prince of Hesse*
- Anna Ivanovna* (1693-1740)—Duchess of Courland (1710-30), Empress of Russia (1730-40); Peter I's niece.—312
- Anna Pavlovna* (1795-1865)—daughter of Emperor Paul I of Russia, Alexander I's sister, whom Napoleon I proposed; from 1816, Queen of the Netherlands (wife of William II, Prince of Orange).—326
- Applegarth, Robert* (1833-1925)—cabinet-maker, a trade union leader, General Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners (1862-71), member of the London Trades Council; member of the General Council of the International (1865, 1868-72); delegate to the Basle Congress of the International (1869); one of the Reform League leaders; subsequently left the working-class movement.—380
- August(us) II (the Strong)* (1670-1733)—King of Poland (1697-1706, 1709-33) and Elector of Saxony as Frederick Augustus I (1694-1733).—312
- August(us) III* (1696-1763)—King of Poland (1734-63) and Elector of Saxony (from 1733) as Frederick Augustus II; son of Augustus II.—312
- Aveling, Edward* (1851-1898)—English journalist, socialist; one of the translators of Volume I of *Capital* into English.—216

## B

- Bagnagatti, G.*—secretary of the Association of Mutual Progress (Mazzini organisation of Italian workers in London); member of the Central Council of the International (November 1864 to 1865).—20
- Bangya, János (Johann)* (1817-1868)—Hungarian journalist and army officer; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; Kossuth's emissary abroad after the defeat of the revolution and at the same time a secret police agent; later served in the Turkish army under the name of Mehemed Bey.—92, 93
- Bars, Franciszek* (1760-1812)—Polish lawyer, stood for reforms; a refugee after the second partition of Poland (1793); took part in the preparation of the uprising under Kościuszko (1794); representative of Kościuszko's insurgents in the French Convention.—320-21
- Barton, John* (1789-1852)—British economist; represented the classical school of political economy.—147
- Bastiat, Frédéric* (1801-1850)—French economist; preached harmony of class interests in bourgeois society.—32, 95, 207, 260, 261, 262
- Beales, Edmond* (1803-1881)—English lawyer, radical, President of the British National League for the Independence of Poland; supported the North during the American Civil War; President of the Reform League (1865-69).—97
- Becker, Bernhard* (1826-1891)—German journalist, follower of Lassalle, President of the General Association of German Workers (1864-65); subsequently supported Eisenachers; delegate to the Hague Congress of the International (1872).—92-96
- Becker, Johann Philipp* (1809-1886)—German revolutionary, took part in the German and Swiss democratic movement in the 1830s and 1840s and in the 1848-49 revolution; organised sections of the International in Switzerland and Germany; delegate to the London (1865) Conference and all the congresses of the International, editor of *Der Vorbote* (1866-71); friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—95, 358, 366, 388, 390, 395, 397, 398, 439-40
- Beethoven, Ludwig van* (1770-1827)—German composer.—390
- Beluze, Jean Pierre* (1821-1908)—French petty-bourgeois socialist, cabinet-maker, follower of Cabet, director of the Crédit au Travail bank (1862-68); one of the founders of *L'Association*, organ of the co-operative movement; member of the International, subsequently left the working-class movement.—82-83, 396
- Bem, Józef* (1794-1850)—Polish general, took part in the Polish insurrection of 1830-31 and the revolutionary struggle in Vienna in 1848; a leader of the Hungarian revolutionary army (1848-49); after the defeat of the revolution emigrated to Turkey.—197
- Benedek, Ludwig von* (1804-1881)—Austrian general, took part in the suppression of the peasant uprising in Galicia in 1846 and of the national liberation movements in Italy and Hungary in 1848 and 1849; commanded a corps during the Italian war of 1859; chief of staff of the Austrian army in 1860; commander-in-chief of the Austrian army during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—166, 167, 171, 175, 176, 177, 179-81
- Benoît, Gedeon*—Prussian diplomat; secretary of the Prussian embassy in Warsaw, an envoy (1763-76).—316
- Bernis, François Joachim Pierre de* (1715-1794)—French statesman, diplomat and writer, abbé, cardinal from 1758; Foreign Minister (1757-58).—313
- Besson, Alexander*—mechanic, French refugee in London, member of the

- General Council of the International (1866-68), Corresponding Secretary for Belgium, a leader of the French branch in London, belonged to the group of petty-bourgeois republicans.—423
- Bismarck-Schönhausen, Otto, Prince von* (1815-1898)—statesman of Prussia and Germany, diplomat; Ambassador to St. Petersburg (1859-62) and Paris (1862); Prime Minister of Prussia (1862-72, 1873-90), Chancellor of the North German Confederation (1867-71) and of the German Empire (1871-90); carried through the unification of Germany by counter-revolutionary means.—62, 74, 165, 225, 360, 395, 416, 438
- Blackmore* (or *Blackmoor*)—participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall, London; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65).—21, 352, 354
- Blind, Karl* (1826-1907)—German journalist, democrat; took part in the Baden revolutionary movement in 1848-49; a leader of the German petty-bourgeois refugees in London in the 1850s; National-Liberal in the 1860s.—22-25, 87
- Bobczynski, Konstantin*—took part in the Polish insurrection of 1863, then emigrated to London; member of the General Council of the International (1865-68), Corresponding Secretary for Poland (from May 1866); participant in the London (1865) Conference; moved to Birmingham in 1866.—411
- Bocquet, Jean Baptiste*—French democrat, Republican, took part in the 1848 revolution in France and emigrated to London after its defeat; participant in the meeting held on September 28, 1864 in St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65).—20, 363
- Boisguillebert, Pierre Le Pesant, sieur de* (1646-1714)—French economist, forerunner of Physiocrats; father of French classical political economy.—274
- Bolleter, Heinrich*—German refugee in London, member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London; member of the Central Council of the International (November 1864 to 1865); participant in the London (1865) Conference.—20, 100, 366
- Bonaparte*—see *Napoleon I*
- Bonaparte*—see *Napoleon III*
- Bonaparte, Joseph* (1768-1844)—Napoleon I's eldest brother, King of Naples (1806-08) and of Spain (1808-13).—323
- Bonaparte, Prince Napoléon Joseph Charles Paul* (1822-1891)—Napoleon III's cousin; adopted the name of Jérôme after the death of his elder brother (1847); went by the name of Plon-Plon and the Red Prince.—36
- Booth, John Wilkes* (1839-1865)—American actor, supporter of the South in the American Civil War, assassin of President Abraham Lincoln.—99
- Bordage, P.*—member of the Central Council of the International (October 1864 to 1866), participant in the London (1865) Conference, member of the French branch in London.—20, 100, 363
- Borkheim, Sigismund Ludwig* (1826-1885)—German democratic journalist; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising, emigrated after its defeat; London merchant from 1851; was on friendly terms with Marx and Engels.—94
- B(o)ulgakov, Yakov Ivanovich* (1743-1809)—Russian diplomat, Ambassador to Poland (1790-December 1792).—319
- Bourbons*—royal dynasty in France (1589-1792, 1814-15, 1815-30), in

- Spain (1700-1808, 1814-68, 1874-1931 and since 1975), in Naples (1735-1806, 1815-60) and in Parma (1798-1859).—311, 312, 322
- Bowring, Sir John* (1792-1872)—English politician, linguist and man of letters, free trader.—390
- Breitschwert, Otto Ludwig* (pseudonym *L. Otto*) (1836-1890)—German journalist; member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—20
- Bright, John* (1811-1889)—English manufacturer and politician, a Free Trade leader and a founder of the Anti-Corn Law League; leader of the Left wing of the Liberal Party from the early 1860s; held several ministerial posts.—439
- Brisot de Warville, Jacques Pierre* (1754-1793)—French journalist, took an active part in the French Revolution; member of the National Convention, a Girondist leader.—28
- Broglié, Charles-François, comte de* (1719-1781)—French diplomat, after 1852 ambassador at the court of the King of Poland and Elector of Saxony, Augustus III, for some years; chief of the secret diplomatic service of Louis XV.—314-15
- Broaner, Eduard*—German physician, democrat, deputy to the Baden Constituent Assembly (1849), emigrated to England.—23
- Buckley, James*—British trade-unionist, member of the General Council of the International (November 1864 to 1869).—20, 100
- Burkhard, A.*—German refugee in Manchester, Secretary of the Board of Directors of the Schiller Institute in the 1860s.—404
- Burns, Robert* (1759-1796)—Scottish poet, democrat.—381
- C
- Cabet, Étienne* (1788-1856)—French writer, utopian communist, author of *Voyage en Icarie*.—31
- Carpenter, William Benjamin* (1813-1885)—English naturalist and physiologist.—390
- Carter, James*—a prominent figure of the English workers' movement, barber; member of the General Council of the International (October 1864 to 1867) and Corresponding Secretary for Italy (1866-67); participant in the London (1865) Conference, the Geneva (1866) and Lausanne (1867) congresses of the International.—20, 100, 352, 353, 354, 358, 368, 387, 411, 412, 413, 423
- Catherine II* (1762-1796)—Empress of Russia (1762-1796).—160, 199, 314, 316, 319, 320
- Cato, Marcus Porcius* (95-46 B.C.)—Roman statesman and philosopher, leader of the aristocratic republican party.—25
- Caulaincourt, Armand Augustin Louis, marquis de*, from 1808 *Duke of Vicenza* (1772-1827)—French general and statesman, Ambassador to Russia (1807-11), Foreign Minister (1813-14, 1815).—326
- Champagny, Jean-Baptiste Nompère de, duc de Cadore* (1756-1834)—French statesman and diplomat, Ambassador to Vienna (1801-04), Minister of the Interior (1804-07); Foreign Minister (1807-April 1811).—326
- Charles II* (1630-1685)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1660-85).—311
- Charles VI* (1685-1740)—Holy Roman Emperor (1711-40).—312, 313
- Charles X* (1757-1836)—King of France (1824-30).—196
- Charles XII* (1682-1718)—King of Sweden (1697-1718).—312
- Charras, Jean Baptiste Adolphe* (1810-1865)—French military leader and politician, moderate republican; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; took part in suppressing the June 1848 uprising of the Paris workers; opposed Louis Bonaparte;

- banished from France after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—327
- Chatham*—see *Pitt, William, Earl of Chatham*
- Chebuliez, Antoine Élisée* (1797-1869)—Swiss economist, tried to combine Sismondi's theory with elements of Ricardo's theory.—147
- Chodźko, Leonard* (1800-1871)—Polish politician, member of the Polish mission to Paris during the 1830-31 insurrection.—321
- Choiseul, Étienne François, duc de, comte de Stainville* (1719-1785)—French statesman and military leader; Foreign Minister (1758-61 and 1766-70), and at the same time War Minister (1761-70) and Naval Minister (1761-66); de facto leader of all French policy.—313, 317
- Christmas*—a Director of the Industrial Newspaper Company.—380
- Cialdini, Enrico, Duke of Gaeta* (1811-1892)—Italian general; took part in the national liberation war (1848-49), the Crimean (1853-56) and Italian (1859) wars; commanded a corps during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—172, 173, 175
- Clam-Gallas, Eduard, Count* (1805-1891)—Austrian general, Hungarian by birth; commanded a corps during the Italian war of 1859 and Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—179
- Clare, John* (1793-1864)—English poet, son of a farmhand, agricultural labourer.—381
- Clariol* (or *Clarion*)—delegate of the Paris Compositors' Society to the London (1865) Conference of the International.—397
- Collet, Joseph*—French journalist, republican, a refugee in London, editor of *The International Courier*, member of the General Council of the International (1866-67).—429
- Condillac, Étienne Bonnot de* (1715-1780)—French philosopher and economist, follower of Locke.—242, 278
- Cope, James*—British trade-unionist, Committee member of the London Boot-Closers' Society, member of the London Trades Council, the General Council of the International (1865-67), participant in the London (1865) Conference.—396
- Cornelius, D.*—member of the Central Council of the International.—21
- Coulson, Edwin (Edward)*—British trade-unionist, Secretary of the London branch of the Operative Bricklayers' Society; member of the London Trades Council, of the Central Council of the International (1865-66) and of the Executive Committee of the Reform League.—100, 380, 396
- Cowley, Henry Wellesley, Earl of* (1804-1884)—British diplomat, Ambassador to Paris (1852-67).—429
- Cremer, Sir William Randal* (1838-1908)—active participant in the British trade-union and pacifist movement, reformist; a founder of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners (1860); member of the London Trades Council, the British National League for the Independence of Poland, the Land and Labour League, participant in the inaugural meeting of the International, held at St. Martin's Hall (September 28, 1864); member of the General Council of the International (1864-66) and its General Secretary, delegate to the London Conference (1865) and the Geneva Congress (1866) of the International; member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League; opposed revolutionary tactics, subsequently Liberal M.P.—21, 100, 337, 339, 340, 351, 353-55, 357-58, 363-64, 365-67, 370, 376, 380, 384, 385, 396, 411, 412
- Crespelle* (or *Crespel*)—member of the General Council of the International (1866-67), member of the



- French branch in London where he upheld the General Council's policy.—339
- Créteineau-Joly, Jacques* (1803-1875)—French conservative historian; champion of legitimate monarchy.—326
- Cucchiari, Domenico* (1806-1900)—Italian general, commanded a division in the Italian war of 1859 and an Italian corps on the side of Prussia in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—174
- Czartoryski, Fryderyk Michał, prince* (1696-1775)—Polish statesman; the head of the noble family, entrusted with the great seal of Lithuania (in 1752); tried to carry out reforms with Russia's help.—314
- D
- Darwin, Charles Robert* (1809-1882)—English naturalist, founder of the theory of evolution by natural selection.—217, 225, 390
- Davis, Jefferson* (1808-1889)—American politician, big planter, Democrat; took an active part in the war with Mexico (1846-48); U.S. Secretary of War (1853-57); an organiser of the Southern slave-holders' revolt; President of the Confederate States of America (1861-65).—99
- Davison, A.*—Secretary of the Board of Directors of the Schiller Institute in Manchester at the end of the 1860s.—420
- Davout (Davoust), Louis Nicolas, duke of Auerstädt and prince of Eckmühl* (1770-1823)—marshal of France, participated in the wars of Napoleonic France, supreme ruler of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw and commander-in-chief of the Polish army (1807).—324
- Defoe, Daniel* (c. 1661-1731)—English writer and journalist; author of *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*.—381
- Delacroix de Contaut, Charles* (1741-1805)—French statesman and diplomat; member of Convention; Foreign Minister (1795-97).—321
- Dell, William*—interior decorator; active in the British working-class and democratic movement; member of the British National League for the Independence of Poland; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall, member of the General Council of the International (1864-69) and its Treasurer (1865, 1866-67); participated in the London (1865) Conference; a leader of the Reform League.—20, 100, 195, 351, 352, 423
- Della Rocca*—see *Morozzo della Rocca, Enrico*
- Denoual, Jules*—French democrat, participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall, London; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65).—20, 363, 393
- De Paepe, César* (1841-1890)—Belgian socialist, compositor, subsequently physician; one of the founders of the Belgian section of the International (1865); member of the Belgian Federal Council; delegate to the London (1865) Conference, the Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses, and to the London (1871) Conference of the International; following the Hague Congress (1872) supported the Bakuninists for some time; a founder of the Belgian Workers' Party (1885).—385, 389, 397, 401
- Destutt de Tracy, Antoine Louis Claude, comte de* (1754-1836)—French economist, philosopher; advocate of constitutional monarchy.—294
- Dick, Alexander*—British trade-unionist; member of the Amalgamated Bak-

- ers; member of the Central Council of the International (November 1864-February 1865); in connection with his removal to New Zealand (1865) was appointed Corresponding Secretary of the International for that country.—20
- Diderot, Denis* (1713-1784)—French philosopher of the Enlightenment, atheist; leader of the Encyclopaedists.—160
- Dombrowski (Dabrowski), Jan Henryk* (1755-1818)—Polish general, took part in the uprising of 1794 under Kościuszko; organised Polish legions in the French army; participated in the Napoleonic campaigns of 1806-07, 1809 and 1812.—321, 322, 323
- Dronke, Ernst* (1822-1891)—German journalist, "true socialist", later member of the Communist League and an editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*; emigrated to England after the 1848-49 revolution; supporter of Marx and Engels; subsequently gave up politics.—92
- Dujonquoy*—owner of the New York Hotel in London (1865).—339
- Dumesnil-Marigny, Jules* (1810-1885)—French economist and journalist; member of the International (1865); participant in the London (1865) Conference of the International.—397
- Duncker, Franz Gustav* (1822-1888)—Berlin publisher and politician; belonged to the Party of Progress; founder and editor of the *Volks-Zeitung*.—208, 215
- Dunoyer, Barthélemy Charles Pierre Joseph* (1786-1862)—French economist and politician.—31
- Dupleix, François*—French refugee in Switzerland, bookbinder; a founder of the French section of the International in Geneva; delegate to the London (1865) Conference and the Geneva (1866) and Lausanne (1867) congresses of the International.—385, 397
- Dupont, Eugène* (c. 1831-1881)—prominent figure in the French and international working-class movement; musical instrument maker; took part in the June 1848 uprising in Paris; from 1862 on, lived in London; member of the General Council of the International (November 1864 to 1872), Corresponding Secretary for France (1865-71), participant in the London Conference (1865) and the Geneva Congress (1866); Chairman of the Lausanne Congress (1867) and delegate to the Brussels Congress (1868), the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872); associate of Marx and Engels; became a member of the British Federal Council of the International in 1872; moved to the USA in 1874.—20, 100, 339, 340, 364, 369, 413, 423
- Durando, Giacomo* (1807-1894)—Italian general; commanded an Italian corps on the side of Prussia during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—174
- Dutton, Ralph*—member of the Central Council of the International, participated in the discussion on the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—411

## E

- Eccarius, Johann Georg (John George)* (1818-1889)—prominent figure in the international and German working-class movement, tailor; member of the League of the Just, later of the Communist League; a founder of the German Workers' Educational Society in London; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-72), Council's General Secretary (1867-71), Corresponding Secretary for America (1870-72); delegate to all the Internation-

- al's congresses and conferences; was associate of Marx; in the spring of 1872 joined the reformist leaders of the British trade unions.—20, 97, 100, 339, 367, 368, 380, 411, 413, 423, 439, 446
- Edelsheim* (from 1868 *Edelsheim-Gyulai*), *Leopold Wilhelm* (1826-1893)—Austrian general, commander of a cavalry division during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—177, 180
- Edward III* (1312-1377)—King of England (1327-77).—254, 288
- Elliott, Ebenezer* (1781-1849)—English poet, son of a smith; depicted the condition of the English workers.—381
- Engel, Ernst* (1821-1896)—German statistician, head of the royal Prussian statistical bureau in Berlin (1860-82).—45
- Engels, Frederick* (1820-1895).—24, 80, 81, 85-90, 93, 95, 214, 216, 239, 241, 253, 259, 345, 404, 420
- Erlanger, Raphael, von*—Frankfurt banker.—64
- Ernst* (1824-1899)—Austrian archduke, general, commanded a corps during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—181
- F
- Facey, Thomas Grant*—British trade-unionist; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall, London; member of the Central Council of the International (October 1864), member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League.—380
- Favier, Jean-Louis* (1711-1784)—French journalist; an agent of the secret diplomatic service of Louis XV; diplomat in Russia and other countries; several of his works were published by L. Ph. Ségur in *Politique de tous les cabinets de l'Europe*.—314, 316-17
- Ferdinand II* (1810-1859)—King of the Two Sicilies (1830-59).—312
- Ferdinand, Karl Josef von Este* (1781-1850)—Austrian archduke; field marshal, fought against Napoleonic France; commander-in-chief of the troops which invaded the Grand Duchy of Warsaw in 1809.—325
- Ferrier, François Louis Auguste* (1777-1861)—French economist, government official, advocate of mercantilism.—207
- Feuerbach, Ludwig Andreas* (1804-1872)—German materialist philosopher.—26, 200
- Flies, Eduard von* (1802-1886)—Prussian general, commander of a cavalry brigade and then a division during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—179
- Fontaine, Léon*—Belgian journalist; active participant in the democratic movement; Central Council's Corresponding Secretary *pro tem* for Belgium (1865); delegate to the Brussels Congress (1868) of the International.—365, 401
- Fontana, Giuseppe* (1840-1876)—a leader of the Association of Mutual Progress (Mazzini organisation of Italian workers in London); member of the Central Council of the International (October 1864 to 1865); Corresponding Secretary for Italy (1864-65).—20, 353, 355, 357, 359
- Fourier, François Marie Charles* (1772-1837)—French utopian socialist.—26, 215, 231
- Fox, Peter (André, Peter Fox)* (d. 1869)—journalist, active member of the British democratic and working-class movement; Positivist; a leader of the British National League for the Independence of Poland; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-69); General Secretary of the Council

- (September-November 1866); Corresponding Secretary for America (1866-67); an editor of *The Commonwealth* (1866); member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League.—20, 97, 100, 311, 312, 313, 332, 339, 354-56, 363, 365, 366, 368, 411, 412-14, 416, 423
- Francis I* (1768-1835)—Emperor of Austria (1804-35); Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire under the name of Francis II (1792-1806).—327
- Franklin, Benjamin* (1706-1790)—American physicist, economist, politician; took part in the war of the North American colonies for independence.—122, 378
- Frederick II (the Great)* (1712-1786)—King of Prussia (1740-86).—313-14, 315, 316
- Frederick Augustus I* (1750-1827)—Elector of Saxony as Frederick Augustus III (1763-1806); King of Saxony (1806-27).—323
- Frederick Charles (Friedrich Karl Nikolaus), Prince* (1828-1885)—Prussian general, commander-in-chief of the Prussian, and later of the allied Prussian and Austrian army in the Danish war of 1864; commander of the 1st Prussian Army in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—166, 177, 180
- Frederick William II* (1744-1797)—King of Prussia (1786-97).—318
- Frederick William III* (1770-1840)—King of Prussia (1797-1840).—165, 324
- Frederick William (Friedrich Wilhelm Nikolaus Karl)* (1831-1888)—Crown Prince of Prussia and the German Empire; son of William I; general, commanded the 2nd Prussian Army during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866; King of Prussia and Emperor of Germany as Frederick III (1888).—166, 177, 180
- Frémont, John Charles* (1813-1890)—American explorer and politician, belonged to the Left wing of the Republican Party; took an active part in the conquest of California during the Mexican war (1846-48); was nominated for the presidency in 1856; during the Civil War commander of the Northern Army in Missouri (till November 1861) and Virginia (1862).—24
- Fribourg, Ernest Edourd*—active figure in the French working-class movement; engraver, subsequently businessman; Right-wing proudhonist; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; a leader of the International's Paris Section; delegate to the London Conference (1865) and the Geneva Congress (1866); in 1871 he published the book *L'Association internationale des travailleurs* which was hostile to the International and the Paris Commune.—82, 83, 329-31, 359, 385, 386, 393, 395-97, 413

## G

- Gablenz, Ludwig Karl Wilhelm, Baron von* (1814-1874)—Austrian general, commanded a brigade during the Italian war of 1859 and a corps in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—180
- Gardner, Robert*—British manufacturer; in 1844 shortened the working day from 12 to 11 hours at his cotton mills in Preston.—304
- Garibaldi, Giuseppe* (1807-1882)—Italian revolutionary, democrat, chief organiser of the defence of the Roman Republic in April-June 1849; headed the struggle of the Italian people for national liberation and the unification of Italy in the 1850s and 1860s.—176
- Geib, August* (1842-1879)—German bookseller in Hamburg; Social-

- Democrat; member of the General Association of German Workers; participant in the Eisenach Congress (1869); a founder of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party; Treasurer of the party (1872-78), deputy to the Imperial Diet (1874-77).—223
- Gérard, Balhasar* (1558-1584)—fanatic Catholic who in 1584 assassinated Prince William of Orange, leader of the Netherland bourgeois revolution of the sixteenth century.—99
- Gladstone, William Ewart* (1809-1898)—British statesman, Tory, later Peelite; a leader of the Liberal Party in the latter half of the nineteenth century; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852-55 and 1859-66) and Prime Minister (1868-74, 1880-85, 1886 and 1892-94).—5, 7
- Gottraux, Jules*—a Swiss, who became a British subject; member of the International.—429
- Gounod, Charles François* (1818-1893)—French composer.—390
- Gray, Rodger W.*—British mason, President of the Board of Directors of *The Bee-Hive* Industrial Newspaper Company; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65).—20
- Gross, Heinrich* (d. 1765)—Russian diplomat, German by birth; Russian Ambassador to Warsaw in the 1850s-early 1860s; Minister Plenipotentiary to London in 1765.—314, 316
- Grossmith, John*—active member of the British democratic and working-class movement; member of the Central Council of the International (November 1864 to 1865).—20, 352
- Grün, Karl Theodor Ferdinand* (pen-name *Ernst von der Haide*) (1817-1887)—German journalist, "true socialist" in the mid-1840s.—28
- Gustavus III* (1746-1792)—King of Sweden (1771-92).—317

## H

- Hales, John* (b. 1839)—British trade-unionist; weaver; member of the General Council of the International (1866-72) and its Secretary (1871-72); delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872) of the International; headed the reformist wing of the British Federal Council from the beginning of 1872; expelled from the International in 1873.—411, 413, 438
- Händel, Georg Friedrich* (1685-1759)—German composer.—390
- Hansen, N. P.*—a Dane, member of the General Council of the International (December 1864 to 1867), participated in the London Conference of the International (1865); Corresponding Secretary for Denmark (1866), and for Denmark and Holland (1867).—20, 100, 423
- Hartwell, Robert*—active member of the British democratic and working-class movement, printer, former Chartist, an editor of *The Bee-Hive*; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65); was on the Reform League's Executive Committee.—21, 353
- Hatzfeld(t), Sophie, Countess von* (1805-1881)—German aristocrat, friend and supporter of Lassalle.—88, 94
- Haufe, Albert F.*—German tailor, lived in London, member of the Central Council of the International (1866).—163
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich* (1770-1831)—German philosopher.—26, 257
- Heine, Heinrich* (1797-1856)—German revolutionary poet.—91

- Helvétius, Claude Adrien* (1715-1771)—French philosopher of the Enlightenment, atheist.—31
- Henry VII* (1457-1509)—King of England (1485-1509).—288
- Herwarth von Bittenfeld, Karl Eberhard* (1796-1884)—Prussian general, took part in the Danish war of 1864, commanded the Army of the Elbe in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—177, 180
- Herwegh, Georg Friedrich* (1817-1875)—German democratic poet, in the 1860s supported Lassalle.—87
- Hess, Moses* (1812-1875)—German radical journalist, one of the chief representatives of "true socialism" in the mid-1840s; member of the Communist League; after the split in the League he sided with the Willich-Schapper separatist group; a Lassallean in the 1860s; participant in the Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses of the International.—36, 89
- Heydt, August, Baron von der* (1801-1874)—Prussian conservative statesman; Elberfeld banker; Minister of Trade, Industry and Public Works (December 1848 to 1862).—223
- Hobbes, Thomas* (1588-1679)—English philosopher.—128
- Hofstetten, Johann Baptist* (d. 1887)—Bavarian army officer; a Lassallean; publisher and an editor of *Der Social-Demokrat* (1864-67).—219, 221, 223, 389
- Hohenzollerns*—dynasty of Brandenburg Electors (1415-1701), Prussian Kings (1701-1918) and German Emperors (1871-1918).—200
- Hollinger, Fidelio*—owner of a printshop in London which printed *Das Volk*.—23, 24
- Holtorp, Emile*—Polish refugee in London, member of the Central Council of the International (October 1864 to 1866), Corresponding Secretary for Poland (1864-65); delegate to the London (1865) Conference of the International, in 1866 joined the International Republican Committee set up by Mazzini.—20, 100, 351, 355, 370
- Homer*—semi-legendary Greek epic poet.—88
- Hooson, Edward*—active member of the co-operative movement in Manchester, took part in the Reform Movement.—337
- Howell, George* (1833-1910)—British mason, a reformist leader of the British trade unions; former Char- tist; Secretary of the London Trades Council (1861-62), participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (October 1864 to 1869); participant in the London (1865) Conference of the International; Secretary of the Reform League; opposed revolutionary tactics.—20, 100, 363, 366, 394, 396
- Hugo, Victor Marie* (1802-1885)—French writer; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, opposed Louis Bonaparte.—201
- Huxley, Thomas Henry* (1825-1895)—English naturalist, close associate of Charles Darwin and populariser of his teaching.—390

## I

*Ivan III* (1440-1505)—Grand Duke of Muscovy (1462-1505).—159

## J

*Janks, A.*—member of the Central Council of the International (1865).—100

*Jellachich (Jellačić), Josef, Count* (1801-1859)—Austrian general, Ban of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia (1848-59); took part in suppressing

- the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary and Austria.—199
- Johnson, Andrew* (1808-1875)—American statesman, Democrat; Senator (1858-62); supporter of the North in the American Civil War, Vice-President (1864) and President of the United States (1865-69); pursued a policy of compromise with the Southern planters.—99, 100, 365-66
- Jones, Ernest Charles* (1819-1869)—outstanding figure in the British working-class movement, proletarian poet and journalist; a leader of the Left-wing Chartists; took part in the work of the International in the 1860s, an organiser of the Reform Movement, friend of Marx and Engels.—337, 353, 365, 384
- Jones, Richard* (1790-1855)—one of the last English classical political economists.—147
- Joséphine Beauharnais* (1763-1814)—Napoleon Bonaparte's wife (from 1796); was crowned in 1804, divorced in 1809.—326
- Jouffroy, Henri*—Prussian privy councillor, French by birth; author and translator of several books on political economy and law (1820s-40s).—261
- Jourdain, Gustave*—French democrat; a refugee in London after the 1848 revolution; member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—20
- Jung, Hermann* (1830-1901)—prominent figure in the international and Swiss working-class movement, watchmaker; member of the General Council of the International and Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland (November 1864 to 1872); Treasurer of the General Council (1871-72); participant in the London Conference (1865), Chairman of the Geneva (1866), Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses and of the London Conference (1871) of the International; member of the British Federal Council; supported Marx in the British Federal Council before the Hague Congress of 1872; later joined the reformists of the British trade unions.—20, 98, 100, 331, 335, 337, 339, 340, 353, 354-55, 356, 364, 365, 370, 376, 380, 387-89, 392, 400, 413, 414, 423
- K
- Kant, Immanuel* (1724-1804)—German philosopher.—27, 29
- Karamzin, Nikolai Mikhailovich* (1766-1826)—Russian historian and writer.—198
- Kaub (Kolb), Karl (Charles)*—German worker, a refugee in London and after 1865 in Paris; member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London; member of the Central Council of the International (November 1864 to 1865), participant in the London Conference of 1865; again was a member of the General Council in 1870-71.—20, 100, 363, 368, 380
- Kisseleff (Kiselev), Pavel Dmitrievich, Count* (1788-1872)—Russian statesman; fought in the war against Napoleon (1812); Governor of Moldavia and Wallachia (1829-34); from 1835 permanent member of secret committees on the peasant question; Minister of the Imperial Domains from 1837; advocate of moderate reforms; Ambassador to Paris (1856-62).—252
- Klapka, György (Georg)* (1820-1892)—general in the Hungarian revolutionary army (1848-49); commandant of the Komorn fortress (June-September 1849).—93
- Klimasch, H.*—member of the Central Council of the International (1865).—100
- Klings, Karl*—German metal-worker, member of the Communist League and then of the General Association

of German Workers; emigrated to the United States (1865); took an active part in the Chicago section of the International.—95

*Kniaziewicz, Karol Otton* (1762-1842)—Polish military leader and politician; took part in the uprising under Kościuszko (1794); commander of a Polish legion in the Napoleonic army; French brigade general; commanded a division in 1812; participant in the 1830-31 insurrection; head of the Polish mission to Paris (1830-31).—322

*Kolatschek, Adolph* (1821-1889)—Austrian journalist and politician; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848-49), petty-bourgeois democrat; publisher of the journals *Deutsche Monatsschrift* (1850-51) and *Stimmen der Zeit* (1858-62); founded the newspaper *Botschafter* (1862).—94

*Kościuszko, Thaddeus (Tadeusz Andrzej Bonawentura)* (1746-1817)—prominent figure in the Polish national liberation movement; leader of the 1794 uprising; took part in the war of the North American colonies for independence (1776-83).—318-20

*Kossuth, Lajos* (1802-1894)—leader of the Hungarian national liberation movement; head of the revolutionary government (1848-49); after the defeat of the revolution emigrated first to Turkey and later to England and the USA.—92

*Kourakin, Alexei Borisovich, Prince* (1759-1829)—Russian statesman; Minister of the Interior (1807-11).—325

*Kugelmann, Ludwig* (1828-1902)—German physician; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany, member of the First International; delegate to the Lausanne (1867) and the Hague (1872) congresses of the International; Marx's regular correspondent (1862-74); friend of Marx and Engels.—202

## L

*Lacretelle, Jean Charles Dominique de* (1766-1855)—French historian.—320

*Lacroix*—see *Delacroix de Contaut, Charles*

*Lafargue, Paul* (1842-1911)—prominent figure in the international and French working-class movement, member of the General Council of the International, Corresponding Secretary for Spain (1866-69); helped to organise the International's sections in France (1869-70), Spain and Portugal (1871-72); delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); a founder of the Workers' Party in France; disciple and associate of Marx and Engels; husband of Marx's daughter, Laura.—406, 411, 416, 423

*Lafayette (La Fayette), Marie Joseph Paul, marquis de* (1757-1834)—French general; took part in the war of the North American colonies for independence (1776-83); a leader of moderate constitutionalists (Feuillants) in the French Revolution; took part in the July Revolution of 1830.—196

*Lake, George*—British trade-unionist, carpenter, member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—20

*Lama, Domenico*—President of the Association of Mutual Progress (Mazini organisation of Italian workers in London); participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65).—20

*Laplace, Pierre Simon* (1749-1827)—French astronomer, mathematician and physicist.—217

*Lassalle, Ferdinand* (1825-1864)—German journalist, lawyer, petty-bourgeois socialist; took part in the



- democratic movement of the Rhine Province (1848-49); founder of the General Association of German Workers (1863) and its President; one of the originators of the opportunist trend in the German working-class movement.—24, 25, 87, 88, 91, 94, 95, 207, 210, 215, 216, 225
- Lassassie, F. de*—French refugee in London, barber; member of the General Council of the International (1865-68); member of the French branch in London where he advocated the General Council's policy; participant in the London (1865) Conference of the International.—100
- La Valette, Charles Jean Marie Félix, marquis de* (1806-1881)—French statesman, Minister of the Interior (1865-67).—429
- Lawrence, Matthew*—British trade-unionist, President of the Operative Tailors' Protective Association in London; member of the General Council of the International (1866-68); delegate to the Geneva Congress of the International (1866).—412
- Lefort, Henri* (1835-1917)—French lawyer, journalist, republican; member of *L'Association's* Editorial Board; took part in the preparations for the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; dissociated himself from the International (March 1865).—82, 83, 329-32, 335, 358, 359, 363, 364, 393
- Lelevel*—see *Lelewel, Joachim*
- Lelewel, Joachim* (1786-1861)—Polish historian and revolutionary; took part in the 1830-31 insurrection in Poland; a leader of the democratic wing of Polish refugees (1847-48); member of the Committee of the Brussels Democratic Association, favoured the idea of Russo-Polish revolutionary alliance.—324, 325
- Le Lubez, Victor* (b. 1834)—French refugee in London; was connected with republican and radical elements in France and Britain; took part in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-66); Corresponding Secretary for France (1864-65); participant in the London (1865) Conference of the International; expelled from the Council by the Geneva Congress (1866) for intrigue and slander.—20, 97, 329, 331, 332, 335-36, 339, 351, 352, 354-56, 358, 359, 363-64, 380, 384, 387, 388, 389, 392, 393, 401, 411
- Leopold II* (1747-1792)—Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire (1790-92).—319
- Leroux, Jules*—French republican, printer; refugee in England; member of the Central Council of the International (October 1864-March 1865); member of the French branch in London.—20, 363
- Lessner, Friedrich* (1825-1910)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement, tailor; member of the Communist League; participant in the revolution of 1848-49; prosecuted at the Cologne Communist Trial in 1852; a refugee in London from 1856; member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London and of the General Council of the International (November 1864 to 1872), participant in the London Conference (1865), the Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868), Basle (1869) and the Hague (1872) congresses of the International; member of the British Federal Council; later one of the founders of the British Independent Labour Party; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—20, 100, 339, 359, 380, 405, 413, 416

- Leszczyński, Stanislaus* (1677-1766)—palatine of Posen; King of Poland under the name of Stanislaus I (1704-11, 1733-36); Duke of Lorraine (from 1736); father-in-law of Louis XV of France.—312
- Leverson, Montague*—active member of the British working-class movement; participant in the Polish meeting of March 1, 1865, in London.—97
- Lewis, Leon*—American journalist; in 1865, in London, was elected member of the Central Council of the International and Corresponding Secretary for America; did not take part in the work of the Council.—370
- Liebkecht, Wilhelm* (1826-1900)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; participant in the revolution of 1848-49; member of the Communist League and of the International; delegate to the Basle Congress of the International (1869); deputy to the Imperial Diet from 1867; a founder and leader of the German Social-Democratic Party; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—94, 389, 438
- Limousin, Charles Mathieu* (1840-1909)—French working-class leader, printer, later journalist, follower of Proudhon; Secretary of the Board of *L'Association*; a leader of the Paris Section of the International; delegate to the London (1865) Conference of the International; active in the co-operative movement; published several journals.—82, 330, 331, 396
- Lincoln, Abraham* (1809-1865)—American statesman, a leader of the Republican Party, President of the United States (1861-65); during the Civil War, under pressure from the masses, carried out a number of important bourgeois-democratic reforms, thus making possible the adoption of revolutionary methods of warfare; assassinated by a slave-holders' agent in April 1865.—19, 20, 99, 100, 354, 355, 365, 407
- Linguet, Simon Nicolas Henri* (1736-1794)—French lawyer, writer, historian and economist, critic of the Physiocrats.—32
- List, Friedrich* (1789-1846)—German economist, supporter of Protectionism.—207
- Lochner, Georg(e)* (born c. 1824)—German joiner, active member of the German working-class movement; member of the Communist League and of the German Workers' Educational Society in London; member of the General Council of the International (November 1864 to 1872), delegate to the International's London conferences of 1865 and 1871; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—20, 100
- Longmaid, John*—active member of the British working-class movement; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65); member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League.—21, 100, 364
- Longuet, Charles* (1839-1903)—journalist, a prominent figure in the French working-class movement, Proudhonist; member of the General Council of the International (1866-67 and 1871-72); Corresponding Secretary for Belgium (1866); delegate to the Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868) and the Hague (1872) congresses and the London Conference (1871); member of the Paris Commune, later emigrated to England; subsequently joined the opportunist group of Possibilists; married to Marx's daughter, Jenny.—339, 364
- Louis XIV* (1638-1715)—King of France (1643-1715).—274, 311, 312

- Louis XV* (1710-1774)—King of France (1715-74).—59, 254, 287, 312, 317, 318
- Louis XVI* (1754-1793)—King of France (1774-92), executed during the French Revolution.—318
- Louis Napoleon*—see *Napoleon III*
- Louis Philippe* (1773-1850)—Duke of Orleans, King of the French (1830-48).—9
- Lucraft, Benjamin* (1809-1897)—a reformist leader of the British trade unions, furniture-maker; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International, held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-71); delegate to the Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses of the International; member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League; in 1871 refused to sign the General Council's address *The Civil War in France* and left the International.—21, 100, 365
- Lüning, Otto* (1818-1868)—German physician and writer, a "true socialist" in the mid-1840s, publisher of the *Neue Deutsche Zeitung* (1848-50), a National-Liberal from 1866.—24
- Luther, Martin* (1483-1546)—German theologian, writer, prominent figure of the Reformation; founder of Protestantism (Lutheranism) in Germany.—261
- Lyell, Charles* (1797-1875)—English chemist and geologist.—390
- M
- McCulloch, John Ramsay* (1789-1864)—British economist who vulgarised David Ricardo's theories.—293
- Malthus, Thomas Robert* (1766-1834)—English clergyman and economist, founder of the misanthropic theory of population.—27, 141
- Manteuffel, Edwin Hans Karl, Baron von* (1809-1885)—Prussian general; during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 commander of the Army on the Main, which operated against German states allied to Austria.—179
- Manteuffel, Otto Theodor, Baron von* (1805-1882)—Prussian conservative statesman, Minister of the Interior (November 1848-November 1850), Prime Minister and Foreign Minister (1850-58).—56, 58, 59, 63, 75, 223
- Mantz, Edwin Shelly*—member of the Central Council of the International (1865); Secretary of the Board of the Industrial Newspaper Company.—379, 380, 382-84
- Maria Fedorovna (Sophia Dorothea), princess of Württemberg* (1759-1828)—second wife (from 1776) of the heir-apparent to the Russian throne and Emperor (from 1796) Paul I; mother of Alexander I.—326
- Marie Louise* (1791-1847)—daughter of Francis I of Austria; married Napoleon I in 1810.—327
- Marie-Louise-Joséphine* (1782-1824)—wife of Duke Louis Bourbon of Parma; was placed by Napoleon at the head of the vassal kingdom of Etruria founded in 1801 and abolished in 1807.—323
- Marmont, Auguste Frédéric Louis Viesse, duc de* (1774-1852)—Marshal of France, fought in Napoleonic wars, sided with the Bourbons in April 1814.—325
- Martini*.—178
- Marx, Jenny (née von Westphalen)* (1814-1881)—Karl Marx's wife.—25, 390-91, 439-40
- Marx, Karl* (1818-1883).—20, 22-23, 33, 80, 87-96, 100, 103, 108, 109-11, 113, 114, 116-22, 124-31, 133, 134, 136, 138, 139, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 163, 196, 197, 201, 203, 207, 208, 210-17, 219-28, 229-32, 234-40, 247, 250, 251, 253, 255, 260, 261, 311-13, 314, 316, 318, 320, 321, 323, 327, 335, 337, 339,

- 351-60, 361-67, 369, 380, 384-89, 393, 401, 405, 411-13, 423-27, 438-40
- Mazzini, Giuseppe** (1805-1872)—Italian revolutionary, democrat, a leader of the Italian national liberation movement, headed the Provisional Government of the Roman Republic (1849); an organiser of the Central Committee of European Democracy in London (1850); when the International was founded in 1864, tried to bring it under his influence.—25, 393, 401
- Meissner, Otto Karl** (1819-1902)—Hamburg publisher; published *Capital* and some other works by Marx and Engels.—81, 84, 85, 207, 210, 214, 216, 224, 227, 229, 231, 238, 361-62
- Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Jakob Ludwig Felix** (1809-1847)—German composer.—390
- Menenius, Agrippa** (d. 493 B.C.)—Roman patrician.—106
- Mercy d'Argenteau, Florimund, Count** (1727-1794)—Austrian diplomat, minister to St. Petersburg (from 1761), Paris (1780) and London (1790).—317
- Mitchell, Sir Andrew** (1708-1771)—British diplomat and politician; envoy plenipotentiary to Berlin (1753-71).—316
- Moltke, Helmuth Karl Bernhard, Count von** (1800-1891)—Prussian military leader and writer; general, from 1871 field marshal; Chief of the Prussian (1857-71) and the imperial (1871-88) General Staff.—165
- Montalembert, Charles Forbes René de Tryon, comte de** (1810-1870)—French politician and journalist; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (1848-51); Orleanist, leader of the Catholic party; supported Louis Bonaparte during the coup d'état of December 2, 1851, but soon afterwards joined the opposition.—201
- Moore, Samuel** (1838-1911)—English lawyer, member of the International; translated into English Vol. I of Karl Marx's *Capital* (in collaboration with Edward Aveling) and the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*; friend of Marx and Engels.—216, 259
- Morau, Jean Victor Marie** (1763-1813)—French general; took part in the wars waged by the French Republic against European coalitions.—322
- Morgan, William**—shoemaker, active member of the British working-class movement; member of the General Council of the International (October 1864 to 1868); took part in the work of the Reform League.—20, 100, 355, 363-64, 380, 387, 396
- Morisot**—member of the General Council of the International (1864).—20
- Morozzo della Rocca, Enrico** (1807-1897)—Italian general, chief of Piedmontese General Staff in the Italian war of 1859; commander of an Italian corps on the side of Prussia during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—174
- Morton, John Chalmers** (1821-1888)—English agronomist, editor of the *Agricultural Gazette* (1844-88).—112
- Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus** (1756-1791)—Austrian composer.—390

## N

- Napier, Sir William Francis Patrick** (1785-1860)—English general and military historian; fought in the Peninsular war against Napoleon I (1808-14).—52
- Napoleon I (Bonaparte)** (1769-1821)—Emperor of the French (1804-14 and 1815), general before 1804, First Consul for life (1799-1804).—33, 165, 199, 321-27, 355
- Napoleon III (Charles Louis Napoleon Bonaparte)** (1808-1873)—Napoleon I's nephew, President of the Second

- Republic (1848-51), Emperor of the French (1852-70).—32, 33, 36, 72, 89, 156, 157, 414
- Nero (Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus)* (37-68)—Roman Emperor (54-68).—9
- Nesselrode, Karl Vasilyevich, Count* (1780-1862)—Russian statesman and diplomat; Foreign Minister (1816-56); State Chancellor from 1845.—197
- Newman, Francis William* (1805-1897)—English philologist and writer, radical; wrote several books on religious, political and economic subjects.—110
- Newman, Samuel Phillips* (1797-1842)—American priest, economist and philologist.—278
- Newman, William*—see *Newmarch, William*
- Newmarch, William* (1820-1882)—English economist and statistician.—110
- Nicholas I* (1796-1855)—Emperor of Russia (1825-55).—196, 197, 324
- Nieass, John D.*—British plasterer; member of the London Trades Council and of the British National League for the Independence of Poland; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65).—21, 100, 380
- Niemcewicz, Julian Ursyn (Ursin)* (1757-1841)—Polish statesman and writer; stood for reforms; took part in the uprising under Kościuszko (1794) and the 1830-31 insurrection, a refugee, author of memoirs.—320
- North, Frederick, 2nd Earl of Guilford* (1732-1792)—British statesman, Tory; Prime Minister (1770-82); Home Secretary in the Portland Coalition Cabinet (Fox-North Cabinet) (1783).—317
- Norvins, Jacques Marquet, baron de Montbreton de* (1769-1854)—French politician and historian; a refugee during the French Revolution (1789-94); wrote several works on Napoleonic period.—327
- Nusperli, M. G.*—member of the Central Council of the International (October 1864-January 1865).—21

## O

- Odger, George* (1820-1877)—shoemaker; a reformist leader of the British trade unions; Secretary of the London Trades Council (1862-72); member of the British National League for the Independence of Poland, the Land and Labour League; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-71), its President (1864-67), took part in the London Conference (1865) and the Geneva Congress (1866); member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League; opposed revolutionary tactics; in 1871 refused to sign the General Council's address, "The Civil War in France", and left the Council.—21, 100, 351, 366, 369, 379, 380, 396, 408, 412, 416, 423
- O'Donovan Rossa*—wife of Jeremiah O'Donovan Rossa, a leader of the Irish Fenians; organised the collection of funds for the families of the Irish political prisoners in 1865-66.—339
- Ogiński, Michał Kleofas, Count* (1765-1883)—Polish politician and diplomat; composer; participant in the uprising of 1794 under Kościuszko; represented groups of Polish refugees in France and in Turkey; returned to Poland in 1802; Russian Senator under Alexander I; author of memoirs.—320-21
- Osborne, John*—British plasterer; trade-unionist, participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held

- on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-67); was active in the Reform League and the Land and Labour League.—20, 100
- Ostrowski, Antoni Jan, Count* (1782-1845)—Polish writer and politician, participant in the 1830-31 insurrection; a refugee; son and biographer of Tomasz Adam Ostrowski.—323
- Ostrowski, Tomasz (Thomas) Adam, Count* (1735-1817)—Polish statesman, president of the Senate of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw from 1811.—323
- Otto, Ludwig*—see *Breitschwert, Otto Ludwig*
- Owen, Robert* (1771-1858)—English utopian socialist.—11, 110, 231

## P

- Palmerston, Henry John Temple, Viscount* (1784-1865)—British statesman, a Tory at the beginning of his career; from 1830 onwards—a Whig; Foreign Secretary (1830-34, 1835-41 and 1846-51); Home Secretary (1852-55) and Prime Minister (1855-58 and 1859-65).—12, 152
- Paskiewitch (Paskevich), Ivan Fedorovich, Prince* (1782-1856)—Russian field marshal; fought against Napoleon; participated in the suppression of the Polish insurrection of 1830-31 and the revolution in Hungary (1849).—196
- Paul I* (1754-1801)—Emperor of Russia (1796-1801).—199, 319, 322
- Peter I (the Great)* (1672-1725)—Tsar of Russia (1682-1721), Emperor of Russia (1721-25).—32, 199
- Petersen, Peter*—member of the Central Council of the International (November of 1864 to 1865).—20, 100
- Pfänder, Karl* (c. 1818-1876)—prominent figure in the German working-class movement, painter; emigrated to London in 1845; member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London, of the Communist League and of the General Council of the International (November 1864 to 1867; 1870-72); friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—20, 100
- Philip II* (1527-1598)—King of Spain (1556-98).—99
- Pichegru, Charles* (1761-1804)—French general, took part in the wars of French Republic against the coalition of the European states (1794-95); took the command of the French army in Holland.—319
- Pidgeon, W.*—British trade-unionist, baker, participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall, member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—21, 351
- Pitt, L. K.*—British priest, chaplain of the British trading station in St. Petersburg at the time of Catherine II and Paul I.—319
- Pitt, William, Earl of Chatham* (1708-1778)—British statesman, Whig; Foreign Secretary and Secretary of State for War (1756-61), Prime Minister (1766-68).—317, 319
- Pompadour, Jeanne-Antoinette Poisson, marquise de* (1721-1764)—mistress of Louis XV.—59, 254, 287
- Poniatowski, Stanislaw August* (1732-1798)—King of Poland as Stanislaus II Augustus (1764-95).—315, 316, 319
- Pozzo di Borgo, Karl Osipovich, Count* (1764-1842)—Russian diplomat of Corsican descent; envoy (1814-21) and Ambassador (1821-35) to Paris and then to London (1835-39).—199
- Proudhon, Pierre Joseph* (1809-1865)—French writer, economist and sociologist; a founder of anarchism; deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1848).—26-33, 89, 153, 215, 260

*Pulz, Ludwig, Baron* (b. 1823)—Austrian general; commander of a cavalry brigade during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—174

## Q

*Quesnay, François* (1694-1774)—French economist, founder of the physiocratic school, physician.—293

## R

*Radetzky, Joseph, Count of Radetz* (1766-1858)—Austrian field marshal; commander of the Austrian troops in Northern Italy from 1831; suppressed the national liberation movement in Italy in 1848-49; Governor-General of the Kingdom of Lombardy-Venetia (1850-57).—173, 199

*Ramming, Wilhelm, Baron von Riedkirchen* (1815-1876)—Austrian general, commander of a brigade in the Italian war of 1859, and of a corps in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—179-80

*Ramsay, Sir George* (1800-1871)—one of the last English classical political economists.—147

*Rau, Karl Heinrich* (1792-1870)—German economist.—207, 215

*Raumer, Friedrich Ludwig Georg von* (1781-1873)—German historian and politician; representative of narrative-romantic trend in German historiography.—33

*Reybaud, Marie Roch Louis* (1799-1879)—French writer and economist, liberal.—414

*Ricardo, David* (1772-1823)—English economist.—29, 95, 120, 147, 207, 208, 210, 225

*Robespierre, Maximilien François Marie Isidore de* (1758-1794)—Jacobin leader, head of the revolutionary government (1793-94).—110

*Rodbertus-Jagetzow, Johann Karl* (1805-1875)—German economist, leader of the Centre Left in the Prussian National Assembly, subsequently theoretician of "state socialism".—207

*Roon, Albrecht Theodor Emil, Count von* (1803-1879)—Prussian statesman and military leader; field marshal-general from 1873; War Minister (1859-73) and Navy Minister (1861-71); reorganised the Prussian army.—45, 50, 54

*Roscher, Wilhelm* (1817-1894)—German economist, founder of the historical trend in political economy.—207, 215

*Rose, George* (1744-1818)—British statesman, Tory; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1782-83 and 1784-1801).—145

*Rousseau, Jean Jacques* (1712-1778)—French philosopher and writer of the Enlightenment.—32, 33, 160

*Rulhière, Claude Carlotan de* (1735-1791)—French historian, author of 4-volume history of the 18th-century Poland published in Paris (1807).—313-14

*Rumjanzev (Rumyantsev), Nikolai Petrovich* (1754-1826)—Russian diplomat and statesman, Foreign Minister (1808-14), Chancellor from 1809; chairman of the Council of State (1810-12).—319, 325, 326

*Rüstow, Friedrich Wilhelm* (1821-1878)—German army officer and military novelist, democrat, a refugee in Switzerland; Garibaldi's chief of staff (1860); friend of Lassalle.—87

*Rybczyński, Franciszek*—Polish refugee in London, member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—20

## S

*Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de Rouvroy, comte de* (1760-1825)—French utopian socialist.—26, 231

- Salvatella, Narcisse*—member of the Association of Mutual Progress (Mazzini organisation of Italian workers in London); member of the Central Council of the International (1865).—100
- Savary, Anne Jean Marie René, duc de Rovigo* (1774-1833)—French general and politician, Minister of Police (1810-14), Governor-General of Algeria (1831-33).—325
- Sawaskiewicz, Leon Leopold* (1806-1870)—Polish politician and writer; active in the 1830-31 insurrection; a refugee in France, Belgium and England; author of a work on Poland's history during the French revolution and Napoleonic wars; contributor to the newspaper *La Tribune du Peuple*.—320-24, 326, 327
- Schantzenbach, Alexander*—member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—21
- Schapper, Karl* (1812-1870)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; a leader of the League of the Just; member of the Central Authority of the Communist League; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; one of the leaders of the sectarian-adventurist group during the split in the Communist League (1850); again drew close to Marx in 1856; member of the Central Council of the International (1865); participant in the London Conference of 1865.—100
- Schiller, Johann Christoph Friedrich von* (1759-1805)—German poet, dramatist, historian and philosopher.—402, 417
- Schily, Victor* (1810-1875)—German democrat, lawyer, took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising; emigrated to France; member of the International, delegate to the London Conference of 1865; friend of
- Marx.—83, 95, 329-32, 335-36, 359, 363, 397
- Schmalz, Theodor Anton Heinrich* (1760-1831)—German conservative lawyer and economist, imitator of the Physiocrats.—261-62
- Schulze-Delitzsch, Franz Hermann* (1808-1883)—German economist; liberal politician; advocated unification of Germany under Prussia's supremacy, a founder of the National Association and a leader of the Party of Progress; sought to divert the workers from revolutionary struggle by organising co-operative societies.—57, 95, 207, 395, 438
- Schweitzer, Johann Baptist von* (1833-1875)—German lawyer; a Lassallean leader; editor of *Der Social-Demokrat* (1864-67), President of the General Association of German Workers (1867-71); supported unification of Germany under Prussia's supremacy; fought against the Social-Democratic Workers' Party; expelled from the General Association for his contacts with the Prussian authorities (1872).—26, 87-91
- Ségur, Louis Philippe, comte de* (1753-1830)—French diplomat, politician and historian; Ambassador in Russia (1783-89); wrote a history of international relations in Europe in the 18th century.—315, 316-18
- Semiramis* (9th cent. B.C.)—famous Assyrian princess, round whose personality a mass of legend has accumulated; her name came to be applied to hanging gardens, one of the seven wonders of the world.—160
- Senior, Nassau William* (1790-1864)—English economist, vulgarised Ricardo's theory; opposed shortening of the working day.—11, 110, 250, 286, 293
- Setacci, C.*—a leader of the Association of Mutual Progress (Mazzini orga-



- nisation of Italian workers in London); member of the Central Council of the International (October 1864 to 1865).—20
- Seward, Frederick William* (1830-1915)—American journalist and diplomat, son of William Henry Seward.—100
- Seward, William Henry* (1801-1872)—American statesman, leader of the Right wing of the Republican Party; ran for presidency (1860); Secretary of State (1861-69).—100
- Shakespeare, William* (1564-1616)—English poet and dramatist.—145, 381
- Shaw, Robert* (d. 1869)—a leader of the British working-class movement; house painter; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-69); Treasurer of the Council (1867-68); Corresponding Secretary for America (1867-69); delegate to the London Conference (1865) and the Brussels Congress (1868) of the International.—21, 100, 396, 423, 438, 446
- Side, Robert Henry*—member of the Central Council of the International (November 1864 to 1866).—21
- Siebel, Karl* (1836-1868)—German poet; did much to promote works by Marx and Engels, including Vol. I of Marx's *Capital*; distant relative of Engels.—81, 95
- Sismondi, Jean Charles Léonard Simonde de* (1773-1842)—Swiss economist, exponent of economic romanticism.—147, 208
- Smales, Thomas*—member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—21
- Smith, Adam* (1723-1790)—Scottish economist.—95, 120, 126, 147, 225
- Smith, Edward* (c. 1818-1874)—English physician and medical officer of the Privy Council to Inquire into the Nourishment of the Poorer Labouring Classes.—6
- Solustri, F.*—a leader of the Association of Mutual Progress (Mazzini organisation of Italian workers in London); member of the Central Council of the International (November 1864 to 1865).—20
- Soulsby*—captain of the *Hero*, on which Engels travelled to Sweden (July 1867).—343
- Stainsby, William D.*—British trade-unionist, tailor, participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-68), and of the executive committees of the Reform League.—20, 100, 380
- Stanley, Edward Henry, 15th Earl of Derby* (1826-1893)—English statesman, Tory, Conservative (1860s-70s), subsequently Liberal; Secretary of State for Colonies (1858, 1882-85) and Secretary of State for India (1858-59), Foreign Secretary (1866-68, 1874-78); son of Edward Derby, leader of Tories.—429
- Stephens Alexander Hamilton* (1812-1883)—American politician, Democrat; Congressman (1843-59); participant in the rebellion of Southern slaveholders; Vice-President of the Confederacy (1861-65).—19, 99
- Stephenson (Stevenson), George* (1781-1848)—English engineer, inventor of the locomotive, son of a miner.—381
- Steuart, Sir James*, afterwards *Denham* (1712-1780)—British economist, one of the last Mercantilists.—238
- Steub, Ludwig* (1812-1888)—German ethnologist, linguist, writer, author of several essays on the Tyrol.—344
- Stieber, Wilhelm* (1818-1882)—Prussian police officer, an organiser of and chief witness for the prosecution in the Cologne Communist Trial (1852); together with Wermuth

- wrote *Die Kommunisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*; chief of the Prussian political police (1850-60).—92
- Stormont, David Murray, Viscount, Earl of Mansfield* (1727-1796)—British diplomat and statesman, Tory; envoy to Warsaw (1756-June 1761) and to Paris (1772-78); member of the Cabinet (1779-82).—317
- Suvorov, Alexander Vasilyevich, Count Rymniksky, Prince Italiisky* (1729 or 1730-1800)—Russian field marshal and military theorist, Generalissimo.—319, 322
- Swieten, Gottfried, Baron van* (1734-1803)—Austrian diplomat; envoy to Berlin in 1870s.—318
- Sylvis, William* (1828-1869)—American iron-moulder; prominent figure in the American working-class movement, a founder of the International Iron-moulders' Union (1859) and its President (1863-69); took part in the American Civil War (1861-65) on the side of the North, a founder of the National Labor Union (1866) and its President (1868-69); favoured affiliation to the International.—436
- Szemere, Bartholomäus (Bertalan)* (1812-1869)—Hungarian politician and journalist; Minister of the Interior and head of the revolutionary government (1849); fled from Hungary after the defeat of the revolution.—93
- T
- Talandier, Pierre Théodore Alfred* (1822-1890)—French democrat, journalist; took part in the 1848 Revolution in France; emigrated to London after the coup d'état of 1851; member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—20
- Talbot, Edouard*—French physician, organised a section of the International in Caen (1865); Corresponding Secretary of the International in that town.—340
- Thibaudeau, Antoine Claire, comte de* (1765-1854)—French politician and historian; member of the Convention during the French Revolution, subsequently Bonapartist; Senator during the Second Empire; author of a history of Napoleonic France.—325
- Thiers, Louis Adolphe* (1797-1877)—French historian and statesman, Prime Minister (1836, 1840), deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1848) and to the Legislative Assembly (1849-51); head of the Orleanists after 1848; dealt brutally with the Paris Communards (1871); President of the Republic (1871-73).—31, 322, 326
- Thornton, William Thomas* (1813-1880)—British economist, follower of John Stuart Mill.—145
- Tolain, Henri Louis* (1828-1897)—French engraver; prominent figure in the French working-class movement, Right-wing Proudhonist; a leader of the Paris section of the International; delegate to the London Conference (1865) and Geneva (1866), Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses of the International; deputy to the National Assembly after September 4, 1870; went over to the side of the Versaillists during the Paris Commune; was expelled from the International in 1871, subsequently Senator.—82, 330, 332, 335, 357, 363, 385, 393, 395-97
- Tooke, Thomas* (1774-1858)—English economist, adherent of the classical school in political economy.—110, 126, 238
- Torrens, Robert* (1780-1864)—English economist, adherent of the so-called theory of money circulation.—278
- Tremenheere, Hugh Seymour* (1804-1893)—British official and journalist, member of various government

commissions inspecting labour conditions.—8

*Trimlett*—British trade-unionist; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864, at St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—351

*Turff, Henry*—British trade-unionist, a leader of the London branch of the Operative Bricklayers' Society; member of the Central Council of the International (1865); member of the Board of Directors of the Industrial Newspaper Company.—380

*Turgot, Anne Robert Jacques, baron de l'Aulne* (1727-1781)—French economist and statesman; Physiocrat; Controller-General of Finance (1774-76).—238

*Türr, István (Achmed Kiamil Bey)* (1825-1908)—Hungarian army officer; participant in the revolution of 1848-49 in Italy and Germany; refugee in Turkey; fought in the Crimean war on the side of the Allies; took part in Garibaldi's revolutionary march to South Italy (1860); general of the Italian army from 1861.—92

## U

*Ure, Andrew* (1778-1857)—English chemist, economist; free trader; opposed shortening of the working day.—11, 110, 293

*Urquhart, David* (1805-1877)—British diplomat, writer and politician, Turkophile; went on diplomatic missions to Turkey in the 1830s; member of the House of Commons (1847-52); founder and editor of *The Free Press* (1855-77) renamed *Diplomatic Review* in 1866.—112

## V

*Valltier, A.*—Frenchman, member of

the Central Council of the International (1865).—100

*Varlin, Louis Eugène* (1839-1871)—prominent figure in the French working-class movement, bookbinder, Left-wing Proudhonist; one of the International's leaders in France; delegate to the London Conference (1865), the Geneva (1866) and Basle (1869) congresses of the International; member of the Paris Commune; shot by the Versailles on May 28, 1871.—396

*Vauban, Sébastien Le Prêtre (Prestre) de* (1633-1707)—Marshal of France, military engineer, economist.—274

*Vésinier, Pierre* (1824-1902)—French journalist, anti-Bonapartist; an organiser of the French branch of the International in London; participant in the London Conference (1865) and the Brussels Congress (1868); was expelled from the Central Council of the International for conducting a slanderous campaign against it in 1866 and in 1868 expelled from the International; member of the Paris Commune.—389, 392, 399

*Victor Emmanuel II (Vittorio Emanuele)* (1820-1878)—King of Piedmont (Sardinia) (1849-61) and of Italy (1861-78).—173, 174

*Vielhorski*—see *Wielhorski, Józef Michał*

*Villeneuve, Louis-Sauveur de* (1675-1745)—French diplomat; Ambassador to Turkey (1728-44); mediator in negotiations between Austria, Russia and Turkey which resulted in the conclusion of the Belgrade Peace Treaty (1739).—313

*Vinçard, Pierre Denis* (1820-1882)—French worker journalist; participant in the revolution of 1848, active in the co-operative movement; wrote several works on the condition of the working class; member of the International.—82, 330, 331, 335, 365

*Vögele, A.*—German refugee in London, compositor in Hollinger's printshop (1859).—24

*Vogt, Karl* (1817-1895)—German naturalist, petty-bourgeois democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848-49), belonged to the Left wing; one of the five imperial regents (June 1849); in 1849 left Germany; was Louis Bonaparte's paid agent; libelled Marx and Engels.—23, 24, 92

*Voltaire, François Marie Arouet* (1694-1778)—French philosopher, writer and historian of the Enlightenment.—33, 160, 250

## W

*Wade, Benjamin Franklin* (1800-1878)—American lawyer and politician, Left-wing Republican, President of the Senate (1867-69).—422

*Wehner, J. G.*—German refugee in Manchester, Treasurer of the Schiller Institute in the 1860s.—404, 420

*Werecki, I. M.*—Polish refugee in London, democrat, member of the Central Council of the International (1865-66).—340

*Weston, John*—active in the British working-class movement; carpenter, subsequently manufacturer, Owenist; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-72); delegate to the London Conference (1865); member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League; a leader of the Land and Labour League.—20, 100, 103-06, 108-10, 112-13, 115-17, 119, 147, 351, 352, 355, 363-67, 380, 384, 386, 412, 413

*Weydemeyer, Joseph* (1818-1866)—leading figure in the German and American working-class movement;

member of the Communist League, took part in the 1848-49 revolution; editor of the *Neue Deutsche Zeitung* (1849-50), emigrated to the USA after the defeat of the revolution; took part in the American Civil War on the side of the North; helped disseminate the ideas and documents of the International in the USA; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—24, 25, 357

*Wheeler, George William*—active in the British working-class movement; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-67), Treasurer of the Council (1864-65, 1865-67); delegate to the London Conference (1865) of the International, member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League.—20, 100, 339, 340, 352, 354, 355, 358, 365, 366, 369, 379, 387, 396

*Whitlock, J.*—British trade-unionist; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864, at St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65); took part in the work of the Reform League.—20, 100, 351, 352, 357, 358, 359

*Wiehe, Johann Friedrich*—German refugee in London, compositor, worked in Hollinger's printshop in 1859.—23-24

*Wielhorski, Józef Michał* (1759-1817)—Polish general; participant in the uprising under Kościuszko (1794); commander of the Polish legion of the French army; War Minister of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw in 1812.—322

*William I* (1797-1888)—Prince of Prussia, Prince-Regent (1858-61), King of Prussia (1861-88), German Emperor (1871-88).—165, 177

*Windischgrätz, Alfred Candidus Fer-*

- dinand, Prince* (1787-1862)—Austrian field marshal; commanded the troops which crushed the uprisings in Prague and Vienna (1848); led the Austrian army against the Hungarian revolution (1848-49).—199
- Wirth, Max* (1822-1900)—German economist, journalist, liberal.—215
- Wolff*—member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65).—20
- Wolff, Luigi (Louis)*—Italian major, follower of Mazzini, member of the Association of Mutual Progress (organisation of Italian workers in London); participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65); participant in the London Conference (1865); exposed as an agent of the Bonapartist police in 1871.—20, 351, 393, 396, 401
- Wolff, Wilhelm* (1809-1864)—German teacher, proletarian revolutionary, leading figure in the Communist League, an editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (1849); emigrated to Switzerland in summer 1849 and Great Britain in 1851; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—214
- Worley, William*—British worker, printer; member of the British National League for the Independence of Poland; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864, at St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International; took part in the work of the Reform League.—21, 100, 352, 355, 380

## Z

- Zabicki, Antoni* (1818-1889)—active member of the Polish national liberation movement, compositor; left Poland after 1831; participant in the Hungarian revolution of 1848-49; from 1851 a refugee in England; from 1863 published *Głos Wolny*—newspaper of the Polish democratic refugees; Secretary of the Polish National Committee, member of the General Council of the International (1866-71), Corresponding Secretary for Poland (1866-71).—423

## INDEX OF LITERARY AND MYTHOLOGICAL NAMES

- Achilles* (Gr. Myth.)—the bravest Greek warrior in the Trojan War, a character in Homer's *Iliad*.—88
- Christ, Jesus* (Bib.).—390
- Hildebrand*—character in ancient German epic *Das Hildebrandslied*.—76
- Jesus*—see *Christ, Jesus*
- Juggernaut* (Hindu Myth.)—Krishna, an incarnation of the Hindu god Vishnu.—142
- Moloch*—the Sun-God in Carthage and Phoenicia, whose worship was accompanied by human sacrifices.—11
- Scapin*—main character in Molière's comedy *Les fourberies de Scapin*, smart servant, mystifier and jester.—25
- Sibyl*—one of a number of women regarded as oracles or prophetesses by the ancient Greeks and Romans. The best known of them was the Sibyl of Cumae, a Greek colony in Southern Italy. The oracles and prophecies attributed to her were collected in the *Sibylline Books* kept in ancient Rome.—214

*Sisyphus* (Gr. Myth.)—King of Corinth. For cheating the gods he was condemned to push a rock to the top of a hill from which it rolled down again. Hence the expression the “Sisyphian labour”—hard and useless work.—99, 273

*Swaggerer*—main character in Aesop's fable “The Boasting Traveller”.—244, 279

*Tidmann*—main character of the old Danish folk song *Herr Tidmann*, greedy and arrogant feudal lord.—34-35

## INDEX OF QUOTED AND MENTIONED LITERATURE

### WORKS BY KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

Marx, Karl

[*Address from the Working Men's International Association to President Johnson*] (this volume). In: *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 188, May 20, 1865; *Reynolds's Newspaper*, No. 771, May 21, 1865; *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 7536, June 1, 1865; *Chicago, Sonntags-Zeitung*, 4. Juni 1865.—366

*Capital*

— *Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Oekonomie. Erster Band. Buch I: Der Produktionsprozess des Kapitals*, Hamburg, 1867.—205-308, 361-62, 439-40

*The Communism of the "Rheinischer Beobachter"* (present edition, Vol. 6)

— *Der Kommunismus des Rheinischen Beobachters*. In: *Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung*, Nr. 73, 12. September 1847.—80

*A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*

— *Zur Kritik der Politischen Oekonomie, Erstes Heft*, Berlin, 1859.—31, 95, 208, 211, 215

*Herr Vogt* (present edition, Vol. 17)

— *Herr Vogt*, London, 1860.—23, 24, 92-93

*Hirsch's Confessions* (present edition, Vol. 12)

— *Hirsch's Selbstbekenntnisse*. In: *Belletristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung*, Nr. 8, 5. Mai 1853.—93

*Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association Established September 28, 1864, at a Public Meeting Held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, London* (this volume)

— *Address*. In: *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association, Established September 28, 1864, at a Public Meeting Held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, London*, [London,] 1864.—151, 351-54, 356, 357, 369, 371, 393, 401, 406-07

— *Address of the Association*. In: *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 160, November 5, 1864.—353, 401

— *Manifest an die arbeitende Klasse Europa's*. In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 2-3, 21., 30, Dezember 1864.—356

— *The Address*. In: *St. Louis Daily Press*, No. 22, January 10, 1865.—357

*On Proudhon* [*Letter to J. B. Schweitzer*] (this volume)

— *Über P.-J. Proudhon*. In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 16-18, I., 3. und 5. Februar 1865.—89

- The Poverty of Philosophy. Answer to the "Philosophy of Poverty"* by M. Proudhon (present edition, Vol. 6)  
 — Misère de la philosophie. Réponse à la philosophie de la misère de M. Proudhon. Paris-Bruxelles, 1847.—28-30, 260
- Provisional Rules of the Association* (this volume). In: *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association, Established September 28, 1864, at a Public Meeting Held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, London*, [London,] 1864.—83, 151, 185, 351-53, 356, 357, 369, 393, 401, 406
- The Russian Note* (present edition, Vol. 7)  
 — Die russische Note. In: *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Nr. 64, 3. August 1848.—197
- Statement [Regarding the Causes of the Breach with the *Social-Demokrat*] (this volume). In: *Berliner Reform*, Nr. 67, 19. März, 1865; *Düsseldorfer Zeitung*, Nr. 79, 20. März, 1865; *Hermann*, Nr. 325, 25. März, 1865.—91
- To Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America* (this volume). In: *The Daily News*, No. 5813, December 23, 1864; *The Miner and Workman's Advocate*, No. 95, December 24, 1864; *Reynolds's Newspaper*, No. 750, December 25, 1864; *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 169, January 7, 1865.—354, 355, 407
- To the Editor of the Stuttgart "Beobachter"* (this volume)  
 — An den Redakteur des *Beobachters* zu Stuttgart. In: *Nordstern*, Nr. 287, 10. Dezember 1864.—22, 94
- Value, Price and Profit* (this volume).—367
- A Warning* (this volume)  
 — Warnung. In: *Der Bote vom Niederrhein*, Nr. 57, 13. Mai 1866; *Oberrheinischer Courier*, Nr. 113, 15. Mai 1866.—405

## Engels, Frederick

- Herr Tidmann. Old Danish Folk Song* (this volume)  
 — Herr Tidmann. Altdänisches Volkslied. In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 18, 5. Februar 1865.—89
- The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party* (this volume)  
 — Die preussische Militärfrage und die deutsche Arbeiterpartei. Hamburg. Otto Meissner, 1865.—81, 84-86

## Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick

- The Great Men of the Exile* (present edition, Vol. 11)  
 — Die grossen Männer des Exils.—93
- To the Editor of the "Social-Demokrat". Statement* (this volume)  
 — An die Redaktion des *Social-Demokrat*. Erklärung.—89
- To the Editor of the "Social-Demokrat"* (this volume)  
 — Erklärung. An die Redaktion des *Social-Demokrat*. In: *Barmer Zeitung*, Nr. 60, *Elberfelder Zeitung*, Nr. 60, 26. Februar 1865; *Düsseldorfer Zeitung*, Nr. 59, 28. Februar 1865; *Rheinische Zeitung*, Nr. 60, 1. Beilage; *Berliner Reform*, Nr. 51, *Neue Frankfurter Zeitung*, Nr. 60, *Breslauer Zeitung*, Nr. 102, *Staatsbürger-Zeitung*, Nr. 60, 1. März 1865; *Bonner Zeitung*, Nr. 51, *Hermann*, Nr. 29, *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 29, 3. März 1865; (abridged) *Der weiße Adler*, Nr. 29, 9. März 1865; *Nordstern*, Nr. 300, 11. März 1865.—90



## WORKS BY DIFFERENT AUTHORS

- Aesop. *The Boasting Traveller*.—244, 279  
— *Leo senio confectus*.—25
- Alaux, J. E. *Une forme nouvelle du socialisme. Le Congrès ouvrier de Genève*. In: *Revue contemporaine*, t. 53, 15 octobre 1866.—414
- Bastiat, F. *Harmonies économiques*. Paris, 1850.—207, 260-61
- Becker, B. *Rede des Vereins-Präsidenten Bernhard Becker, gehalten in der Versammlung der Hamburger Mitglieder des Allgemeinen deutschen Arbeiter-Vereins am 22. März 1865*. In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 39, Beilage, 26. März 1865.—92-96
- Becker, J. Ph. *Muthiges Kämpfen*. In: *Nordstern*, No. 296, 11. Februar 1865.—358
- Bible*  
*The New Testament*  
Luke.—58
- Blind, K. *Bradford*, 25. Oct. In: *Der Beobachter*, Nr. 268, 17. November 1864.—23, 24  
— *Ein republikanischer Protest, London*, 17. Sept. In: *Die Westliche Post*, October-beginning of November 1864.—24-25  
— *Erklärung, London*, 3. November. In: *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Nr. 313, 9. November 1859.—24  
— [Regarding the Causes of Marx's and Engels' Breach with the *Social-Demokrat*.] In: *Neue Frankfurter Zeitung*, Nr. 64, 5. März 1865.—87  
— *Republikanischer Protest*. In: *Hermann*, Nr. 2407, 8. Oktober 1864.—25  
— [Republikanischer Protest.] In: *Neue Frankfurter Zeitung*, Nr. 270, 29. September 1864.—24  
— (anon.) *Zur Warnung, London*, 1859. Leaflet. In: *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Nr. 173, 22. Juni 1859.—23  
— [To the editors of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*.] In: *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Nr. 345, 11. Dezember 1859.—24
- Boisguillebert, P. *Dissertation sur la nature des richesses, de l'argent et des tributs... In: Économistes financiers du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle... Précédés de Notices historiques sur chaque auteur, et accompagnés de commentaires et de notes explicatives*, par M. Eugène Daire. Paris, 1843.—274
- Brissot de Warville, J. P. *Recherches philosophiques sur le droit de propriété & sur le vol, considérés dans la nature & dans la société*. In: *Bibliothèque philosophique du législateur, du politique, du jurisconsulte...*, t. VI, Berlin, Paris, Lyon, 1782.—28
- Charras, J. B. *Histoire de la campagne de 1815. Waterloo*. T. I-II, Leipzig, 1857, Londres, 1858.—327
- Chodźko, L. *Histoire des Légions Polonaises en Italie, sous le commandement du général Dombrowski*. T. I-II, Paris, 1829.—321
- Condillac, E. B. *Le commerce et le gouvernement*. In: *Mélanges d'économie politique*. Tome I. Commentaire et notes, par E. Daire et G. Molinari. Paris, 1847.—242, 278
- Crétineau-Joly, J. *L'Église romaine en face de la Révolution*. T. 1-2, Paris, 1859.—326
- Destutt de Tracy, A. L. C. *Éléments d'idéologie*. IV-e et V-e parties. *Traité de la volonté et de ses effets*. Paris, 1826.—294

- Dunoyer, Ch. *De la liberté du travail ou simple exposé des conditions dans lesquelles les forces humaines s'exercent avec le plus de puissance*, t. I-III, Paris, 1845.—31
- Eccarius, J. G. *International Working Men's Congress*. In: *The Times*, Nos. 25909, 25911-25913, September 6, 9-11, 1867.—439
- Engel, von Dr. Er. *Resultate des Ersatz-Aushebungsgeschäfts im preussischen Staate in den Jahren von 1855 bis mit 1862*. In: *Zeitschrift des königlich preussischen statistischen Bureaus* redigirt von Dr. Ernst Engel. Nr. 3, März 1864.—45-50
- An Essay on Trade and Commerce: Containing Observations on Taxes, as they are supposed to affect the Price of Labour in our Manufactories: together with some interesting Reflections on the Importance of our Trade to America. To which is added the Out-Lines, or Sketch, of a Scheme for the Maintenance and Employment of the poor, the Prevention of Vagrancy, and Decrease of the Poor's Rates. Humbly addressed to the Legislature of the Kingdom*. By the author of *Considerations on Taxes &c.*, London, 1770. The authorship is ascribed to J. Cunnigem.—141
- Ferrier, F.-L.-A. *Du gouvernement considéré dans ses rapports avec le commerce*. Paris, 1805.—207
- Fox, P. *The British Coup d'état in Ireland*. In: *The Workman's Advocate*, No. 136, October 14, 1865.—339, 407
- *The Influence of Irish National Feeling Upon the Relations between Great Britain and the United States*. In: *The Workman's Advocate*, No. 137, October 21, 1865.—339, 407
- *The Irish Difficulty. Continued. A Postscript*. In: *The Workman's Advocate*, No. 138, October 28, 1865.—339, 407
- Franklin, B. *A Modest Inquiry into the Nature and Necessity of a Paper Currency*. In: *The Works of...*, Vol. II, Boston, 1836. The work was first published in 1729.—122
- Geib, A. [Speech at the general meeting of the General Association of German Workers. November 24, 1867.] In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 139, 29. November 1867, 1. Beilage.—223
- Gladstone, W. [Speeches in the House of Commons.]
- April 16, 1863. In: *The Times*, No. 24535, April 17, 1863.—7, 8, 9
- April 7, 1864. In: *The Times*, No. 24841, April 8, 1864 and *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*. 3d series, Vol. CLXXIV, London, 1864.—5
- Hegel, G. W. F. *Wissenschaft der Logik*. In: *Werke*. Zweite Auflage, Bande III, IV, V, Berlin, 1841.—257
- Heine, H. *Neuer Frühling* (1831).—91
- Hess, M. *Paris, 10. Jan.* [*Arb.-Associationen. Internat. Arb.-Assoc. "Avenir national"*]. In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 8, 13. Januar 1865. Marked: "H".—36
- *Paris, 28. Jan.* [*Internationale Arbeiter-Association.—Geldkrisis*]. In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 16, 1. Februar 1865. Marked: "H".—36, 89
- *Paris, 7. Febr.* [*Amerika.—Der Orient.—Italien.—Die Internationale Arbeiter-Association.*] In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 21, 12. Februar 1865. Marked: "H".—89
- Das Hildebrandslied*. In: *Denkmäler deutscher Poesie und Prosa aus dem VIII.—XII. Jahrhundert*. Berlin, 1864.—76, 79, 86

- Hobbes, Th. *Leviathan: or, the Matter, Form, and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiastical and Civil*. In: *The English Works of...*, Vol. III, London, 1839.—128
- Hofstetten, J. [Speech at the general meeting of the General Association of German Workers, November 24, 1867.] In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 139, 29. November 1867, 1. Beilage.—219-23
- Homer, *The Iliad*.—88
- Hugo, V. [Speech in the Legislative Assembly, July 17, 1851.] In: *Le Moniteur officiel*, 18 juillet 1851.—201
- Карамзинъ, Н. М. *Исторія Государства Россійскаго*, т. XI. СПб., 1835.—198
- Lacretelle, Ch. de. *Histoire de France, pendant le XVIII-ème siècle*, T. 1-14. Paris, 1808.—320
- Lafargue, P. *Aperçu sur la marche de l'Association internationale des travailleurs*. In: *La Rive Gauche*, No. 24, 17 juin 1866.—411
- Lafayette. [Speech at the sitting of the Chamber of Deputies on January 16, 1831.] In: *Le Moniteur universel*, 17 janvier 1831.—196
- Lassalle, F. *Herr Bastiat-Schulze von Delitzsch, der ökonomische Julian, oder: Capital und Arbeit*. Berlin, 1864.—95, 207
- Lelevel (Lelewel), J. *Histoire de Pologne*. T. 1-5. Paris, Lille, 1844.—324, 325
- [Linguet, S. N. H.] *Théorie des loix civiles, ou principes fondamentaux de la société*. T. I-II. Londres, 1767.—32
- List, F. *Das nationale System der politischen Oekonomie*. Bd. 1. *Der internationale Handel, die Handelspolitik und der deutsche Zollverein*, Stuttgart und Tübingen, 1841.—207
- Longuet, Ch. *La Dynastie des La Palice*. In: *La Rive Gauche*, 12 mars, 1865.—364
- Luther, M. *An die Pfarrherrn Wider den Wucher zu predigen*. Vermanung. Wittenberg, 1540.—261
- Malthus, Th. R. *An Essay on the Principle of Population; as it affects the Future Improvement of Society, with Remarks on the Speculations of Mr. Godwin, M. Condorcet, and other Writers*. London, 1798.—27  
— *An Inquiry into the Nature and Progress of Rent, and the Principles by which it is regulated*. London, 1815.—141
- Morton, J. C. *On the Forces used in Agriculture*. In: *Journal of the Society of Arts*, No. 368. Vol. VII, December 9, 1859.—112
- Napier, W. F. P. *History of the War in the Peninsula and in the South of France, from the Year 1807 to the Year 1814*. Vol. III, London, 1833.—52
- Newman, S. Ph. *Elements of Political Economy*. Andover and New York, 1835.—278
- Newmarch, W. *On the Extent to which Sound Principles of Taxation are embodied in the Legislation of the United Kingdom*. In: *Report of the thirty-first meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science; held at Manchester in September 1861*, London, 1862.—110
- Niemcewicz, J. U. *Notes sur ma captivité à Saint-Petersbourg, en 1794, 1795 et 1796*. Paris, 1843.—320
- Norvins, J. *Histoire de Napoléon*. T. 1-4. Paris, 1827-1828.—327
- Oginski, M. K. *Mémoires de Michel Oginski sur la Pologne et les polonais, depuis 1788 jusqu'à la fin de 1815*. Paris. 1826. T. I.—320; T. II.—321

- Ostrowski, A. *Żywoł Tomasza Ostrowskiego, ministra rzczyzypolitej późnij prezesa senatu księstwa warszawskiego i królestwa polskiego, oraz rys wypadków krajowych od 1763 r. do 1817.* Paryż. 3<sup>go</sup> maja 1836 roku.—323
- Owen, R. *Observations on the Effect of the Manufacturing System.* London, 1815.—110
- Palmerston, J. [Speech in the House of Commons on June 23, 1863.] In: *The Times*, No. 24593, June 24, 1863.—12
- Proudhon, P. J. *Essai de grammaire générale, d'après les principes établis par Bergier.* In: Bergier, N. S. *Les élémens primitifs des langues.* Besançon, 1837.—26  
— *Gratuité du crédit. Discussion entre M. Fr. Bastiat et M. Proudhon.* Paris, 1850.—32  
— *Qu'est-ce que la propriété? Ou recherches sur le principe du droit et du gouvernement.* Paris, 1840.—26, 27, 28, 30  
— *La Révolution sociale démontrée par le coup d'état du 2 décembre.* Paris, 1852.—32  
— *Si les traités de 1815 ont cessé d'exister? Actes du futur congrès.* Paris, 1863.—32  
— [Speech at the sitting of the National Assembly on July 31, 1848.] In: *Compte rendu des séances de l'Assemblée Nationale.* Vol. II. Paris, 1849.—31  
— *Système des contradictions économiques, ou philosophie de la misère.* T. I-II. Paris, 1846.—28-32  
— *Théorie de l'impôt, question mise au concours par le conseil d'état du canton de Vaud en 1860.* Paris, 1861; Bruxelles, 1861.—32
- Quesnay, F. *Dialogues sur le commerce et sur les travaux des artisans.* In: *Physiocrates* [...] avec une introduction et des commentaires par E. Daire. Partie I, Paris, 1846.—293
- Reybaud. *L'Economie politique des ouvriers.* In: *Revue des deux mondes*, t. 66, 1 novembre 1866.—414
- Ricardo, D. *On the Principles of Political Economy, and Taxation,* London, 1817; 3rd ed., 1821.—120, 147
- Roon, A. T. E. von. [Speech in the military commission of the Assembly, February 10, 1863.] In: *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen der durch die Allerhöchste Verordnung vom 22. Dezember 1862 einberufenen beiden Häuser des Landtages.* Haus der Abgeordneten. Bd. 1, Berlin, 1863.—45, 50, 54
- Rulhière, Cl. *Histoire de l'Anarchie de Pologne*, t. 1, Paris, 1819.—313-14
- Rüstow, W., Herwegh, G. *An die Redaktion des Social-Demokrat.* In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 31, 8. März 1865.—87
- Sawaszkievicz, L.-L. *Tableau de l'influence de la Pologne sur les destinées de la Révolution française et de l'Empire*, Paris, 3 éd. 1848.—320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 326, 327
- Schmalz, Th. A. H. *Economie politique, ouvrage traduit de l'Allemand, de M. Schmalz, conseiller intime de sa majesté le roi de prusse et professeur de droit public a l'université de Berlin; Par Henri Jouffroy, conseiller au service de Prusse; Revu et annoté sur la traduction, par M. Fritot, avocat a la cour royale de Paris, auteur de l'esprit du droit et de la science du publiciste.* T. I, Paris, 1826.—261  
— *Staatswirthschaftslehre in Briefen an einen teutschen Erbprinzen.* Th. I, Berlin, 1818.—261
- Schweitzer, J. B. *Ferdinand Lassalle.* In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 1, 15. Dezember 1864.—88  
— *In Betreff der bekannten...* In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 37, 22. März 1865.—91  
— [Statement.] *Der Redacteur des Social-Demokraten übersendet uns nachfolgende...*

- In: *Berliner Reform*, Nr. 68, 21. März 1865.—91
- *Wir würden den an sich...* In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 31, 8. März 1865.—87
- Senior, N. W. *Letters on the Factory Act, as it affects the Cotton Manufacture, addressed to the Right Honourable the President of the Board of Trade, to which are appended; a Letter to Mr. Senior from Leonard Horner, Esq. and Minutes of a Conversation between Mr. Edmund Ashworth, Mr. Thomson and Mr. Senior.* London, 1837.—250, 286
- Seward, W. H. [Speech at the meeting in Rochester. October 25, 1858.] In: *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 5466, October 28, 1858.—100
- Smith, A. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations.* Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1814. The first edition appeared in 1776.—126
- Stephens, A. H. [Speech at Savannah, March 21, 1861.] In: *New-York Daily Tribune*, No. 6215, March 27, 1861.—19, 99
- Steuart, J. *An Inquiry into the Principles of Political Oeconomy.* In: *The Works of Sir James Steuart...* collected by General Sir James Steuart, His Son. In six volumes. Vol. I, London, 1805.—238
- Thibaudeau, A. C. *Le Consulat et l'Empire, ou Histoire de la France et de Napoléon Bonaparte de 1799 à 1815.* T. 1-10. Paris, 1834-35.—325
- Thiers, L. A. *Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire faisant suite à l'Histoire de la Révolution française.* Paris, 1845, t. III; Paris, 1851, t. XI.—322, 326
- [Speech in opposition to Proudhon's proposals made to the Finance Commission of the French National Assembly, July 26, 1848.] In: *Compte rendu des séances de l'Assemblée Nationale*, Vol. II, Paris, 1849.—31
- *Rapport du citoyen Thiers, précédé de la proposition du citoyen Proudhon relative à l'impôt sur le revenu, et suivi de son discours prononcé à l'Assemblée nationale, le 31 juillet 1848.* Paris, 1848.—31
- Thornton, W. Th. *Over-population and its Remedy; or, an Inquiry into the Extent and Causes of the Distress prevailing among the Labouring Classes of the British Islands, and into the Means of Remedying It.* London, 1846.—145
- Tooke, Th. *A History of Prices, and of the State of the Circulation, from 1793 to 1837; preceded by a brief sketch of the state of the corn trade in the last two centuries.* Vol. I-II, London, 1838.—110, 126
- *A History of Prices, and of the State of the Circulation, in 1838 and 1839, with Remarks on the Corn Laws, and Some of the Alterations Proposed in Our Banking System.* London, 1840.—110, 126
- *A History of Prices, and of the State of the Circulation, from 1839 to 1847 inclusive: with a General Review of the Currency Question, and Remarks on the Operation of the Act 7 & 8 Vict. c. 32.* London, 1848.—110, 126
- *An Inquiry into the Currency Principle; the Connection of the Currency with Prices, and the Expediency of a Separation of Issue from Banking.* London, 1844.—238
- Tooke, Th. and Newmarch, W. *A History of Prices, and of the State of the Circulation, during the Nine Years 1848-1856.* In two volumes; forming the fifth and sixth volumes of the *History of Prices from 1792 to the present time.* London, 1857.—110, 126
- Torrens, R. *An Essay on the Production of Wealth,* London, 1821.—278
- Turgot, [A. R. J., de l'Aulne.] *Réflexions sur la formation et la distribution des richesses.* In: *Oeuvres...*, Tome premier, Paris, 1844. The first edition appeared in 1766.—238
- Urquhart, D. *The Right of Search: Two Speeches (January 20 and 27, 1862).* London, March 1862.—112

- Vauban, S. *Projet d'une dîme royale*. In: *Économistes financiers du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 1843.—274
- Vésinier, P. *L'Association Internationale des Travailleurs*. In: *L'Écho de Verviers*, Nos. 293-294, 16 et 18 décembre 1865.—392-400
- Voltaire, F.-M. A. de. *Candide, ou l'optimisme*, traduit de l'Allemand de Monsieur de Docteur Ralph. Genève, 1760.—250  
— (anon.) *La tragédie de Sémiramis, et quelques autres pièces de littérature*. Paris, 1749.—160
- Wolff, W. *Die schlesische Milliarde*. In: *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Nr. 252, 255, 256, 258, 264, 270-272, 281; 22., 25., 27., 29. März; 5., 12., 13., 14., 25. April 1849.—214

DOCUMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION<sup>a</sup>

- Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Statuts et règlements*. Londres, 1866.—423
- Association internationale. Exposition de principes*. In: *L'Écho de Verviers*, No. 301, 27 décembre 1865. Draft Rules of the International submitted to the Geneva Congress on behalf of the French Section in London.—389
- Congrès de Genève. Mémoire des délégués français*. Bruxelles, 1866.—413
- Congrès de Genève. Société Internationale des Travailleurs*. In: *Le Courrier international*, Nos. 8-16, 9, 16, 23, 30 mars, 6, 13, 20, 27 avril 1867.—429-30
- Congress of Geneva. International Association of Working Men*. In: *International Courier*, Nos. 7-15, February 20, March 13, 20 and 27, April 3, 10 and 17, 1867.—429
- The Irish State Prisoners. Sir George Grey and the International Working Men's Association*. In: *The Commonwealth*, No. 157, March 10, 1866. Signed by the President of the General Council, George Odger.—407
- Liebknecht, W. *Report on the Working-Class Movement in Germany*. Manuscript. [1865.]—384
- Rundschreiben der deutschen Abtheilung des Zentral Komites der Internationalen Arbeiterassociation fur die Schweiz an die Arbeiter*, Genf, 1865. Compiled by J. P. Becker. Leaflet. The English translation "Geneva, November 1865. Brother Working Men!" was published in *The Workman's Advocate*, No. 145, December 16, 1865.—388

## DOCUMENTS

- An Act for the Extension of Factory Acts* [15th August 1867] (30 & 31 Vict. c. 103).—307
- Alexander I. *Letter to Prince Kourakin*, November 1 (13), 1809. In: *Санкт-Петербургскія Вѣдомости*, 9 ноября, 1809. *Московскія Вѣдомости*, 17 ноября, 1809.—325-26

<sup>a</sup> Document written by Marx see in Section "Works by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels; Marx, Karl".

- Caulaincourt and Rumjanzev. [Secret convention of January 4, 1810.] In: A. Thiers. *Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire*, Vol. XI.—326
- Census of England and Wales for the year 1861*. London, 1863.—8
- Children's Employment Commission (1862). First Report of the Commissioners*. London, 1863.—8
- First-Sixth Reports, London, 1863-1867.—253, 255
- Fourth Report of the Commissioners. London, 1865.—258-59
- Declaration of Independence in Congress, July 4, 1776*. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America.—19
- First Report from the Select Committee on Adulteration of Food, &c.; with the Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix*. Ordered, by the House of Commons, to be printed, 27 July 1855.—253
- Gesetz über die Verpflichtung zum Kriegsdienste*. Vom 3ten September 1814. In: *Gesetz-Sammlung für die Königlichen Preussischen Staaten*. Jg. 1814.—44-45
- Nesselrode [Circular to All Russian Embassies]. In: *Frankfurter Oberpostamts-Zeitung*, No. 210 (2. Beilage), 28. Juli 1848: *St. Petersburg, 6. Juli. Die russische Note*.—197
- Николай I. Высочайший манифестъ. 14 марта, 1848. In: *Съверная пчела*, № 59, 15 марта, 1848.—197
- Pitt, L. K. *Account of Russia during the Commencement of the Reign of the Emperor Paul*. Manuscript.—319-20
- [Pozzo di Borgo to Alexander I.] Mémoire de M. Pozzo di Borgo. Octobre-novembre 1814. In: *Histoire d'Alexandre I<sup>er</sup> Empereur de Russie* par Ivan Golovine, Leipzig-Paris, 1859.—199
- Public Health. Report of the Medical Officer of the Privy Council with Appendix*.
- First-Eighth Reports, London, 1861-1866.—253
- Sixth Report 1863 London, 1864.—6-8
- Report addressed to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, relative to the Grievances complained of by the Journeymen Bakers; with Appendix of Evidence*. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty. London, 1862.—8
- Reports by Her Majesty's Secretaries of Embassy and Legation, on the Manufactures, Commerce, &c., of the Countries in which they reside*. London, 1867.—424-25
- Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the operation of the acts (16&17 Vict, c. 99 and 20&21 Vict. c. 3) relating to transportation and penal servitude*. Vol. I. Report and appendix. Vol. II. Minutes of evidence. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty. London, 1863.—6
- Reports of the Inspectors of Factories to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department* [for the 1840s-1860s]. London, 1842-1867.—222, 253
- for the half year ending 31st October 1863. London, 1864.—8
- Report of the Conference of Trades' Delegates of the United Kingdom, held in Sheffield, in the Temperance Hall, Townhead Street, on July 17th, 1866, and Four Following Days*. Sheffield, 1866.—191
- [Ségur, L. P.] *Politique de tous les cabinets de l'Europe, pendant les règnes de Louis XV et de Louis XIV*. Seconde édition. T. I-III, 1801.—315, 316, 317, 318
- The State Prisoners. An Appeal to the Women of Ireland*. In: *The Workman's Advocate*, No. 148, January 6, 1866. Signed: Mrs. O'Donovan Rossa and Mrs. Clarke Luby.—339

*Traité de paix entre S.M. l'empereur des Français, roi d'Italie et S.M. l'empereur de toutes les Russies; signé à Tilsit, le 7 juillet 1807.* In: G. F. Martens, *Recueil des principaux Traités d'Alliance, de Paix, de Trêve, de Neutralité...*, t. VIII, 1803-1808, Goettingue, 1835, pp. 637-43.—323, 324

ANONYMOUS ARTICLES AND REPORTS  
PUBLISHED IN PERIODIC EDITIONS

- The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 160, November 5, 1864: *Working Men's International Association*.—353  
— No. 164, December 3, 1864.—354  
— No. 166, December 17, 1864.—355
- The Daily News*, March 2, 1865: *The Late Polish Insurrection*.—98
- The Fortnightly Review*, No. 37, December 1866. Editorial.—414
- Kölnische Zeitung*, Nr. 179, 29. Juni 1866: *Reichenberg*, 27. Juni, Mittags. Marked: W.—178
- Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland*. Nr. 28, 4. Juli 1868: *Marx, Karl, das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Oekonomie.* (In 3 Bdn.) Erster Bd. Buch I. Der Produktionsprocess des Kapitals. Hamburg, 1867. O. Meissner (XII, 784 S. 5 gr. 8.) 3 Thlr. 10 Sgr. Signed "h".—260
- The Morning Star*, No. 2703, November 2, 1864: [Report of the Central Council meeting, November 1, 1864].—353
- Polonia; or monthly reports on Polish affairs*, No. IV, November, 1832: On the Necessity of Appointing a British Diplomatic Agent to the Senate of the Free Town of Cracow.—198
- Rheinischer Beobachter*, Nr. 206, 25. Juli 1847: *Politische Gänge. Achter Gang*.—80
- The Times*, No. 25507, May 25, 1866: *Austrian and Prussian Armaments*.—168  
— No. 25532, June 23, 1866: *The Austrian Army (from our military correspondent). Head-quarters of the army of the North, Olmütz, June 19*.—171  
— No. 25701, January 7, 1867: *The Imperial decrees published on Saturday last*.—198
- Der weiße Adler*, Nr. 30, 11. März 1865: *Ein Meeting zu Gunsten Polens in London*.—97
- Zeitung für Norddeutschland*, Nr. 5522, 15. Februar 1867: [Report of Karl Marx's planned trip to the Continent].—202



## INDEX OF PERIODICALS

- Allgemeine Militär-Zeitung*—a newspaper of the German Officers' and Soldiers' Society published in Darmstadt and Leipzig from 1826 to 1902; Engels contributed to it from 1860 to 1864.—45, 49
- Allgemeine Zeitung*—a conservative daily founded in 1798; from 1810 to 1882 it was published in Augsburg.—24
- L'Association*—a French journal of the co-operative workers' associations, which were under the influence of the bourgeois republicans; published from 1864 to 1866 in Paris and Brussels; its editorial board was in Paris.—36
- Barmer Zeitung*—a daily liberal newspaper published from 1834 to 1931.—80
- The Bee-Hive Newspaper*—a weekly trade-unionist newspaper published under various titles in London from 1861 to 1876; from November 1864 to April 1870, it printed documents of the First International; in view of the growing influence of the bourgeois radicals on the newspaper's editorial board, the General Council of the International broke off relations with it in April 1870.—13, 16-19, 21, 100, 203, 204, 353-55, 357, 401, 425, 427, 437
- Belletristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung*—a weekly founded by German petty-bourgeois refugees in New York in 1852 and published under this title from March 18, 1853 to March 10, 1854.—93
- Der Beobachter. Ein Volksblatt aus Schwaben*—a daily published in Stuttgart from 1833; in the 1860s, organ of the petty-bourgeois democracy.—22, 23, 224, 226
- Berliner Reform*—a daily of the German petty-bourgeois democrats; published in Berlin from 1861 to 1868.—81, 90, 91, 96
- Der Bote vom Niederrhein*—a newspaper published in Duisburg in the 1860s.—163
- Der Botschafter*—an Austrian daily, an official government newspaper published in Vienna in 1862-65.—93, 94
- The Commonwealth*—a weekly of the Central Council of the International; published in London from February 1866 to July 1867, it was the successor of *The Workman's Advocate*; Eccarius was its editor from February to April 1866; Marx was on the Board of Directors till June 1866; because of the growing

- influence of the trade-unionists on the board, the newspaper virtually became an organ of bourgeois radicals.—152, 155, 158, 161, 184, 195, 203, 407, 413.
- Le Courrier français*—a weekly (from June 1867, a daily) newspaper of the Left republicans; appeared in Paris from 1861 to 1868; virtually an organ of the International in France from May 1866.—194, 203
- Le Courrier international*—see *The International Courier*
- The Daily News*—a liberal newspaper of the English industrial bourgeoisie; appeared under this name in London from 1846 to 1930.—21, 98
- Demokratisches Wochenblatt*—a German workers' newspaper; published from January 1868 to September 1869 in Leipzig under the editorship of Wilhelm Liebknecht; at the Eisenach Congress in 1869 it was declared a central organ of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party and renamed *Der Volksstaat*.—231, 234, 237
- Deutsche-Brüsseller-Zeitung*—a newspaper founded by German political emigrants in Brussels; published from January 1847 to February 1848. From September 1847 Marx and Engels regularly contributed to the newspaper which, under their influence, became the organ of revolutionary communist propaganda.—80
- Düsseldorfer Zeitung*—a German daily founded in 1745, published under this title from 1826 to 1926; voiced liberal views in the 1840s-60s.—81, 216, 218
- L'Echo de Verviers*—a Belgian daily democratic newspaper founded in 1864; was a mouthpiece of petty-bourgeois elements in the French Section in London, who were hostile to Marx and the Central Council of the International.—388-89, 392-95, 397-400
- Eiberfelder Zeitung*—a daily published under this title from 1834 to 1904; in the 1860s voiced liberal views.—80, 214, 215
- Examiner and Times*—a liberal newspaper founded in 1848 as a result of the merger of *Manchester Times* and *Manchester Examiner*; in the 1840s-60s it supported the Free Traders; appeared under various titles until 1894.—439
- The Fortnightly Review*—a historical, philosophical and literary magazine founded in 1865 by a group of radicals; subsequently became liberal in character; published in London till 1934.—238, 306, 414
- Frankfurter Oberpostamts-Zeitung*—a newspaper published from 1619 to 1866. During 1848-49 it was the voice of the Imperial Regent and the Imperial Government; later, the organ of the Federal Diet. From 1852 onwards it appeared under the title *Frankfurter Post-Zeitung*.—197
- Gazette de Moscou*—see *Московскія вѣдомости*
- Głos Wolny*—a Polish-language newspaper of the democratic wing of the Polish emigration; published in London from January 1863 three times a month; edited by Antoni Zabicki, member of the Central Council of the International.—196, 198-201
- Hermann. Deutsches Wochenblatt aus London*—a German-language weekly organ of the German petty-bourgeois democratic refugees published in London from 1859.—25, 86, 93

- The International Courier*—a weekly published in London from November 1864 to July 1867 in English and French; its French name was *Le Courier international*. In 1867, the paper was the organ of the International.—185, 194, 429-30
- Journal de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs*—a monthly of the International's sections in Romance Switzerland, published in Geneva from December 1865 to September 1866 with the participation of J. Ph. Becker.—388, 399, 408
- Kölnische Zeitung*—a daily published from 1802 to 1945; during the 1848-49 revolution and in subsequent years expressed the interests of the Prussian liberal bourgeoisie.—178
- Kreuz-Zeitung*—see *Neue Preußische Zeitung*
- Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland*—a scientific and literary weekly published in Leipzig from 1850 to 1944.—260
- Londoner Anzeiger*—a weekly of the German democratic refugees in London, published from 1864 to 1867.—84
- Manchester Examiner*—see *Examiner and Times*
- The Manchester Guardian*—a daily founded in 1821; organ of the Free Traders and, from the mid-nineteenth century, of the Liberal Party.—164, 168, 172, 176, 179, 182
- The Miner and Workman's Advocate*—a daily newspaper of the miners' trade union of Great Britain, published in London from 1863 to 1865.—21, 379, 380, 383
- Mitteldeutsche Volks-Zeitung*—a liberal newspaper published in Leipzig from 1862 to 1866.—163
- Moniteur*—see *Le Moniteur universel*
- Le Moniteur universel*—a daily published in Paris from 1789 to 1901; published under this title from 1811; official government organ from 1799 to 1869.—196, 201, 322
- The Morning Star*—a daily of the English Free Traders published in London from 1856 to 1869.—353
- Московскія вѣдомости (Moskovskiye Vedomosti—Moscow Recorder)*—a paper published from 1756 to 1917; in the 1850s, it became reactionary in character.—198, 326
- Neue Badische Landeszeitung*—a daily democratic paper published in Mannheim from 1867 to 1933.—229, 230
- Neue Deutsche Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie*—a democratic daily published from July 1, 1848 to December 14, 1849, first in Darmstadt (till April 1, 1849), and then in Frankfurt am Main. It was edited by Otto Lüning, and from October 1, 1849, also by Joseph Weydemeyer.—24
- Neue Frankfurter Zeitung*—a democratic paper published from 1859 to 1866.—25, 87
- Neue Preußische Zeitung*—a conservative daily published in Berlin from June 1848 to 1939; mouthpiece of the Prussian Junkers and Court circles; known also as the *Kreuz-Zeitung*, because its heading included a cross bearing the motto "Forward with God for King and Fatherland".—63
- Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie*—a daily published in Cologne under the editorship of Marx from June 1, 1848, to May 19, 1849 (with an interval

- between September 27 and October 12, 1848); organ of the revolutionary-proletarian wing of the democrats during the 1848-49 revolution in Germany. Engels was among its editors.—81, 152, 214
- New-York Daily Tribune*—a newspaper founded by Horace Greeley in 1841 and published until 1924; organ of the Left wing of the American Whigs until the mid-1850s and later of the Republican Party; it voiced progressive views and opposed Negro slavery in the 1840s and 1850s; Marx and Engels contributed to it from August 1851 to March 1862.—19, 99, 366
- New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung*—see *Belletristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung*
- Nordstern*—a daily published in Hamburg from 1860 to 1866; from 1863, a Lassallean mouthpiece.—25, 358
- Oberrheinischer Courier damit verbunden der Freiburger Anzeiger*—a paper published in the 1860s.—163
- Polonia; or monthly reports on Polish affairs*—published by the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland, London.—198
- Revue contemporaine*—a fortnightly published in Paris from 1851 to 1870; during the Second Republic, an organ of the Party of Order, which comprised the Legitimists and Orleanists; after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851, took a Bonapartist stand.—414
- Revue des deux Mondes*—a literary and political fortnightly published in Paris from 1829.—414
- Rheinischer Beobachter*—a conservative daily published in Cologne from 1844. Its publication was discontinued after the March 1848 revolution in Germany.—80
- Rheinische Zeitung*—a liberal daily published in Düsseldorf from 1863 to 1866, and in Cologne from 1867 to 1874.—81, 96, 210
- La Rive Gauche*—a democratic weekly published from October 1864 to August 1866, first in Paris, and then in Brussels by a group of French Left republicans; it printed documents of the International. Its editor was Charles Longuet.—364, 410, 411
- Санкт-Петербургская ведомости (Sankt-Peterburgskije Vedomosti*—St. Petersburg Recorder)—an official government daily published from 1728 to 1914.—326
- St. Louis Daily Press*—an American workers' paper published from 1864.—357
- Северная пчела (Severnaya Pchela*—Northern Bee)—a semi-official government, political and literary newspaper published in St. Petersburg from 1825 to 1864.—197
- Der Social-Demokrat*—an organ of the Lassallean General Association of German Workers; published in Berlin from December 15, 1864 to 1871, in 1864 weekly and from 1865 three times a week; in 1864-67 it was edited by J. B. Schweitzer. Marx and Engels contributed to the paper for a short time, ceased to do so in February 1865, since they disagreed with the political line of the editors.—13, 26, 28, 30, 33, 35, 36, 80, 87-89, 91, 92, 94, 219, 328, 359, 360, 389
- Staats-Anzeiger für Württemberg*—a government daily newspaper published in Stuttgart from 1849 with a weekly supplement, *Gewerbeblatt aus Württemberg*.—227, 228

- The Times*—a conservative daily founded in London in 1785.—12, 160, 168, 171, 198, 439
- La Tribune du Peuple*—a Belgian democratic paper of the socialist and atheistic society "Peuple", published in Brussels from 1861 to April 1869; from August 1865 de facto and from January 1866 official newspaper of the Belgian sections of the International.—389, 409, 429
- Vierteljahrsschrift für Volkswirtschaft und Kulturgeschichte*—an economic liberal magazine published in Berlin from 1863 to 1893.—260
- La Voix de l'Avenir*—a weekly published in La-Chaux-de-Fonds from 1865 to 1868; from 1867 official newspaper of the Romance sections of the International in Switzerland; was influenced by Proudhonist ideas.—399, 408
- Der Vorbote*—a monthly of the German sections of the International in Switzerland, published in Geneva from 1866 to 1871 under the editorship of Johann Philipp Becker; on the whole, upheld the line pursued by Marx and the General Council by regularly publishing documents of the International and information about its activity in various countries.—194, 388, 390-91, 399, 408, 415, 440
- Der weiße Adler*—a German-language liberal paper, published in Zurich from 1864 three times a week.—97-98
- Die westliche Post*—a German-language paper published in St. Louis (USA) from 1858; in the 1860s, an organ of petty-bourgeois democratic refugees.—24-25
- The Working Man*—a weekly published in London from 1861 to 1867 with an interval; its editor-in-chief was the French democratic refugee Joseph Collet; the paper was notable for its reformist tendencies.—203, 204, 425, 427
- The Workman's Advocate*—a weekly workers' paper published in London after the reorganisation of *The Miner and Workman's Advocate* in September 1865; official organ of the Central Council of the International; Marx was a member of its board. In February 1866, because of the growing influence of the reformist elements on the editorial board, it was reorganised once again and renamed *The Commonwealth*.—339, 380-82, 389, 394, 399
- Zeitschrift des königlich preussischen statistischen Bureaus*—a Prussian monthly official statistical journal published in Berlin from 1860 to 1905.—45
- Zeitung für Norddeutschland*—a liberal paper published in Hanover from 1848 to 1872.—202
- Die Zukunft*—a democratic paper of the People's Party, published from 1867 in Königsberg, and from 1868 to 1871 in Berlin; published Marx's preface to Volume One of *Capital* and Engels' review of this volume.—207, 209, 223

## SUBJECT INDEX

## A

- Absolute surplus-value*—211-12, 258, 290, 292  
 See also *Surplus-value*
- Abstract labour*—121-23, 265-68, 274, 283-84  
 See also *Labour*
- Abstraction*—104, 106-07, 113, 116, 118, 122, 125, 126-27, 133-35, 142, 144, 148, 217, 231-32, 243, 255, 268-69, 271-72, 277-79, 292
- Accumulation of capital*—104, 147, 213, 236-37, 257  
 See also *Extended reproduction*
- Advanced capital*—257, 290-91  
 See also *Capital*
- Agricultural labourers*—74, 192, 254, 308, 367
- Agriculture*—68, 70-71, 216-17, 301, 308  
 See also *Agricultural labourers; Nationalisation of land*
- Ancient Egypt*—296
- Ancient Rome*—9, 100, 106, 243, 251, 278
- Ancient world*—217, 225, 252, 287, 296
- Appropriation*—132-35, 136-37, 233-34, 247, 282  
 See also *Communism; Private property; Property*
- Aristocracy, nobility in England*—65, 68, 252
- Armaments, weapons*—167-68, 178-79, 181, 182  
 See also *Artillery*
- Arming of the people*—193  
 See also *Uprising, armed*
- Army*—43-45, 61-63, 72, 166-68, 296, 426  
 — and economy—42, 193  
 — and exploiting classes—60-61, 73  
 — and proletariat—67, 85-86, 426  
 — standing—194, 376, 386, 426  
 — militia—55, 194  
 — discipline and morale—43, 52, 176, 182  
 — soldiers—53, 62-63  
 — officers—43, 52-53, 61  
 — recruiting (cadre-) system—43-45, 50-54, 62, 85-86  
 — universal military service—44-46, 48-52, 62, 64, 67, 85-86, 193-94  
 — Italian—175-76  
 — Sardinian (Piedmontese)—175  
 — Swiss—52  
 See also *Armaments, weapons; Artillery; Art of war; Cavalry; Fortifications; Infantry; Military training; War(s)*
- Army, Austrian*—51, 164-68, 171, 175, 178, 181
- Army, English*—44, 51, 52, 167
- Army, French*—47, 51, 72, 167
- Army of German states*—49, 51, 179
- Army, Prussian*—42-43, 45-54, 61-63, 164-66, 167-68  
 — as a tool of reaction—53-54, 60-63  
 — and monarchy and Junkers—73  
 — art of war, training, combat effi-

- ciency—50-55, 61, 165-67, 171, 176, 177, 182  
 — universal conscription—44-45, 48-52, 63  
 — reorganisation in 1850s-60s—44, 50-51, 55-58, 60-61, 64-67, 84-86  
 — revolutionary and oppositional mood in—53-54, 63-64  
 — and working class—67, 79, 84-86  
 — and *Landwehr*—42-44, 51-52, 85, 164
- Army, Russian*—167, 199
- Artillery*—53-54, 164, 167
- Art of war*—52-53, 166-67, 175-77, 179-80, 182  
 See also *Army; Artillery; Cavalry; Fortifications; Infantry; War(s)*
- Association*—11, 69-70, 190
- Austria*—153-54, 199, 222-23  
 — foreign policy and diplomacy—153-54, 324-25  
 — and France—312, 313, 316-17, 318, 325-26  
 — and Germany—155-56  
 — and Italian states—155-56  
 — and Poland—153-54, 159-60, 161, 316, 325-26  
 — and Prussia—200, 317-18  
 — and Russia—153-54, 157-58  
 See also *Austro-Italian war, 1848-49; Austro-Italo-French war, 1859; Austro-Prussian war, 1866; Crimean war, 1853-56*
- Austro-Italian war, 1848-49*—173-74, 176, 198  
 See also *Revolution of 1848-49 in Austria*
- Austro-Italo-French war, 1859*—43, 51, 166-67, 172-76
- Austro-Prussian war, 1866*—164, 178  
 — character of hostilities—164-82  
 — battle of Sadowa (Koniggrätz)—181  
 — battle of Custoza, 1866—173-76  
 — and Germany—178  
 — and Prussia—178
- Average profit*—134
- Average rate of profit*—119, 137, 138, 144, 145, 149
- B
- Banks*—31, 113-14  
 See also *Credit*
- Belgium*—156, 289, 311, 316, 319, 375-76, 385  
 See also *Working class in Belgium; Working-class movement in Belgium*
- Bill of exchange*—114-16
- Bonapartism*—36, 59, 72-74, 89  
 — criticism of Bonapartist "principle of nationalities"—153, 155-59, 160-61  
 — Prussian—72-73, 225  
 See also *Society of December 10*
- Bourgeoisie*—41, 56-57, 64-71, 74-76  
 — origin and development—68, 69, 200-01  
 — role in the development of productive forces—70-71  
 — economic domination—14, 68, 236-37  
 — and state power—64, 68, 77  
 — and Bonapartism—72-73  
 — bargains with feudal reaction—56-57  
 — theorists and ideologists of—32, 110  
 See also *Capitalist; Competition; Petty bourgeoisie; Republic, bourgeois; Revolution, bourgeois; Society, bourgeois*
- Bourgeoisie, English*—57, 65, 360, 422  
 See also *Petty bourgeoisie—English*
- Bourgeoisie, French*—57, 65, 72-73, 78
- Bourgeoisie, German*—56-57, 65, 66, 75-76, 360  
 See also: *Bourgeoisie, Prussian*
- Bourgeoisie, Prussian*—56-57, 64-65, 66, 75-76, 85, 395
- Bourgeoisie, US*—20, 422, 437
- Bourgeois political economy*—11, 28-29, 110, 112-13, 207-08, 217, 231-32, 242, 268-71, 305-06  
 — vulgar bourgeois political economy—110, 207-09, 231-32, 293  
 See also *Classical bourgeois political economy; Malthusianism; Physiocrats, the*
- Bureaucracy, red tape*—56, 57, 59, 60, 65, 68-69, 71-74, 77
- Byelorussia, Byelorussians (White Russia)*—158-59, 161

## C

*Campaign of 1812 (in Russia)*—327

*Capital*—214, 256, 277, 295-96

— as relation of production—191, 236-37, 258, 280-81, 290-91, 422

— as general formula—238-41, 256-57, 275-79, 290

— as self-increasing value—240-41, 258, 276-77, 290-91, 295-96

— capitalist as capital personified—257-58, 277

— and wage labour—70, 131, 231, 233, 257-58, 299, 415

— as accumulated unpaid labour of workers—214, 231-32

— and working day—140-42, 256-57

— prerequisites for its appearance—246-47, 275, 278-81, 290-91, 295

— and division of labour—296-98, 299, 300-01, 304-05

— its minimum—290

— as money—211, 239-41, 275, 276-77, 280

— its historically transient character—216, 280-81

— and development of productive forces—237

— and landed property—275

— control, as its function—248, 257-58, 282, 290, 293-96

— its migration—107, 109

— and workers' health—287-88

— bourgeois economists on identity of interests of capital and labour—207-09

See also *Accumulation of capital; Advanced capital; Capitalist mode of production; Concentration of capital; Constant capital; Exploitation of labour-power by capital; Fixed capital; Interest-bearing capital; Manufacturer's capital; Merchant's (commercial) capital; Organic composition of capital; Primitive accumulation of capital; Usurer's capital; Variable capital*

"*Capital*" by K. Marx—207-18, 224-59, 260-61, 361-62, 439-40

*Capitalism*—245-46, 286

See also *Capitalist mode of production; Society, bourgeois*

*Capitalist*—68, 69-71, 78, 106-08, 128-29, 133-35, 137, 233-34, 241, 243-44, 247-48, 253-55, 257-58, 277, 287-88, 292-96, 302, 306

See also *Bourgeoisie; Capital; Exploitation of labour-power by capital; Petty bourgeoisie; Workers' living and labour conditions under capitalism*

*Capitalist mode of production*—246, 280

— tendencies of development—254-55, 269

— its categories—266-67

— historical prerequisites and conditions for—224-25, 234, 237, 246, 247, 293, 296

— and precapitalist forms of labour—252

— and industrial revolution—68

— its material basis—305, 307-08

— production of surplus-value as main goal—247-48, 257, 295-96

— and labour co-operation—296-97

— and division of labour—299

— and control of labour process—257-58, 295-96

— duration of the working day—220, 253, 288, 293

— accumulation of capital—236

— and reproduction of capitalist relations—236

— and market—252

— antagonistic contradictions of, and prerequisites for its destruction—148-49, 307-08

— necessity of its destruction—210-11

See also *Mode of production; Society, bourgeois*

*Categories*—29, 208, 246, 267, 280

*Cavalry*—53-54, 182

*Chartist movement*—10, 152

*Chemistry*—6, 9, 125, 127

*Child's labour*—142, 188, 189, 255, 288-89, 302, 376, 386

See also *Factory legislation; Labour; Working day*

*Christianity*—267

*Circulation*—239, 240-43, 246, 269-70

See also *Commodity circulation; Money circulation*

*Class(es)*—9, 12-14, 20, 68-71, 74-75, 76-78, 89, 128-29, 134-35, 188-89,



- 200-01, 210, 229, 233-34, 235-37, 295-96, 437  
 See also *Bourgeoisie; Class struggle; Petty bourgeoisie; Social relations; Society; Working class*  
*Class struggle*—72-73, 76-77, 146, 148-49, 161, 186, 187-92, 200-01, 235-36, 287-89, 421, 423, 437  
 See also *Class(es); Economic struggle; Political struggle; Revolution, proletarian, socialist; Tactics of proletarian class struggle; Working-class movement*  
*Classical bourgeois political economy*—208  
 See also *Bourgeois political economy; Physiocrats, the*  
*Climate*—247, 281, 298  
*Coin*—114-15, 271-72, 274-75  
 See also *Money*  
*Commodity*—31, 118, 122, 208, 236-37, 239, 244-46, 248-49, 265-70, 280-84  
 See also *Commodity production*  
*Commodity circulation*—116, 238-42, 246, 269-73, 275-81  
 See also *Circulation; Commodity, Commodity production; Exchange, barter*  
*Commodity production*—121-22, 246, 267-69, 278, 280, 284  
 See also *Commodity; Commodity circulation; Production*  
*Communism*—188, 190, 191-92, 216, 224-25  
 — as goal of working-class movement—14, 69-71  
 — prerequisites for—29, 148-49, 210, 216-17, 224-25, 237, 307-08  
 — necessity of proletarian revolution—129, 216  
 — international character of—14  
 — abolition of private property—11-12, 69, 216-17, 237  
 — and production—11, 12, 69-70, 129, 188, 189-90, 216-17, 237  
 — labour—11, 12, 14, 149, 188, 189, 190  
 — working time and leisure—142  
 — elimination of opposition between classes, social equality—12, 14, 237  
 — and army—193  
 — demand for arming the whole people—193  
 — role of class-consciousness—11, 14  
 — morals—13  
 — and science—11  
 — and man—187-89, 237  
 — education—184, 188-89  
 See also *Dictatorship of the proletariat; Period of transition from capitalism to communism (socialism); Revolution, proletarian, socialist*  
*Communism, in France*—26, 31  
*Communism, scientific*—210, 215-17  
 See also *Dictatorship of the proletariat; Party, proletarian*  
*Communist League, the*—57, 71, 80, 81  
*Community*—296, 298, 299  
*Competition*—118-20, 147, 184, 191, 254, 292, 298-99  
*Compromise (in politics)*—33, 65-66, 85, 89  
*Concentration of capital*—125  
 See also *Capital*  
*Concept(ion)*—28, 48, 208, 274  
 See also *Categories*  
*Concrete labour*—248, 265-68, 284  
 See also *Abstract labour; Labour*  
*Consciousness*—26, 69, 71, 189, 280, 307  
*Constant capital*—147, 250, 285, 294  
*Constitution*—59, 60, 64-65, 77  
 See also *Democracy, bourgeois; Monarchy, constitutional*  
*Consumption*—130, 135, 141, 233, 244, 245, 249, 258, 280-82, 290-94  
*Content and form*—112, 234, 267-69, 270-71, 272, 274, 276, 277, 285, 294, 299, 305  
*Control of production*—11, 258, 282, 290, 295, 298  
 See also *Organisation of social labour and production; State, the*  
*Co-operation, co-operative movement*—11-12, 190, 209, 212, 224, 293-97, 299, 300-01  
 — and production of surplus-value—212, 306-07  
 — and capital—294-96, 299  
 — in pre-capitalist formations (simple)—295-97  
 — capitalist—296-97, 300  
 — workers' producer and consumer co-operatives—11-12, 190  
 — co-operative production in the period of transition to, and under, communism—11-12, 190, 216-17

— criticism of bourgeois co-operative theories—12

*Corn Laws (England)*—112, 139-40

*Corruption*—72-73

*Corvée*—233-34, 252, 287

See also *Feudal services; Serfdom*

*Costs of production*—133-34, 295

*Coup d'état*—54, 60-63, 67

*Cracow, insurrection of 1846*—152

*Crafts, craftsmen*—257, 288, 290, 297-300, 307

*Credit*—31-32, 72-73, 114-15, 273-74

See also *Banks; Interest (econ.); Interest-bearing capital*

*Crimean war, 1853-56*—154, 199

*Criticism*—26-30, 41, 53-54, 84, 85-86, 91, 117, 208, 210-11, 215, 225, 229, 231-32

*Culture*—221, 230, 298

## D

*Danish war, 1864*—43, 61, 166, 167-68

See also *Schleswig-Holstein question*

*Danubian principalities*—252

See also *Wallachia*

*Darwinism*—217, 221, 224-25, 390

*Demand and supply*—107-09, 112, 116-18, 126, 144, 146-48

*Democracy, bourgeois*—59

*Democracy, petty-bourgeois*—69

*Denmark*—325, 348

*Despotism*—72, 155

See also *Bonapartism; Monarchy, absolute; Tsarism*

*Dialectics*—29, 95, 208, 213, 257-58, 439-40

See also *Materialism*

*Dictatorship of the proletariat*—12, 14, 69-70, 190

See also *Communism; Party, proletarian; Period of transition from capitalism to communism (socialism); Revolution, proletarian, socialist; Working class*

*Division of labour*—122, 125, 209, 212, 220, 224, 269, 292, 297, 298-301, 304-08

*Domestic industry*—187-88, 212, 228

See also *Crafts, craftsmen*

## E

*Economic categories*—29, 208, 246, 267, 268, 269, 280, 281

See also *Categories*

*Economic crises*—10, 115, 143, 271, 274, 306

*Economic laws*—117, 118, 119, 120, 125, 134, 146, 147, 148, 149, 208, 210, 217, 225, 237, 242, 243, 244, 248, 249, 251, 254, 257, 268-69, 272, 277, 278, 279, 287-88, 293, 303

— general and specified—120

— natural-historic character of—29, 188, 208, 217, 225

— coercive, compulsory character of—254, 288

— contradictory character of—256, 257

— bourgeois and petty-bourgeois conceptions of—116-20, 208, 209, 215

*Economic relations*—27-29, 224, 267

See also *Economy and politics; Relations of production*

*Economic struggle*—14, 146, 148-49, 191, 192, 441

*Economy and politics*—12, 14, 33, 64, 68, 69, 146

*Education, training*—52, 54, 184, 187-89

*Egypt*—198

*Emigration*—9, 10, 50, 92-93, 162-63, 306

*Ends and means*—14, 61, 69, 191, 210, 247, 252, 257, 277, 295, 441

*England (Great Britain)*—68, 155-56, 209, 432

— in the 1850s-60s—5, 8-9, 10, 20

— world-market monopoly—9, 109

— industry—5, 7, 10, 11, 68, 115, 124, 212, 228, 422

— landed property—8-9

— tenant-farmers—68, 145

— finances, budget, taxation—8, 113-14

— social contrasts, morals, corruption—5, 7-9

— factory inspection—8, 209

— Factory Acts—10-11, 72, 109-10, 209

— Reform Bill, 1832—77

— Reform Bill, 1867—432

- and struggle for free trade principles—7, 230
  - foreign policy, diplomacy—10, 198-99
  - and France—313, 316
  - and Poland—152, 197-98
  - and Russia—10, 198-99
  - and the US Civil War—6
  - See also *Aristocracy, nobility in England; Army, English; Bourgeoisie, English; Ireland; Peasantry—English; Reform League, 1865; Working class in England*
  - Enlightenment, the*—160
  - Epoch*—68, 76, 145, 246, 287, 296
  - Equality*—14, 129, 441
  - See also *Rights of man*
  - Europe*—156, 157-58
  - Exchange, barter*—125-26, 131, 240, 241-42, 243-44, 244-45, 248, 249, 266-68, 269-70, 271, 272, 274, 276-80
  - Exchange(able) value*—265-66, 276-78
  - See also *Value*
  - Experience*—12, 118, 127, 254, 256, 299
  - See also *Theory and practice*
  - Exploitation*—132, 133, 211-12, 233, 234, 251, 252, 258, 286, 287, 288, 290, 301, 302, 307, 338
  - Exploitation of labour-power by capital*—68, 134-35, 212, 233, 234, 251-52, 257, 258, 287, 290-91
  - as source of capital—134-35, 258
  - degree of—136, 255-56, 289, 302, 338
  - extensive and intensive growth—142, 290-91
  - means of production as means of exploitation—258, 290, 305
  - and surplus-value—289-99
  - manufacture, large-scale industry and machines—258, 287-89, 295, 302-05, 306
  - and control of labour process—258, 295
  - See also *Absolute surplus-value; Child's labour; Factory legislation; Female labour; Intensity of labour; Labour; Wage labour; Workers' living and labour conditions under capitalism; Working day*
  - Extended reproduction*—128, 131
  - See also *Reproduction*
- F
- Factory legislation*—72, 76, 142, 146, 228, 229, 255, 287, 289, 302-03, 307
  - reduction of labour time—10-11, 72, 76, 109, 110, 146, 187, 209, 212, 222-23, 230, 235, 252-53, 254, 255, 287, 304
  - 10-hour Bill in England and struggle for it—10, 11, 72, 109, 141, 222, 228, 230, 288, 307
  - workers' movement for legal reduction of working day—187, 222-23, 235, 422
  - See also *Workers' living and labour conditions under capitalism*
  - Factory system*—236, 300, 301-02, 304-06
  - See also *Large-scale industry; Machinery*
  - Family and marriage*—142, 188, 298, 302
  - Farmers*—145-47
  - Female labour*—187-88, 255, 288-89, 302, 376, 386
  - See also *Factory legislation; Labour; Working day*
  - Fenians, Fenianism*—339, 391
  - Fetishism*—267-68
  - Feudalism*—27, 69, 71, 77, 191, 200, 257, 287, 296
  - See also *Community; Guilds, guild system; Middle Ages, the*
  - Feudal services*—214, 234
  - See also *Corvée*
  - Feuerbach, Feuerbachianism*—26, 200
  - First International (International Working Men's Association)*—3-16, 186, 190
  - foundation of—12-13, 14-15, 82, 96, 330, 351, 356, 406
  - first programmatic documents—3-16, 151, 351, 352, 369, 371, 393, 398, 401, 406, 442
  - struggle for class character of Association—12-15, 36, 82-83, 186, 330, 392-400
  - struggle for international solidarity and united actions of proletarians of all countries—11-16, 162-63, 185, 186, 190, 369, 376, 405
  - emancipation of workers as Association's aim—14-15, 186, 203, 369, 423, 437, 441

- and building of a classless society—  
11-12, 149, 190
- economic and political struggle of  
proletariat—11-12, 149, 190-92,  
407
- and trade unions—149, 191-92,  
369, 376, 386, 396-97, 432-  
33
- and strikes—162-63, 186, 405,  
407-08, 412, 430-31
- and struggle for limitation of work-  
ing day and higher wages—103-  
49, 183, 186-88, 222-23, 376, 386
- female and child's labour, educa-  
tion—183-84, 187-89, 376, 386
- and statistical inquiry into condi-  
tion of working class—183-84,  
186-87, 376, 428, 430, 443
- and factory legislation—187-89,  
222-23
- and co-operative movement—11,  
190, 376, 386, 444-45
- and national question—152-61
- and Polish question—97-98, 152-  
61, 193, 196-201, 354-56, 414
- and independence of Ireland—  
399, 407
- and Bonapartism—36, 398, 414
- and foreign policy—12-13, 19-21,  
97-100, 152-54, 156-57, 193, 376,  
407, 411, 426-27
- struggle against Mazzinists—393-  
394, 401
- struggle against Proudhonists—  
82, 153
- struggle against Lassalleans—395-  
96
- and League of Peace and Free-  
dom—204, 426-27, 439
- organisational principles—15-16,  
18, 185, 351, 395, 441-46
- Rules and Regulations—14-16,  
412, 441-46
- Central (General) Council—15-16,  
17, 18, 82-83, 150, 195, 203, 330,  
351, 353, 357, 364-65, 398-99, 412,  
413, 438
- Sub-Committee (Standing Com-  
mittee)—331, 351, 354, 358, 365,  
375-77, 385, 412, 413, 429
- local sections, federations, federal  
councils, national organisations—  
15-16, 184, 203, 335, 354, 358,  
443-46
- membership—15, 17, 18, 82, 328,  
340, 369, 398, 412-13, 432-33
- Marx as a corresponding secretary  
for Belgium—339, 364
- Marx as a corresponding secretary  
for Germany—20, 100, 356-57,  
358, 365, 369, 384, 387, 388, 389,  
405, 411, 412
- its press—328, 340, 388, 394, 399,  
407, 408, 429-30
- and ruling classes, and police  
persecution—364, 385, 388, 409,  
412-14
- functions and tasks of general  
congresses—15-16, 186
- First International and revolutionary move-  
ment in Poland*—97-98, 152-54, 354-  
55, 356, 370, 399, 406, 414
- First International in Belgium*—357, 364,  
385, 388-89, 395, 397, 409, 410, 421,  
436-37
- First International in England*—17, 96,  
354-55, 358, 365, 369, 378-79, 394,  
396, 406, 408, 412, 421-22, 432-33
- functions and activity of General  
Council—14-16, 358, 364-65, 394,  
396, 407-08, 421-32
- and struggle for election reform—  
337, 357, 358, 359, 365, 366, 394,  
396, 406-08, 422, 432
- and press—380-83, 394, 407-08,  
413-14
- emigrant sections—360, 389, 393,  
395, 407, 435
- First International in France*—385, 409,  
436-37
- participation of French workers  
and Republicans in foundation of  
International and in the work of  
Congresses—82, 385-86, 388, 406,  
413
- first Paris section (till April 1865)—  
82-83, 330-36, 357, 358-59,  
363-64
- Paris sections (April 1865-April  
1870)—364-65, 385, 386, 387, 389,  
394-95, 396-97, 413
- outside Paris—340, 387, 394-95,  
396, 409
- and strikes—421, 437

- and Proudhonists—82, 153, 331-32
  - police persecution—412, 428-29
  - First International in Germany*—356-57, 358, 365, 384, 388, 395-96, 405, 409, 421, 436, 438
  - local sections—356, 388, 389, 395, 411, 436
  - and General Association of German Workers—328, 356-57, 395
  - First International in Italy*—401, 410, 412, 436
  - First International in Switzerland*—98, 356, 358, 366, 388, 395, 397-99, 406, 408-09, 421, 436
  - First International in the USA*—19-21, 99-100, 354, 355, 357, 365-66, 369, 370, 407, 410, 436, 437
  - Fixed capital*—123, 124, 303
  - See also *Machinery*
  - Foreign policy*—13, 152-53, 193
  - Formal and real subordination of labour to capital*—11, 190, 258, 290, 295, 296-97, 304-05
  - Fortifications*—164, 170, 172
  - Fourierism, Fourierists*—26, 215, 231
  - France*—52, 72, 73, 74, 156
    - industry—65, 73
    - agriculture—75
    - classes, class relations and class struggle—72, 73, 200
    - bourgeoisie—72
    - working class—36, 72-75, 77-78, 89
    - peasantry—72, 74, 75
    - state apparatus—73, 74
    - home situation, home policy—225, 397
    - counter-revolutionary terrorism—72-74
    - foreign policy and diplomacy—311-27
    - and Austria—312, 313, 314, 316, 317, 318, 325
    - and Belgium—311, 319
    - and England—313, 316, 317
    - and Germany—311, 314
    - and Holland—311, 319, 320
    - and Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont)—311
    - and Poland—311-27
    - and Prussia—200, 313, 314, 317-18, 320
    - and Russia—196, 311-13, 314-17, 320, 322, 323-27
    - and Spain—311
    - and Sweden—311, 312, 314, 317
    - and Turkey—311, 313, 316, 317
  - See also *Army, French; Bourgeoisie, French; First International in France; France's wars against first and second European coalitions, 1792-97, 1798-1801; French Revolution, 1789-94; July Revolution in France, 1830; June insurrection of Paris proletariat, 1848; Napoleonic wars; Peasantry—French; Revolution of 1848 in France; Working class in France; Working-class movement in France*
  - France's wars against first and second European coalitions, 1792-97, 1798-1801*—140-41, 145, 173, 318-23
  - See also *French Revolution, 1789-94*
  - Free time*—142, 253, 287
  - Free trade*—9, 77
  - See also *Competition; Corn laws*
  - French Revolution, 1789-94*—19
- G
- General Association of German Workers*—36, 80, 81, 87-91, 94-95, 210, 328, 395
  - See also *Lassalleism, Lassalleans*
  - General law of capitalist accumulation*—237
  - See also *Accumulation of capital; Impoverishment of the working class; Industrial reserve army; Pauperism*
  - Geneva Congress of the First International*—150, 183-84, 185-204, 385-86, 412, 428
    - on necessity of combining economic and political struggle of the working class—191-92
    - on introduction of 8-hour working day—187-88, 222-23
    - confiscation of Congress documents by French police—412-14, 428-29
    - publication of Congress documents—413, 429
  - German philosophy*—30
  - See also *Hegel, Hegelianism; Kantianism*

*German Social-Democracy*—210, 215  
 See also *First International in Germany*; *General Association of German Workers*  
*German Workers' Educational Society in Geneva, 1840s-60s*—395, 398  
*German Workers' Educational Society in London, 1840-1918*—360, 395, 415  
*Germany*—41, 65, 68, 73-75, 228, 261, 415  
 — population—57, 74-75, 156-57, 207, 217-18, 224, 228  
 — survivals of feudalism, and process of their liquidation—65, 75  
 — division of country and task of its unification—67, 97, 155-56, 178, 208, 228, 360, 421  
 — industry—65, 68, 70-71, 208  
 — agriculture—74-75  
 — legislation—360  
 — suffrage—67, 72-75, 77, 210, 236  
 — bourgeois liberalism—41, 57, 58, 64-65, 85, 415  
 — cultural development—224, 228  
 — science—207-09, 224, 231  
 — prospects of revolution in 1860s—415  
 — oppression of other nations—155-56  
 — and France—311, 314  
 — and Italy—156  
 — and Poland—153-54, 193, 360  
 — and Russia—153-54, 196-97  
 — and Switzerland—156  
 See also *Army of German states*; *Army, Prussian*; *Bourgeoisie, German*; *Bourgeoisie, Prussian*; *German Social-Democracy*; *Party of Progress, Germany, 1861-84*; *Peasantry—German*; *Petty bourgeoisie—German*; *Prussia*; *Revolution of 1848-49 in Germany*; *Working class in Germany*; *Working-class movement in Germany*  
*Gold and silver*—10, 116, 125, 140, 251, 271, 272, 273, 274, 287  
*Guilds, guild system*—70, 77, 217, 257, 296, 297, 299  
 See also *Crafts, craftsmen*; *Feudalism*

## H

*Hegel, Hegelianism*—26, 29, 257  
*History, historical development*—27-28,

[56, 217, 224-25, 245-47  
 — world history—246, 281  
*Holland*—311, 319, 320, 322  
*Hungary*—155-56  
 See also *Revolution of 1848-49 in Hungary*

## I

*Impoverishment of the working class*—5, 9, 139-40, 148-49, 231-32, 236-37  
 See also *General law of capitalist accumulation*; *Industrial reserve army*; *Pauperism*; *Workers' living and labour conditions under capitalism*  
*Industrial reserve army*—147, 213, 236-37, 254, 287, 303, 305  
 See also *Impoverishment of the working class*; *Pauperism*  
*Industrial revolution*—68, 71, 300  
 See also *Large-scale industry*; *Machinery*  
*Industry (branches)*—6, 289  
 See also *Crafts, craftsmen*; *Domestic industry*; *Factory system*; *Guilds, guild system*; *Large-scale industry*; *Machinery*; *Manufacture*  
*Infantry*—48, 52-54  
 See also *Armaments, weapons*; *Military training*  
*Instruments (tools) of labour*—68, 70, 129, 236, 245, 284, 285, 290, 294, 305  
 See also *Means of labour*  
*Intensity of labour*—142-44, 212, 221-22, 290, 303-04  
 See also *Exploitation of labour-power by capital*; *Working day*  
*Interest (econ.)*—32, 134-36  
*Interest-bearing capital*—32, 243, 279  
 See also *Banks*; *Credit*; *Interest (econ.)*; *Usurer's capital*  
*Interests*—33, 69, 77-78, 115, 189, 211, 237, 252  
 — general, special—69-70, 163  
 — of society—237  
 — of people—155  
 — class—69-70, 75, 77-78, 163, 237  
 — bourgeois—41, 69, 77-78, 110, 237, 253-54, 287  
 — petty-bourgeois—33  
 — proletarian—163, 192  
 — communists as spokesmen for

proletarian interests—69, 78-79  
*International Working Men's Association*—  
 see *First International*  
*Internationalism, proletarian*—12-16, 184,  
 437, 441  
 See also *Communism; First International*;  
*International solidarity of workers*;  
*Social relations*  
*International solidarity of workers*—6, 11-  
 16, 162-63, 186, 365, 386, 405, 407-  
 08, 409, 412, 421-23, 426, 430-31,  
 437, 441-43  
 See also *Communist League, the; First*  
*International*  
*Ireland*—5, 12, 306  
*Italy*—155-57, 251, 322  
 See also *Austro-Italo-French war, 1859*;  
*Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont)*

## J

*Jews*—158, 160  
*July Revolution in France, 1830*—78,  
 155, 196  
*June insurrection of Paris proletariat,*  
*1848*—72

## K

*Kantianism*—27, 29  
*Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont)*—60,  
 311

## L

*Labour*—125, 189-90, 267-68, 282, 307  
 — as function of labour-power—244,  
 248, 281, 282  
 — under communism—11, 12, 14,  
 188, 190  
 — emancipation of—12, 14, 360, 441  
 — co-operative labour—11, 12, 190-  
 91, 376, 386  
 — its quantity and quality—122, 124,  
 137, 138, 265, 282-84  
 — dual character of—248, 265-266,  
 284  
 — as source of wealth—231, 308  
 — as source of value—122, 124,  
 137-38, 243, 265, 283  
 — time of labour as its measure—  
 128, 265  
 — manual—124, 296, 304

— simple, unskilled—122, 138, 147,  
 265, 284  
 — complex, skilled—118-19, 122,  
 138, 147, 265, 281, 284  
 — compulsory—11, 258, 290  
 — subordination to capital—11, 190,  
 258, 290, 295, 296, 304, 305  
 — individual—121-22, 270, 274, 293  
 — supervision and control—258,  
 295, 298  
 — demand and supply—117-18,  
 146-48

See also *Abstract labour; Child's labour*;  
*Concrete labour; Division of labour*;  
*Exploitation of labour-power by capital*;  
*Female labour; Instruments (tools) of*  
*labour; Intensity of labour; Labour(ing)*  
*power; Labour (working) time; Means of*  
*labour; Necessary labour; Organisation of*  
*social labour and production; Production*;  
*Productive and unproductive labour; Pro-*  
*ductivity (productive power) of labour*;  
*Social labour; Surplus labour; Wage*  
*labour; Workers' living and labour condi-*  
*tions under capitalism; Working day*  
*Labour discipline*—305

*Labour(ing) power*—131-33, 143, 191,  
 244-45, 248, 250, 282, 285, 293, 305  
 — and pre-capitalist modes of pro-  
 duction—132, 258, 287  
 — as commodity—127-30, 141, 208,  
 211, 219, 222, 232, 244-49, 255,  
 280, 289, 415  
 — its value (price)—128-32, 138-40,  
 144-46, 211, 219, 233, 246-49, 281,  
 283, 292, 294  
 — its use value—211-12, 244, 248,  
 283  
 — its consumption, and production of  
 surplus-value—130-31, 233, 244-  
 45, 247-49, 280-83  
 — costs of production and reproduc-  
 tion of—129-30, 141, 144, 246-47,  
 251, 253-54, 281  
 — and wages—143, 144, 288  
 — and working day—131, 140-44,  
 252-53  
 — its waste—252-55, 287-88  
 — and capital—252-55, 258, 280,  
 287-88  
 — and industrial reserve army—287  
 — and means of production—246,

282, 285, 294  
 See also *Labour; Worker*  
*Labour (working) time*—122, 124, 141, 142, 212, 219, 220, 231, 247-49, 253, 260, 265, 268, 283, 286, 287, 293, 295, 302-03  
 See also *Working day*  
*Landed property*—8-9, 70-71, 134, 216-17, 275  
 See also *Feudalism*  
*Language*—156, 158, 344  
*Large-scale industry*—9-10, 65-68, 70, 71-73, 125, 142, 147-48, 159, 188, 209, 212-13, 216-17, 224, 227-28, 287-89, 299-301, 302, 306-08  
 See also *Factory system; Industrial reserve army; Industrial revolution; Industry (branches); Machinery; Production*  
*Lassalleism, Lassalleans*—25, 69, 71, 74-75, 80, 87, 91, 95, 207, 210, 215, 216, 225  
 See also *General Association of German Workers*  
*Lausanne Congress of First International, 1867*—203, 204, 421-23, 428-37  
*Law of value*—125, 138, 143-44, 243-44, 269, 277, 279, 293  
 See also *Value*  
*Law(s)*—210, 224-25, 269  
 — objective character of—106, 117, 254, 287-88  
 — and manifestations of—256-57, 277-78  
 — “eternal”—29, 208, 248  
 — general, universal—119-20, 125, 138, 189, 237  
 — natural—29, 117, 188  
 — of society—29, 188, 208, 217-18, 224-25, 237  
 See also *Economic Laws*  
*League of Peace and Freedom, 1867*—204, 426  
*Legislation, bourgeois*—76-77  
*Legislation, social*—76-77, 145, 189  
 See also *Factory legislation; Working day*  
*Literature*—27, 34-35, 76, 79, 86, 145, 160  
*Lithuania, Lithuanians*—158-59, 161  
*Logic*—103-04, 119, 260  
 See also *Abstraction; Categories; Concept(ion); Dialectics; Method*

*London Conference of First International, 1865*—150, 151, 153, 185, 339, 364, 375-77, 384-87, 395-99  
*Luxuries*—107, 108, 133-35, 137, 233-34, 306

## M

*Machinery*—70, 147-48, 299-300, 301, 304-05, 306-07  
 — as means of production—133, 135, 147, 248, 284-85  
 — machine system—300, 305  
 — as basis of large-scale industry—212, 300-01, 302-03, 307-08  
 — as material basis of capitalist mode of production—305, 307-08  
 — cost of—301-02  
 — wear and tear, depreciation of—141, 301, 302-03  
 — capitalist use of—141, 302-05, 306  
 — and value (price) of commodity—300-04  
 — productivity of—300-02, 306  
 — and surplus-value—302-03, 306  
 — and capital—147-48  
 — and economic crises—306  
 — and division of labour—125, 209, 212, 234, 296-97, 300, 304-07  
 — and worker—141-42, 147-48, 302-03, 304-05, 306, 307  
 — and working day—141-42, 212-13, 254, 303-04  
 — and intensity of labour—142-43, 303-04  
 — and labour productivity—124-25, 146-47, 212-13, 254, 300-01  
 — and wages—146-48  
 — and subordination of labour to capital—255, 304-05  
 — conversion of part of variable capital into constant—305-06  
 — and use of female and child's labour—255, 302-03  
 — and increase of industrial reserve army—146-47, 236, 302-04, 305  
 — and struggle of the working class against bourgeoisie—255  
 — and co-operation—307  
 — and manufacture—298-99, 300, 301, 307



- in agriculture—306-07
- and science—300-01, 305
- See also *Constant capital*; *Fixed capital*;  
*Instruments (tools) of labour*; *Means of labour*; *Means of production*
- Malthusianism**—27, 141
- Man, individual, personality**—121, 129, 142, 154, 188, 189, 237, 245, 267, 270, 274, 280, 294-97, 307, 368, 422
- See also *Consciousness*; *Labour*; *Rights of man*; *Society*
- Manufacture**—297-300
- transition from, to large-scale industry—300-01, 306-07
- as stage of development of industrial production—224, 227
- as organisation of social labour—296-97, 300-01
- as form of division of labour—209, 212, 224, 296-300, 304-05
- aggregate worker as its main instrument—298
- its capitalist nature—299, 307
- and labour productivity—303-04
- and use of machinery—298, 300, 301, 306-07
- in agriculture—308
- study of, in Vol. I of *Capital*—209, 224, 227
- Manufacturer's capital**—241
- See also *Capital*
- Market**—9, 146, 184, 245
- See also *Market price*; *Trade, Commerce*;  
*World market*
- Market price**—107, 113, 118, 126, 134, 137, 144
- Marxist political economy**—210-18, 224-25, 229
- See also "*Capital*" by K. Marx
- Material conditions of (social) life**—29, 148-49, 295
- Materialism**—224-25
- Means of communication**—125, 301
- Means of labour**—11, 14, 134, 191, 247-48, 258, 293-94, 295, 300, 301
- See also *Instruments (tools) of labour*;  
*Means of production*
- Means of production**—245, 258, 291, 294, 305
- produced by labour itself—211-12
- land—70, 216-17
- machinery—133, 135, 147
- raw materials—133, 135, 147, 245
- objectified—305
- and labour-power—147, 246-47, 282, 285, 294
- and means of subsistence—234, 245-46
- and productive forces—70
- and production process—258, 290
- production of—217
- consumption of—135, 258, 291, 294
- and labour—133, 217, 258, 282, 290, 294
- and ownership—70, 211, 234, 244-47, 251
- and money—258, 291
- and creation of value—124, 125, 133, 134-35, 285, 290, 294
- and surplus-value—285
- and income—135
- and capital—135, 147-48, 246, 288, 290, 294
- social character of—293
- under capitalism—70, 246, 282
- under communism—216-17
- Means of subsistence**—106-08, 129, 245-47, 281, 360
- Merchant's (commercial) capital**—241, 243, 275, 277
- Method**—105, 118, 121, 123, 224-25, 439-40
- See also *Dialectics*
- Middle Ages, the**—217, 225, 227, 257, 290
- See also *Feudalism*
- Military training**—52-54, 62, 193-94, 296
- See also *Army*
- Mode of production**—68, 129, 191, 199-200, 225, 255, 258, 269, 292, 296, 299, 300, 305
- See also *Capitalist mode of production*;  
*Communism*; *Feudalism*
- Monarchy, absolute**—58-59, 69, 159-61, 360
- See also *Tsarism*
- Monarchy, constitutional**—59
- Money**—114-15, 246-47, 267-68
- essence of—238-39, 246, 266-69, 272-74

- history of—246, 267-68, 274, 280-81
  - fetishism of—267-68
  - contradictions of—272-74, 277
  - power of, in bourgeois society—272-73
  - as measure of value—267-69, 273-74
  - as standard of price—267-69, 271-72
  - as means of circulation—116, 238-39, 246, 269-70, 276-78
  - as means of hoarding—246, 272-73
  - as means of payment—114-16, 243-44, 246, 272-74, 281
  - world money—246, 274, 280-81
  - of account—243-44, 268-69, 274, 279
  - metallic—114-15, 116
  - paper—114, 271-72
  - credit money—114-16, 273-74
  - laws of its circulation—114, 270-74
  - as commodity—274
  - value (and price) of—106, 114-115
  - transformation of money into capital—238-40, 243-44, 246, 272-81, 283-84
  - depreciation of—271-72
  - and possibility of crises—269-70, 273-74
  - and wages—139-40, 143-44
  - importance of Marx's theory of money—239
  - about analysis of money in Marx's *Capital*—208
  - criticism of Proudhon's theory of money—31
- See also *Bill of exchange; Money circulation*
- Money circulation*—104, 113-16, 238, 270-77
- See also *Bill of exchange; Circulation; Coin; Commodity circulation; Gold and silver; Money*
- Moral depreciation of means of labour*—302
- Morals*—10, 13, 15, 33, 185, 221, 260, 302, 442
- Napoleonic wars*—51-52
- against fourth European coalition, 1806-07—51-52, 165-66, 323-25
  - against sixth European coalition, 1813-14—51-52
  - against seventh European coalition, 1815—43, 63-64, 182
  - nature of 1813-14 and 1815 wars on the part of the Germans—43, 196-97
  - and England—145
  - and Germany—196-97
  - and Prussia—64
  - and Russia—196-97, 327
- See also *France's wars against first and second European coalitions; Vienna Congress of 1814-15*
- Nation*—73, 155-57, 176
- See also *Nationality; National question*
- Nationalisation of land*—217
- Nationality*—155-57, 158-59
- National Labor Union, 1861*—436
- National liberals*—261
- National liberation war of 1848-49 in Hungary*—197-99
- See also *Revolution of 1848-49 in Hungary*
- National movement*—155, 160-61
- See also *Campaign of 1812; Fenians, Fenianism; Napoleonic wars; National liberation war of 1848-49 in Hungary; National question; Polish national insurrection of 1863-64; Polish question; War of North American colonies for independence, 1775-83*
- National question*—15, 152-59, 160-61, 193, 399
- See also *Internationalism, proletarian; Polish question*
- Natural sciences*—127, 217, 224-25, 257
- Natural selection*—217, 225, 254, 390
- Necessary labour*—219-20, 251-53, 283, 286, 292-93, 298
- See also *Labour; Means of subsistence; Variable capital; Wages*
- Nobility, aristocracy, German*—35, 56, 57, 65, 68, 74-75, 89, 225
- Nobility, aristocracy, Polish (szlachta)*—159-60

*Nobility, landowners, Russian*—160-61, 200

*Notion*—128, 136, 261

## O

*Objectification, materialisation*—244, 248, 266, 268, 280, 282

*Organic composition of capital*—147, 299

*Organisation of social labour and production*—11, 69, 125, 188, 190-91, 212, 224, 225, 227, 234, 293, 296-301, 305-08

See also *Communism; Control of production; Production; Social labour*

*Overhead costs (faux frais)*—296

See also *Costs of production*

*Owenism*—11, 110, 231

## P

*Pan-Slavism*—157, 199

*Party of Progress, Germany, 1861-84*—58, 60-62, 66, 76, 79-81, 84, 85-86, 360

*Party, proletarian*—10, 12, 15-16, 41, 57, 67, 68-70, 72-73, 78, 79, 85-86, 185, 220, 397-401, 441-46

See also *Communist League, the; First International*

*Pauperism*—5, 112, 145, 190, 236, 237

See also *Impoverishment of the working class; Workers' living and labour conditions under capitalism*

*Peace (the main concern of the working-class movement)*—12-13, 426

*Peasantry*—35, 72, 74-75, 142, 296, 308

— Danish—35

— English—145

— French—27, 65, 72, 74, 75

— German—35, 71, 74-75, 145

— Irish—306

— Polish—160-61

— Russian—199-200

See also *Community; Peasant wars; Serfs*

*Peasant wars*—34, 35

*Period of transition from capitalism to communism (socialism)*—69

See also *Dictatorship of the proletariat; Party, proletarian*

*Petty bourgeoisie*—27, 28-29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 68-69, 71-72

— English—32

— French—72

— German—68-69, 71-72

See also *Democracy, bourgeois; Peasantry*

*Philanthropy, bourgeois*—12, 237

*Philosophy*—27, 28-30, 32-33, 197, 257

See also *Dialectics; German philosophy; Materialism*

*Physiocrats, the*—126

*Poland*—156, 157, 158-60, 197, 200

— history—158-60

— partitions of—97, 153, 154, 158, 161, 193, 200, 312, 314, 316, 318, 319, 321, 322

— Kościuszko's revolutionary rising, 1794—161, 318

— and Vienna Congress—153-54, 155

— insurrection of 1830-31—152, 154, 196

— aristocracy—159, 161

— struggle for national independence, and country's social and political tasks—155, 193

— and Tsarism—13, 152-54, 157, 159-61, 197, 200, 315, 324, 326, 376

— and Austria—153, 154, 160, 161, 325

— and England—154, 198, 313

— and France—196, 311-27

— and Germany—154, 193

— and Prussia—97, 153, 154, 160, 161, 200, 315, 321

See also *Cracow, insurrection of 1846; Polish question*

*Police*—59, 72, 74

*Polish national insurrection of 1863-64*—152, 154

*Polish question*—97-98, 152-61, 193-201, 311-27

*Political economy*—29, 30, 110, 207-09, 211, 224, 225, 231

See also *Bourgeois political economy; Classical bourgeois political economy; Economic laws; Economic relations; Malthusianism; Marxist political economy; Physiocrats, the*

*Political struggle*—13, 14, 146, 191-92

See also *Working-class movement*

*Politics*—33, 65, 69

See also *Economy and politics; Political struggle; State, the*

- Press, the*—10, 58, 59, 69, 71, 72, 76-78, 235
- Price*—107, 110, 112, 118, 125, 126, 127-28, 137, 138, 143-44, 268, 269  
— influence of labour productivity on—124-25, 138, 292-93, 303  
— use of machinery—301-02  
— and value—125-27, 137, 268  
— and value of gold and silver—140  
— and wages—106-13, 117-20, 143-144, 149, 364  
— and demand and supply—106-09, 112, 113, 118, 126, 144  
— and economic crises—143, 271  
— bourgeois economists' views of—110, 119, 120, 126  
See also *Market price*
- Primitive accumulation of capital*—129, 440
- Private property*—11, 14, 20, 26-28, 68-70, 134, 191, 216, 237, 251, 299, 415, 422, 440, 441  
See also *Landed property; Property*
- Production*—9, 11, 29, 68, 70, 144-45, 147, 188, 190, 193, 216, 224, 236, 237, 258, 296-301, 302, 304-07, 423  
See also *Commodity production; Instruments (tools) of labour; Means of production; Productive forces; Relations of production*
- Productive and unproductive labour*—188, 189, 296
- Productive forces*—9, 29, 70, 190, 293-96, 299, 301
- Productivity (productive power) of labour*—104, 124-25, 138, 147, 212, 237, 259, 292-97, 299, 302, 306
- Profit*—119, 127, 132-38, 144, 145-46, 231-33, 303  
See also *Average profit; Average rate of profit; Interest (econ.); Rate of profit; Rent of land; Surplus-value*
- Property*—26-28, 70, 216-17, 234, 245-46, 251, 267, 299  
See also *Appropriation; Landed property; Private property*
- Proudhonism, Proudhonists*—26-33, 153, 215, 225
- Prussia*—42, 44, 45, 51, 54, 56, 59, 224  
— feudalism and its survivals—56, 60  
— in 1815—beginning of 1848—42, 64  
— Provincial Diets—56, 59  
— "New Era"—55, 56-60, 62, 63, 76  
— reorganisation of the army—54, 58, 60-63, 67, 84-86  
— constitutional conflict (1860s)—41-79, 84, 86  
— and Bonapartism—72-74, 225  
— and industry—65  
— finances, budget, taxes—42  
— nobility, aristocracy—73  
— bureaucracy—56, 57, 59, 60, 65, 69, 71-73, 77, 213, 229  
— political system—42, 59-60, 64  
— constitutionalism—56, 59  
— legislation—50, 328, 360  
— factory legislation—72  
— courts—59  
— press, the—58, 59  
— and Austria—200, 313, 314, 317-18, 322  
— and England—313  
— and France—55, 200, 313-14, 317, 319, 320, 321, 322-23, 323-24, 325  
— and Germany—60, 67, 200  
— and Poland—97, 153, 154, 160, 200, 315, 318-19, 321, 322-23, 324  
— and Russia—55, 153-54, 159, 200, 313, 315, 316, 317-19, 324  
See also *Army, Prussian*
- Purchase and sale*—132, 238-40, 269-70, 280-81, 302

## Q

*Quality and quantity*—44, 240, 265, 272-73, 276, 283-84

## R

*Rate of profit*—107-09, 135-38, 144, 208, 338  
See also *Average profit; Average rate of profit; Profit*

*Rate of surplus-value*—131, 135-36, 250, 255-56, 286, 289-91, 302-03  
See also *Exploitation of labour-power by capital*

*Raw materials*—133, 135, 147, 245, 284-85

*Reform League, 1865*—366, 394, 396, 407, 416, 435

- Reform, social*—69, 76-79  
 See also *Factory legislation*
- Relations of production*—28-29  
 See also *Economic relations; Social, socio-economic formation*
- Relative surplus-value*—212-20, 259, 291  
 See also *Surplus-value*
- Religion*—11, 32, 33
- Rent of land*—119, 134-36  
 See also *Landed property; Nationalisation of land*
- Reproduction*—129, 131, 236  
 See also *Extended reproduction*
- Republic, bourgeois*—19
- Research (study)*—28-29, 84, 85-86, 118, 208, 210-11, 212-13, 215, 217, 224, 225  
 — scientific—119-21, 208, 227, 231  
 — into economic conditions of various classes—208-09  
 — line of Marx's economic research—105, 123, 208, 210-13, 224, 227, 231, 238, 240-41, 242-43, 246-48, 250, 257-58, 282-83  
 — of capital and money—231, 232, 238, 240-41  
 — of co-operation—209, 212, 224  
 — of manufacture—209, 224  
 — of big industry, machine production—209, 212-13, 224-25  
 — of accumulation of capital—128-29, 213, 236  
 — of circulation—238, 240-41  
 — of surplus-value—240-41, 242-43, 250, 255-56, 282  
 — of labour-power—211-12, 246-47  
 — of division of labour—209, 212, 224  
 — of value—118, 123, 240-41, 282-83  
 — of commodity—240-41, 246-47  
 — A. Smith's studies—120  
 — various studies by Marx and Engels—85-86, 215
- Revolution, bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic*—56-57, 69-71, 75-78, 200  
 See also *French Revolution, 1789-94; Revolutions of 1848-49 in Europe; War of North American colonies for independence, 1775-83*
- Revolution, proletarian, socialist*  
 — essence and tasks—12, 129, 216  
 — prerequisites for—29, 148-49, 213, 216, 237, 307-08  
 — as form of class struggle—200-01  
 — international character—14, 441  
 — and party—78  
 — ways of carrying it out—12, 69-70, 441  
 — and army—193  
 — abolition of private ownership of means of production—112, 216-17  
 — and agrarian question—216-17  
 — and trade-union movement—149, 191-92  
 See also *Communism; Dictatorship of the proletariat; Internationalism, proletarian; June insurrection of Paris proletariat, 1848; Revolution, social; Social relations*
- Revolution, social*—200, 213, 216, 307  
 See also *Revolution, bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic; Revolution, proletarian, socialist; Social relations*
- Revolution of 1848-49 in Austria*—197-200  
 See also *Revolution of 1848-49 in Hungary*
- Revolution of 1848 in France*—31, 72, 78, 152, 200  
 See also *June insurrection of Paris proletariat, 1848*
- Revolution of 1848-49 in Germany*—54, 56, 57, 62, 71, 152, 197
- Revolution of 1848-49 in Hungary*—155, 197-200  
 See also *National liberation war of 1848-49 in Hungary*
- Revolution of 1848-49 in Italian states*—199  
 See also *Austro-Italian war, 1848-49*
- Revolutions of 1848-49 in Europe*—10, 11, 78, 197  
 See also *Revolution of 1848-49 (in different countries)*
- Rights of man*—14, 15, 19, 77, 441, 442  
 See also *Equality*
- Romania, Romanians*—157, 287  
 See also *Danubian principalities*
- Russia*—32, 51, 158-61, 197, 198  
 — railways—199  
 — reform of 1861—199-200  
 — foreign policy and diplomacy—13, 97, 155, 156, 160, 161, 198, 199, 311, 312, 313-20, 321-27

— and Central Asia—119  
 — and the Caucasus—13, 199  
 — and Tsarist policy in Poland, 19th cent.—13, 152-54, 157, 159-61  
 — and Austria—312, 325  
 — and England—198  
 — and France—200, 311-21  
 — and Germany—197, 200, 314, 315  
 — and Prussia—154, 200, 313, 314, 315, 316, 318  
 — and Sweden—314, 317  
 — and Turkey—313, 316, 317, 325  
 — and the USA—112  
 See also *Campaign of 1812; Working class in Russia*

## S

*Saint-Simonism, Saint-Simonists*—26, 231  
*Saxony*—49  
*Schiller Institute, the*—402-04, 417-20  
*Schleswig-Holstein question*—94-95, 161  
 See also *Danish war, 1864*  
*Science*—27, 28-31, 33, 91, 110, 119-21, 127-28, 217, 239  
 — and production—9, 10-11, 124-25, 147, 297-98, 299, 301, 305  
 — and agriculture—147  
 — and division of labour—299  
 — and religion—390  
 — military—85, 175-76  
 — of history—217  
 — socialism and communism—29, 215  
 — research—119-21, 208, 227, 231  
 — history of—27, 217, 299  
 — in bourgeois class society—32, 297, 299, 301, 305  
 — and working class—29, 41, 299, 305  
 — under communism—10-11  
 — in Germany—207-09, 224, 231  
 See also *Communism, scientific; Philosophy; Political economy*  
*Scotland*—6, 111, 306  
*Serfdom*—199-200, 209, 214, 234, 252-53  
 See also *Feudalism*  
*Serfs*—11, 70, 132-33, 145, 160-61, 199-200, 217, 252, 287, 415  
 See also *Feudal services; Peasantry*

*Seven Years' War, 1756-63*—312, 313-16  
*Silesia*—214  
*Slavery*—11, 14, 20, 128-29, 132, 143, 209, 234, 296, 441  
 See also *Ancient Rome*  
*Slave trade*—20, 162, 252, 253  
*Socialism, doctrinaire*—207-18, 225  
*Socialism in France*—26, 32  
*Socialism in Germany*—207  
 See also *Communist League, the; Lassalleism, Lassalleans*  
*Socialism, utopian*—29, 30  
*Social labour*—11-12, 107, 108, 121, 122, 124-26, 189-90, 247, 267-68, 269-70, 274, 293-301, 304-05  
 See also *Communism; Labour; Organisation of social labour and production; Wage labour*  
*Social question*—421, 432  
 See also *Revolution, social; Social relations; Society*  
*Social relations*—224-25, 231, 232-33, 245-46, 267, 280-81  
*Social, socio-economic formation*—20, 186, 188, 190, 246, 286  
 See also *Mode of production; Relations of production; Social relations*  
*Society*—68, 69, 70, 124, 190, 208, 224-25, 231, 237, 247, 251, 265, 269, 274, 296  
 — and nature—245  
 — and production—70, 124, 216-17, 247  
 — and classes—68-71, 237  
*Society, bourgeois*—9, 14, 70-71, 188, 231, 237, 360, 440, 441  
 — economic basis of—70-71, 234, 280  
 — social relations—225, 231, 232-33, 246, 280  
 — based on class antagonisms and opposition—9, 70-71, 190  
 — classes, social strata—68-69, 437  
 — proletariat—68, 187, 437  
 — and bourgeoisie—70-71  
 — and class struggle—69, 77  
 — inevitable downfall of—148, 216, 224-25, 237, 289  
 See also *Capitalist mode of production; Corruption; Exploitation of labour-power by capital; Impoverishment of the working class; Pauperism; Productive forces; Rela-*

- tions of production; Workers' living and labour conditions under capitalism
- Society of December 10, the—397
- Society, primitive—296
- See also Community
- Spain—311, 324, 325
- State, the—60, 62, 64-65, 126, 156-57, 158-60, 189, 190, 192-93, 360
- See also Dictatorship of the proletariat; Republic, bourgeois
- State boundaries—156-57
- Statistics—142, 183, 186-87, 440
- Strikes—103, 117, 365, 405, 407, 409, 412, 421, 437
- See also First International; Working-class movement; Working-class movement (in different countries)
- Suffrage—67, 69, 72-77, 210, 236, 432
- Surplus labour—131-33, 140, 209, 233-35, 250-56, 258, 286, 287, 291, 293, 301-02
- See also Corvée; Feudal services
- Surplus produce—131
- Surplus-value—131, 135-36, 208, 232-33, 234, 240, 243, 250, 255-56, 276, 285, 286, 290-91, 303
- development of the theory of surplus-value by Marx—208, 211, 229
- origin of—132-34, 232-34, 235, 240-44, 247-48, 250, 256, 276-77, 281-84, 285
- laws of—134, 208, 257, 289-90, 302-03
- as basis and goal of capitalist production—132, 134-35, 257, 290-91, 292, 295-96
- methods and means of its production—247-50, 256-57
- rate of—136, 255-56
- mass of—289
- capitalisation of—257
- transformed forms of—134-36, 211
- and laws regulating commodity exchange—242-44, 248, 279
- and labour productivity—212, 259, 293, 306
- and means of production—285, 302, 306
- and working day—131-34, 212, 257, 289-90, 303
- interpretation of, by bourgeois economists—242, 250, 278, 283, 286
- See also Absolute surplus-value; Interest (econ.); Profit; Rate of surplus-value; Relative surplus-value; Rent of land
- Sweden—156, 311, 312-13, 314, 317, 324, 325, 343-48
- Switzerland—156, 222, 408-09
- See also Working-class movement in Switzerland

## T

- Tactics of proletarian class struggle—75-79, 85-86
- See also Class struggle; Working-class movement
- Taxes—32, 60, 192, 376, 386
- Theory and practice—10-12, 14, 29-31, 90, 103, 117-18, 146, 207-10, 215, 217, 227, 232, 236, 239, 245, 253, 260, 300, 441
- See also Consciousness; Production
- Thirty Years' war, 1618-48—100, 311
- Trade, commerce—9, 68, 71, 242-43, 275
- See also Merchant's (commercial) capital; World market
- Trade(s) unions, trade union movement—149, 190-91, 375-76, 386
- as school of class struggle—15-16, 149, 191-92, 338, 422
- and need to combine economic and political struggle—149, 191
- need to found international trade union association—422-23
- in England—149, 190-92, 394, 396, 407, 422, 431-36, 437
- See also Economic struggle; Working-class movement (in different countries)
- Truth—15, 127, 208, 217
- Tsarism—161, 199
- Turkey—159, 198, 311, 313, 316, 317, 324

## U

- Ukraine, Ukrainians—158-61
- United States of America—10, 19-20, 112, 253-54, 301
- industry—301, 422
- agriculture—109, 112
- social and political system—19, 422

See also *Bourgeoisie, US; US Civil War, 1861-65; War of North American colonies for independence, 1775-83; Working class in the USA; Working-class movement in the USA*  
*Uprising, armed*—53-54  
 See also *Arming of the people; June insurrection of Paris proletariat, 1848; Peasant wars; Revolution, proletarian, socialist*  
*US Civil war, 1861-65*—6, 13, 19-20, 24, 64, 99-100, 115, 354, 355, 365-66, 407, 422  
*Use value*—244, 245, 248, 251, 265, 267, 283  
*Usurer's capital*—275

## V

*Value*—118, 120-28, 134, 137, 232-33, 240, 243, 247, 260, 278-79, 303  
 — analysis of—118, 120-21, 242  
 — importance of Marx's theory of value—239, 240  
 — its social substance—120-22, 265, 277  
 — and surplus-value—278-79  
 — form of—265-66, 268, 269  
 — magnitude of—122, 269  
 — and price—118, 125-27, 137-38, 268-69  
 — money form of—125, 268  
 — qualitative similarity and quantitative difference of commodities as values—240, 265, 269, 276, 282-84  
 — and labour productivity—124, 138, 293, 302-03  
 — and machinery—300-03  
 — and wages—106, 107, 119-20, 122-23, 137-38, 233  
 — process of its creation and increase—278-79, 283, 293-94  
 — distribution of—137  
 — and market price—106-07, 118, 126, 137  
 See also *Commodity; Exchange(able) value; Law of value; Money; Price; Use value*  
*Variable capital*—147, 250, 256, 285, 289-90, 303  
*Vienna Congress of 1814-15*—155

## W

*Wage labour*—11, 131-33, 134-35, 148-49, 191-92, 217, 232-34, 258-59, 267-69, 290-91, 296, 305-08, 415  
 See also *Exploitation of labour-power by capital; Labour; Social labour*  
*Wages*  
 — as converted form of value (price) of labour-power—127-33, 138-39, 143-45, 281  
 — and reproduction of labour-power—129-30, 144-46  
 — laws of—117  
 — as form of distribution—106-07, 114, 141, 143-44, 148  
 — real—104, 111  
 — piece—183, 186  
 — by the day—183, 186  
 — absolute and relative—139  
 — average—111-12, 143, 144-45, 183, 186  
 — national differences—105, 109-11, 113-14, 118, 145-47  
 — and money circulation—113-16  
 — and means of subsistence—106-08, 129-30  
 — of agricultural labourers—110-12, 145-47, 308  
 — of skilled workers—118, 138-39, 147, 281  
 — and working day—109-10, 140-42  
 — fluctuations of—104-06, 107, 109-10, 117-18, 142, 144-45, 146-48, 149, 338, 364  
 — workers' struggle for higher wages—103, 104-05, 129, 138-49  
 — legislative "regulation" of—287-88  
 — and value of commodity—118-19, 122-23, 137-38, 338  
 — and price of commodity—106-13, 118-20, 143-44, 149  
 — and money—113-16, 139-40, 143-44  
 — and profit—107-09, 137-38, 144, 145-46, 149, 231-32, 338  
 — and market price—143-44  
 — and intensity of labour—142-44  
 — and use of machinery—147-48  
 — and economic crises—115  
 — in Smith's theory—147



- in Ricardo's theory—120, 147, 210
- critique of bourgeois definitions of—103-22
- critique of Lassallean "iron law of wages"—207, 210
- Wallachia*—157, 251-52, 287
- See also *Danubian principalities*
- Wants (needs)*—122, 145, 221, 245, 251, 258, 277
- War of Austrian succession, 1740-48*—313
- War of North American colonies for independence, 1775-83*—19-20
- War of Polish succession, 1733-35*—312-13
- War(s)*—13, 43, 298, 426, 427
- See also *Army*; *Art of war*; *Austro-Italian war, 1848-49*; *Austro-Italo-French war, 1859*; *Austro-Prussian war, 1866*; *Campaign of 1812*; *Crimean war, 1853-56*; *Danish war, 1864*; *France's wars against first and second European coalitions, 1792-97, 1798-1801*; *Napoleonic wars*; *Thirty Years' war, 1618-48*; *US Civil war, 1861-65*; *War of Austrian succession, 1740-48*; *War of North American colonies for independence, 1775-83*
- Wealth*—29, 231, 265, 272-73, 308
- See also *Accumulation of capital*; *Capital*; *Gold and silver*; *Money*
- Will*—28, 105-06, 119, 166, 235, 254, 267, 296
- Worker*—68, 188, 190, 289, 307
- as productive force—190
- workers' separation from means of labour and production—20, 68, 70-71, 129, 294, 299, 305
- his interests—69-70, 75-78, 163
- his reproduction—129, 131, 220, 236
- his income—107, 114-15
- his wages—139
- and wealth—308
- competition among workers—191
- and capitalist—247, 287-88
- and machinery—141, 142, 301-04
- "free"—209, 216, 234, 245, 251, 255, 289, 296, 415
- aggregate worker—251, 255, 294, 297-99
- detail worker—297-301, 304, 305
- See also *Agricultural labourers*; *Exploitation of labour-power by capital*; *Labour*; *Labour(ing) power*; *Wage labour*; *Wages*; *Working class*; *Working day*
- Workers' living and labour conditions under capitalism*—5, 6, 7, 9, 11-12, 14, 68, 70, 119-20, 128-29, 142, 254-55, 258, 287, 288, 294, 305, 415, 422, 441
- See also *Child's labour*; *Economic crises*; *Exploitation of labour-power by capital*; *Female labour*; *Labour*; *Labour(ing) power*; *Pauperism*; *Worker*; *Working day*
- Workers' societies*—15-16, 183-84, 356-58, 369-73, 389, 401, 406, 408-09, 421, 442-43
- See also *First International*, *German Workers' Educational Society in Geneva, 1840s-60s*; *German Workers' Educational Society in London, 1840-1918*
- Working class*—12, 14, 68, 69, 77-78, 237, 415, 441
- essence—68, 128, 236, 280
- number of—12, 191, 236
- concentration in towns—308
- the only consistent revolutionary class—77-78, 89
- world-historic role—69, 192
- goals—14, 69
- material prerequisites for emancipation of—12, 29
- and party—12, 70
- class solidarity—12-14, 15-16, 186, 187, 437, 441
- class consciousness—12, 71
- and petty bourgeoisie—30, 69
- attitude towards wars—426
- and national question—15, 152, 154, 156, 157, 193
- See also *Agricultural labourers*; *Class struggle*; *Dictatorship of the proletariat*; *Internationalism*, *proletarian*; *Party*, *proletarian*; *Revolution*, *proletarian*, *socialist*; *Worker*; *Working class* (in different countries); *Working-class movement*
- Working class in Belgium*—289
- See also *Working-class movement in Belgium*
- Working class in England*—6, 10, 13, 19-20, 68, 72, 109, 112, 118, 145-47, 288, 407, 422
- See also *Working class in Scotland*;

- Working-class movement in England*  
*Working class in France*—72-74, 77-78, 152  
 See also *June insurrection of Paris proletariat, 1848*; *Working-class movement in France*  
*Working class in Germany*—35, 58, 67, 71, 74, 154, 193, 360, 415  
 See also *Working class in Prussia*; *Working-class movement in Germany*  
*Working class in Prussia*—66, 73  
*Working class in Russia*—154  
*Working class in Scotland*—6, 111  
 See also *Working-class movement in England*  
*Working class in the USA*—20, 105, 146  
 See also *Working-class movement in the USA*  
*Working-class movement*—67, 70, 148-49  
 — its immediate and final aims—14; 148-49, 441  
 — struggle for working-class emancipation—12-13, 14, 20, 31, 69, 110, 149, 186, 187, 190, 415, 423  
 — its unity—14-16, 186  
 — political organisation as condition for its development—12, 15-16  
 — trade unions—16, 149, 190-92, 422  
 — emergence of—69, 70, 422  
 — necessity to combine workers economic and political struggle—14, 146, 148-49, 191-92, 441  
 — internationalism of—12-16, 186, 437, 441  
 — struggle for suffrage, and democratic demands; parliamentary activity of workers' representatives—67, 69, 73-74, 75-78, 191, 210, 235-36, 432  
 — and struggle against national oppression—15, 152, 154, 156, 157, 193  
 — at the time of First International—14-15, 422, 441  
 See also *Association*; *Chartist movement*; *Class struggle*; *Communist League, the*; *First International*; *International solidarity of workers*; *Strikes*; *Tactics of proletarian class struggle*; *Trade(s) unions, trade union movement*; *Working class*; *Working-class movement* (in different countries)
- Working-class movement in Belgium*—421, 436, 437  
 See also *Working class in Belgium*  
*Working-class movement in England*  
 — Luddites—305  
 — in 1830-40s—77-78, 288  
 — in 1860s—252-53, 373, 422, 431-32, 437  
 — campaign against intervention in the USA—13, 19, 20  
 — struggle for workers' political rights—191, 375, 422, 432  
 — campaign for 10- and 9-hour working day—10-11, 72, 212, 235  
 — co-operative movement—11, 12  
 — press—378-83  
 See also *Chartist movement*; *First International in England*; *Reform League, 1865*; *Trade(s) unions—in England*; *Working class in England*  
*Working-class movement in France*—78  
 See also *First International in France*; *June insurrection of Paris proletariat, 1848*  
*Working-class movement in Germany*—12, 57, 58, 66, 71, 74, 75-76, 77, 78, 85-86, 210, 215, 360, 395, 421, 438  
 See also *Communist League, the*; *First International in Germany*; *General Association of German Workers*  
*Working-class movement in Italy*—396, 401  
 See also *First International in Italy*  
*Working-class movement in Switzerland*—395, 397, 398  
 See also *First International in Switzerland*  
*Working-class movement in the USA*—20, 187, 191, 223, 289, 422, 436, 437  
 See also *First International in the USA*  
*Working day*—10, 11, 72, 76, 109, 110, 111, 142, 143, 146, 187, 209, 212, 222, 223, 228, 230, 234, 235, 251, 252, 254-55, 287-89, 290, 304, 338, 376, 386, 422  
 — constituent parts—220, 234-35, 250-51, 286  
 — introduction of machines and intensification of labour—212, 221, 255, 302, 303  
 — and surplus-value—211-12, 289-90

- and rate of surplus-value—131, 290, 303
- and labour-power—131, 140-44
- and workers' health—141, 142, 212, 222, 235, 251, 253
- capitalists' striving to excessively lengthen working day—11, 110, 140, 142, 146, 220, 235, 251, 253, 256, 288, 302
- struggle for 10-hour working day in England—10, 11, 72, 109, 212, 222, 230, 235, 288, 307

- campaign for 8-hour working day—187, 223, 288, 422
- See also *Child's labour*; *Female labour*; *Labour (working) time*; *Surplus labour*
- World market*—9, 109, 252, 271, 274, 275

## Y

- "*Young Europe*", 1834-36—155

## GLOSSARY OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES<sup>a</sup>

Breslau .....	Wrocław	Neisse .....	Nyša Lużycka
Constantinople,		Olmütz .....	Olomouc
Konstantinopel .....	Istanbul	Pardubitz .....	Pardubice
Düppel .....	Dybbøl	Posen .....	Poznań
		Ratibor .....	Racibórz
Eipel .....	Úpice	Reichenberg .....	Liberec
Etsch .....	Adige		
Gitschin .....	Jičín	Riesengebirge .....	Karkonosze, Giant Mts.
Glatz .....	Kłodzko	St. Petersburg .....	Leningrad
Glogau .....	Głogów	Tessin .....	Ticino
Hirschberg .....	Jelenia Góra	Tilsit .....	Sovetsk
Iser .....	Jisera	Trautenau .....	Trutnov
Ivangorod .....	Deblin	Trübau .....	Moravská Třebová
Katzbach .....	Kocaba, Kaczawa	Turnau .....	Turnov
Komorn, Comorn .....	Komárom	Valeggio .....	Valéggio
Modlin .....	Novogeorgievsk		Sul Mincio
Moldau .....	Vltava	Waldenburg .....	Walbrzych
Münchengrätz .....	Mnichovo Hradiště	Weißkirchen .....	Hranice

---

<sup>a</sup> This glossary includes geographical names occurring in Marx's and Engels' articles in the form customary in the press of the time but differing from the national names or from those given on modern maps. The left column gives geographical names as used in the original; the right column gives the corresponding names used on modern maps and in modern literature.—*Ed.*