

**KARL  
MARX  
FREDERICK  
ENGELS**

---

**Collected  
Works**



**Volume 21  
Marx and Engels  
1867-1870**

## Contents

Preface .....	XIII
---------------	------

### KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

#### WORKS

November 1867-mid-July 1870

1. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Fenian Prisoners at Manchester and the International Working Men's Association .....	3
2. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Position of the International on Prussian Protectionist Tariffs .....	5
3. <i>K. Marx</i> . Resolution on Changing the Place of the International's Congress in 1868 .....	6
4. <i>K. Marx</i> . Resolution of the General Council on Félix Pyat's Provocative Behaviour .....	7
5. <i>K. Marx</i> . Declaration of the General Council Concerning the British Government's Attitude Towards Tsarist Russia .....	8
6. <i>K. Marx</i> . Draft Resolution on the Consequences of Using Machinery under Capitalism Proposed by the General Council to the Brussels Congress .....	9
7. <i>K. Marx</i> . To the President and Executive Committee of the General Association of German Workers .....	10
8. <i>K. Marx</i> . Draft Resolution on the Reduction of the Working Day Proposed by the General Council to the Brussels Congress .....	11
9. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Fourth Annual Report of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association .....	12
10. <i>F. Engels</i> . To the Directorate of the Schiller Institute .....	18

11. <i>F. Engels</i> . On the Dissolution of the Lassallean Workers' Association .....	20
12. <i>F. Engels</i> . On the Dissolution of the Lassallean Workers' Association (Postscript) .....	24
13. <i>K. Marx</i> . Connections Between the International Working Men's Association and English Working Men's Organisations .....	25
14. <i>K. Marx</i> . How Mr. Gladstone's Bank Letter of 1866 Procured a Loan of Six Millions for Russia .....	28
15. <i>K. Marx</i> . Preamble to the Resolutions of the Geneva (1866) and Brussels (1868) Congresses of the International .....	31
16. <i>K. Marx</i> . Statement to the German Workers' Educational Society in London .....	32
17. <i>K. Marx</i> . The International Working Men's Association and the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy .....	34
18. <i>K. Marx</i> . Resumé of the Meetings of the General Council. <i>International Working Men's Association to the Editor of "The Bee-Hive"</i> .....	37
19. <i>F. Engels</i> . Report on the Miners' Guilds in the Coalfields of Saxony .....	39
20. <i>K. Marx</i> . The General Council of the International Working Men's Association to the Central Bureau of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy .....	45
21. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Belgian Massacres. <i>To the Workmen of Europe and the United States</i> .....	47
22. <i>K. Marx</i> . Address to the National Labour Union of the United States .....	53
23. <i>K. Marx</i> . Preface to the Second Edition of <i>The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte</i> .....	56
24. <i>F. Engels</i> . Karl Marx .....	59
25. <i>K. Marx</i> . Report of the General Council on the Right of Inheritance .....	65
26. <i>K. Marx</i> . Report of the General Council to the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association .....	68
27. <i>K. Marx</i> . Draft Resolution of the General Council on the Policy of the British Government Towards the Irish Prisoners .....	83
28. <i>K. Marx</i> . The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland .....	84
29. <i>K. Marx</i> . Obituary .....	92
30. <i>F. Engels</i> . Preface to the Second Edition of <i>The Peasant War in Germany</i> .....	93
31. <i>K. Marx</i> . The English Government and the Fenian Prisoners .....	101
32. <i>K. Marx</i> . Concerning the Conflict in the Lyons Section .....	108

33. K. Marx. The General Council of the International Working Men's Association to Committee Members of the Russian Section in Geneva .....	110
34. K. Marx. Confidential Communication .....	112
35. K. Marx. To the International Metalworkers' Society .....	125
36. K. Marx. Resolution of the General Council on <i>The Bee-Hive</i> .....	126
37. K. Marx. Concerning the Persecution of the Members of the French Sections. <i>Declaration of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association</i> .....	127
38. K. Marx. Draft Resolution of the General Council on the "French Federal Section in London" .....	131
39. K. Marx. Resolution of the General Council on the Convocation of the Congress in Mainz .....	132
40. K. Marx and F. Engels. To the Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party .....	133
41. K. Marx. General Council Resolution on the Federal Committee of Romance Switzerland. <i>The General Council to the Romance Federal Committee</i> .....	136
42. K. Marx. The Lock-out of the Building Trades at Geneva. <i>The General Council of the International Working Men's Association to the Working Men and Women of Europe and the United States</i> .....	137
43. F. Engels. Notes for the Preface to a Collection of Irish Songs ....	140
44. K. Marx. Confidential Communication to All Sections .....	142
45. K. Marx. Programme for the Mainz Congress of the International .....	143
46. F. Engels. The History of Ireland .....	145
Natural Conditions .....	147
Old Ireland .....	168

#### FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS

1. K. Marx. Notes for an Undelivered Speech on Ireland .....	189
2. K. Marx. Outline of a Report on the Irish Question Delivered to the German Workers' Educational Society in London on December 16, 1867 .....	194
3. K. Marx. Remarks on the Programme and Rules of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy .....	207
4. K. Marx. Ireland from the American Revolution to the Union of 1801. <i>Extracts and Notes</i> .....	212
I. From 1778 to 1782. Independence .....	212
II. From 1782 (after the Declaration of Independence) to 1795 .....	230

III. ....	252
Summary .....	270
5. <i>F. Engels</i> . Notes on Goldwin Smith's Book <i>Irish History and Irish Character</i> .....	283
6. <i>F. Engels</i> . Varia on the History of the Irish Confiscations .....	297
7. <i>F. Engels</i> . Plan for <i>The History of Ireland</i> .....	307
8. <i>F. Engels</i> . Plan of Chapter Two and Fragments for <i>The History of Ireland</i> .....	308

## APPENDICES

1. Record of a Speech on the Irish Question Delivered by Karl Marx to the German Workers' Educational Society in London on December 16, 1867 .....	317
2. Record of Marx's Speeches on Changing the Place of the Congress of the International in 1868. <i>From Newspaper Reports of the General Council Meetings of May 26 and June 16, 1868</i> .....	320
3. <i>Wilhelm Eichhoff</i> . The International Working Men's Association. Its Establishment, Organisation, Political and Social Activity, and Growth .....	322
4. Record of Marx's Speech on the Successes of the International in Germany and France. <i>From the Newspaper Report of the General Council Meeting of July 21, 1868</i> .....	381
5. Record of Marx's Speech on the Consequences of Using Machinery under Capitalism. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of July 28, 1868</i> .....	382
6. Appeal to the German Workers in London .....	385
7. Record of Marx's Speech on the Reduction of the Working Day. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of August 11, 1868</i> .....	387
8. Record of Marx's Speech on the Influence of Competition in Cotton Industry on the Condition of the Working Men in France. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of January 5, 1869</i> .....	388
9. Record of Marx's Speech on the Condition of the Coalminers in the Coalfields of Saxony. <i>From the Newspaper Report of the General Council Meeting of February 23, 1869</i> .....	389
10. Resolution of the General Council on the Programme of the Basle Congress .....	391
11. Record of Marx's Speeches on Landed Property. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of July 6, 1869</i> .....	392
12. Record of Marx's Speech on the Right to Inheritance. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of July 20, 1869</i> .....	394

13. Record of Marx's Speeches on General Education. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meetings of August 10 and 17, 1869</i> .....	398
14. Address of the Land and Labour League to the Working Men and Women of Great Britain and Ireland .....	401
15. Record of Marx's Speech on the Policy of the British Government with Respect to the Irish Prisoners. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of November 16, 1869</i> .....	407
16. Record of Marx's Speeches on the Policy of the British Government with Respect to the Irish Prisoners. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meetings of November 23 and 30, 1869</i> .....	411
17. Record of Marx's Speech on the Significance of the Irish Question. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of December 14, 1869</i> .....	413
18. Articles by Jenny Marx on the Irish Question .....	414
I. ....	414
II. ....	417
III. ....	420
IV. ....	425
V. ....	429
VI. Agrarian Outrages in Ireland .....	434
VII. The Death of John Lynch .....	437
VIII. Letter from England .....	439
19. Letter of the General Council to Robert William Hume in New York .....	442
20. Record of Marx's Speech on <i>The Bee-Hive</i> . <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of April 26, 1870</i> .....	444
21. Account of a Letter by Karl Marx to the Committee of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party .....	445
22. Record of Marx's Speech on the Split in the Romance Federation. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of June 28, 1870</i> .....	446

NOTES AND INDEXES

<i>Notes</i> .....	449
<i>Name Index</i> .....	533
<i>Index of Quoted and Mentioned Literature</i> .....	572
<i>Index of Periodicals</i> .....	593
<i>Subject Index</i> .....	599

## ILLUSTRATIONS

Page of the Minute Book with Marx's manuscript of "Concerning the Persecution of the Members of the French Sections" .....	129
First page of Engels' <i>History of Ireland</i> .....	149
Map of Ireland .....	158-59
Page of Marx's manuscript <i>Ireland from the American Revolution to the Union of 1801</i> .....	213

**TRANSLATORS:**

**KATE COOK:** Works 31; Appendix 18

**VIC SCHNEIERSON:** From the Preparatory Materials 2;  
Appendix 3

**BARRIE SELMAN:** Works 10, 11, 12, 16, 40, 43, 46

**JOAN and TREVOR WALMSLEY:** Works 7, 24





## Preface

Volume 21 of the *Collected Works* of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels contains works dating from November 1867 to mid-July 1870, most of them relating to the activity of the First International—documents, reports, articles, statements, and outlines. Much space is devoted to works, speeches, and preparatory materials on the Irish question.

The period dealt with in this volume saw a sharpening of the economic and social conflicts in Europe and the United States of America, mass working-class actions, an intensification of the Irish national liberation struggle, a deepening of the crisis of Louis Bonaparte's Second Empire, and a mounting threat of war in Europe.

This volume, like volume 20, reflects Marx's diverse activity in the First International and the efforts of its General Council, led by him, to strengthen the unity of the working class and cultivate the spirit of proletarian internationalism and class consciousness in it. The First International (the International Working Men's Association—IWMA) had constituted itself by then, and the time had come for its ideological and organisational consolidation. Its federations and sections had become active in many European countries and in the United States. In Britain its base consisted of the trade unions, which numbered tens of thousands of workers; and in other countries unions were also beginning to take their place as the first class organisations of the proletariat. The International Working Men's Association, Engels wrote in 1869, had already shown in more than one place in Europe that it was a force the ruling classes were compelled to reckon with (see this volume, p. 64).

After the approval of the International's basic documents defining the relationship between economic and political struggle, Marx set out to substantiate and publicly proclaim the principles of scientific socialism in the programme of the International. Besides this, he was engaged in working out the tactics of the proletariat to suit the concrete situation of the late 1860s, defining its independent class attitude to the national question and to the question of war and peace. The General Council's documents written by Marx, like his speeches at meetings of the Council on various aspects of the working-class and general democratic movement, show him as the true leader of the first mass international working-class political organisation which, at least as far as the workers' movement was concerned, Engels described in his article "Karl-Marx" as an "epoch-making organisation" (p. 64).

In 1866 and in the following year most countries in Europe were gripped by economic crisis, accompanied by a capitalist offensive on workers' wages. The actions of the proletariat against this economic oppression grew to unprecedented proportions, often leading to the suppression of strikes by armed force. The masters, as Marx observed in 1869, transformed their private feuds with their men into "a state crusade against the International Working Men's Association" (p. 71). As before, the General Council saw its main objectives as defending the vital interests of the working class, assisting the strike movement, and securing unity of working-class action at national and international level. All its activity was directed to stimulating the international solidarity of the working class and winning more of its detachments to the side of the International Association.

Written by Marx, such General Council appeals as "The Belgian Massacres" and "The Lock-out of the Building Trades at Geneva", as well as the annual reports to the Brussels and Basle congresses of the IWMA, are evidence of the far-flung organisational efforts of the Council and of Marx's own efforts to bring material aid and moral support to the strikers. "This was a great opportunity to show the capitalists," Marx wrote in the "Report of the General Council to the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association" concerning the strike of the Rouen weavers, "that their international industrial warfare, carried on by screwing wages down now in this country, now in that, would be checked at last by the international union of the working classes" (p. 74). And in a number of large-scale strikes, the workers owed their victory to the direct assistance of the International.

The documents and materials in this volume demonstrate the intensive efforts made by Marx and the General Council to form and to consolidate sections of the International in various countries. Particular space is devoted to articles and documents on the German workers' movement. Marx's and Engels' previous writings against Lassalleanism, to which was added the German and international working-class movement's own experience, had helped some sections of the German working class to shake off the influence of Lassallean dogma and had strengthened the opposition within the General Association of German Workers to its Lassallean leaders. Marx's letter, "To the President and Executive Committee of the General Association of German Workers", and Engels' articles "On the Dissolution of the Lassallean Workers' Association" note that the class struggle of the German proletariat and the pressure of the rank and file had compelled the leaders of that organisation to include agitation for political freedom, regulation of the working day, and international cooperation of the working classes—that is, points "from which, in fact, any serious workers' movement must proceed" (p. 10)—on the agenda of its Hamburg Congress (General Assembly) in August 1868.

The constitution of the North-German Confederation greatly furthered the unification of Germany from above under the supremacy of reactionary and militarist Prussia, leading to the emergence in Europe of a source of new wars, in addition to the France of Louis Bonaparte. However, Marx and Engels held that, objectively, Germany's unification was hastening the country's development, and gave the working class new opportunities for revolutionary struggle, which it should use as best it could for "the *national* organisation and unification of the German proletariat" (see Engels' letter to Marx of July 25, 1866, Vol. 42 of the present edition). Conditions were thus maturing in Germany for an independent proletarian party. Marx and Engels welcomed the German working class's steps to that end, and gave August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht all possible assistance in forming such a party. To relieve Marx of at least part of the tremendous burden of his work for the International, Engels took over most of the correspondence with Germany.

On Marx's advice, the General Council sent a representative to the Nuremberg Congress of the Union of German Workers' Associations (September 1868), many of which were simultaneously sections of the International. The congress showed that the delegates were acquainted with the documents of the International. One of the sources of their knowledge was the then just

published pamphlet by Wilhelm Eichhoff, *The International Working Men's Association*, on which Marx had collaborated (see Appendices in this volume). Marx praised the Nuremberg Congress, which came out in favour of adhering to the International (see this volume, pp. 15 and 33). Its decision signified a break between the majority of the Union and the liberal bourgeoisie, and the Union's adoption of proletarian, class positions.

The founding of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party in Eisenach in 1869, as Marx saw it, was a victory for the ideas of the International in the German working-class movement. In the "Report of the General Council to the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association", Marx stressed the proletarian character of the newly formed party, representing more than 150,000 workers from Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, with a programme "literally embodying the leading principles of our Statutes" (p. 79). As Lenin observed later, "a sound basis" had been laid in Eisenach "for a genuinely Social-Democratic workers' party". And he added: "In those days the essential thing was the *basis* of the party" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 19, Moscow, 1973, p. 298).

A few of the works appearing in the present volume reflect the resolve of Marx and Engels to heighten the theoretical level of the German workers' movement by propagating the ideas of scientific socialism and criticising Lassalleanism.

Shortly before the Eisenach Congress, Engels wrote and published "Karl Marx", the first brief biography of him, showing the importance of his activity and of his theories for the emancipation struggle of the working class. Attacking the attempts to portray Lassalle as the founder of the workers' movement in Germany, Engels demonstrated that "nothing could be less correct" (p. 59), showing that the movement had been initiated by Marx and the Communist League founded by him. Engels described the League as a "well-organised socialist party", stressing that later Lassalle had merely taken possession of the ground prepared by it. Not only did Engels' article set out the basis for the criticism of Lassalle; it also called on the German workers to carry on the revolutionary traditions of the Communist League.

To further the German workers' knowledge of the ideas of scientific socialism, Marx and Engels republished *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (Marx) and *The Peasant War in Germany* (Engels), both of which they supplied with new prefaces.

Engels' preface to the second edition of *The Peasant War in Germany* (February 1870) was of tremendous help to the newly formed Social-Democratic Party, impressing upon it a most important point—the attitude of the working class and its party to the peasants. Engels made a concrete historical study of the economic and political situation in Germany after 1848, and specified and projected one of Marxism's most crucial theoretical and political tenets, spelling out the need for an alliance between the working class and the peasantry, a tenet formulated by Marx and Engels on the basis of the 1848-49 revolutions. Engels warned against taking the peasants in capitalist society to be a uniform mass. He stressed the existence of different sections of peasants, and the need for considering the peculiarities of each section if there was to be a firm alliance with the labouring majority in the countryside in opposition to the capitalist farmers. He called attention to the relevance for Germany as well as Britain of the resolution of the IWMA Congress in Basle (1869), that it was in the interest of society to transform landed property into common, national property (p. 100).

Having formed their party, the German Social-Democrats had to think of expanding its mass base and of its relation to the trade unions. The "Resumé of the Meetings of the General Council" and the "Report of the General Council to the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association" set out Marx's views on the relationship between the party and the unions. He called on the leaders of the party to defy Lassallean sectarianism and take the initiative in forming trade unions "on the model of the English ones" but with a broader base, giving due consideration to the relevant decisions of the Geneva, Lausanne, and Brussels congresses of the International. In January 1869, Marx noted with satisfaction that in Germany the trade unions, "brought into existence by the efforts of the International Working Men's Association, number already 110,000 members" (p. 37).

The documents included in this volume show that Marx devoted meticulous attention to the working-class movement in England. England, he noted, was "the only country *where the great majority of the population consists of wages-labourers*" and where "the class struggle and the organisation of the working class by the *Trades Unions* have *acquired* a certain degree of maturity and universality" (p. 86).

As noted earlier, Marx urged working men in other countries to avail themselves of the organisational experience of the British workers when forming unions of their own. He attached great importance to the General Council's activity as the Federal Council for England. As in previous years, this activity was designed, above all, and with some success, to place the trade unions under the influence of the International. In an article, "Connections Between the International Working Men's Association and English Working Men's Organisations", Marx wrote: "Not one significant organisation of the British proletariat exists which is not directly, by its own leaders, represented on the General Council of the International Working Men's Association" (p. 26). Some of the British trade unionists backed the line of the General Council at congresses of the International.

However, it was clear to Marx that the International would not help the British proletariat take the revolutionary road unless it managed to isolate the right-wing trade union leaders. Marx criticised their reformist view of the aims of the workers' movement, their slide to the platform of the Liberal Party, as demonstrated, among other things, by the 1868 general election, and their ambiguous posture on the Irish question. He called on the General Council to strengthen the revolutionary trend in the British working-class movement. He commended the activity of Robert Shaw, a member of the General Council and representative of the British workers. He praised Shaw's "truly revolutionary intelligence" and absence of "petty ambition or personal interest" (p. 92). When the sharp aggravation of the economic crisis in Britain in the late 1860s, which caused widespread impoverishment, aroused sentiment favouring nationalisation of land and gave birth to the Socialistic Land and Labour League, Marx helped draw up the "Address of the Land and Labour League to the Working Men and Women of Great Britain and Ireland", pointing out in it that "nothing short of a transformation of the existing social and political arrangements could avail" in abolishing the existing evils (p. 404).

The increasing political instability of Louis Bonaparte's regime, accompanied by an upsurge of mass revolutionary activity, enhanced the International's influence in France. The Bonapartist government therefore resolved to cripple the Paris Section of the International Association. It framed court proceedings against it on two occasions in 1868 (see the account of the trials in

Eichhoff's pamphlet, this volume, pp. 366-74). Nearly all the defendants used their courtroom speeches to propagate the ideas of the International. The trials and repression of members of the International won it the sympathy of working men and of some democrats, and as Marx wrote in "The Fourth Annual Report of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association", have "given it a fresh impulse by forcing the Empire to drop its patronising airs to the working classes" (p. 14).

The revolutionary tide in France kept rising steadily. Large-scale strikes and political demonstrations in the winter of 1868-69 and the election campaign in the spring of 1869 were clear evidence of the people's mood. The election programme of a group of Paris workers was published, which the General Council praised as a programme based on the principles of the Association. In January 1870, analysing the prospects of revolution in Europe, Marx conjectured that the "revolutionary *initiative* will probably come from France" (p. 86).

To buttress its position, Louis Bonaparte's government resorted to one more demagogic manoeuvre, scheduling a plebiscite for May 8, 1870. Before that date, it arrested leaders of the sections of the International on false charges of conspiring against the emperor. On the instructions of the General Council, Marx wrote a declaration, "Concerning the Persecution of the Members of the French Sections", published in the press of the International and the French workers' papers. Exposing the motives behind the plebiscite, Marx firmly denied that the International was involved in any secret conspiracies, stating that the Rules bind all the sections of the Association to act in broad daylight and that "the very nature of an Association which identifies itself with the working classes, would exclude from it every form of secret society. If the working classes, who form the great bulk of all nations, who produce all their wealth, and in the name of whom even the usurping powers always pretend to rule, conspire, they conspire publicly, as the sun conspires against darkness, in the full consciousness that without their pale there exists no legitimate power" (p. 127).

While standing by the true representatives of the French proletariat in the International, the General Council publicly dissociated itself from the French Federal Section in London, an organisation of the followers of Félix Pyat, a petty-bourgeois democrat. The section had lost contact with the International in 1868, but continued its adventurist and often provocative activity, ostensibly in the name of the International (p. 131).



The mass of the proletariat had by then declared adherence to the International, and the pro-socialist elements were gathered in its General Council. Along with the publication of Volume One of Marx's *Capital* in 1867 and its popularisation in the press (see present edition, Vol. 20), all this helped combat Proudhonism, Lassalleanism and other petty-bourgeois trends, and contributed to the ground being laid for the acceptance of socialist principles as the foundation of the programme endorsed by congresses of the International.

The present volume contains Marx's speeches at meetings of the General Council during the preparation of the agenda of the Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses and the drafts of the resolutions whose adoption he urged on the consequences of using machinery under capitalism, on the reduction of the working day, and on public ownership of the means of production, including land. His speeches and resolutions were all designed to bring home the key socialist principles of the programme of the International to members of the General Council.

Of special interest are the records of Marx's speeches during the preparations for the Brussels Congress on the consequences of using machinery under capitalism and on the reduction of the working day. At the General Council meeting of July 28, 1868 (pp. 382-84), Marx set forth the basic ideas on machinery which he had developed in Volume One of *Capital*. Showing the calamitous consequences for the working classes of the use of machinery in capitalist society, Marx stressed at the same time that it led to "associated organised labour". In his draft resolution, Marx pointed out that "machinery has proved a most powerful instrument of despotism and extortion in the hands of the capitalist class", but noted that, on the other hand, "the development of machinery creates the material conditions necessary for the superseding of the wages-system by a truly social system of production" (p. 9).

Marx argued for the necessity of demanding the reduction of the working day (p. 387). In his draft resolution on this subject he reaffirmed the relevant resolution of the Geneva Congress (1866), and said that the time had arrived "when practical effect should be given to that resolution" (p. 11).

The preliminary discussion of the agenda of the Brussels Congress by the General Council yielded good results. Despite the resistance of the Proudhonist right, the Congress adopted the socialist principles of making the means of production, mines, collieries, railways, the land (including arable land), common

property, and acknowledged the advantages of the public ownership of the means of production. The Congress also adopted Marx's resolutions on the consequences of the use of machinery in capitalist society and on the reduction of the working day.

The question of landed property, already settled at the Brussels Congress, was, as a result of Marx's motion, again on the agenda of the next congress, which gathered in Basle in 1869. This was prompted by the need for isolating any advocates of private landownership and for defining the tactics of the International on the peasantry.

Marx spoke twice during the preliminary discussion of the issue at the meeting of the General Council (pp. 392-93). He explained the error of those who favoured small private property, chiefly the Proudhonists, and of those among the British members of the International who argued in favour of the nationalisation of land with references to the "natural right" of the farmers.

Marx maintained that "to push this natural right to its logical consequences would land us at the assertion of every individual to cultivate his own share", that is, to the assertion of small private property in land. Not the will of individuals, he pointed out, but the "social right and social necessity determined in what manner the means of subsistence must be procured" (p. 392). Marx guided the members of the General Council towards understanding that any consistent solution of the agrarian question called for a revolutionary transformation of all society, which also meant nationalisation of land and its conversion into collective property.

The confirmation of the Marxian platform by the Basle Congress was a victory for revolutionary proletarian socialism over various schools of petty-bourgeois socialism, and marked an important stage in working socialist principles into the programme of the International.

The Brussels resolutions on public property showed that most members of the Association had put aside the Proudhonist dogma and held a common view of the aim of the proletarian struggle, that of building socialist society. It was left to Marx to set out a common approach to attaining this aim. But here, in questions related to the motive forces of the socialist revolution and the attitude to the state and to the allies of the proletariat, he encountered obdurate resistance from followers of the petty-bourgeois schools, notably anarchism. The chief exponent of anarchism at that time was the Russian revolutionary Mikhail Bakunin, whose views were a variety of pre-Marxian petty-bourgeois socialism, reflecting the sentiment of ruined petty

proprietors, and were totally unsuited to chart any realistic way of ending capitalist oppression.

Some of the documents in this volume deal with the struggle by Marx and the General Council against Bakunin's anarchist views on key aspects of the theory and tactics of the proletarian class movement, and against the disruptive activity of Bakunin and his followers in the International.

In the autumn of 1868 in Geneva, Bakunin gathered a following of heterogeneous elements to form the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy. In its Programme and Rules, the Alliance declared itself part of the IWMA, claimed ideological supremacy, and also the right to autonomy within the International. He expected thereby to use the Working Men's Association for the propagation of anarchist ideas in the international working-class movement.

What the International should do about Bakunin's Alliance was discussed at a meeting of the General Council on December 15, 1868, when it was considering the request for its admission to the Association. The document Marx wrote on behalf of the General Council, "The International Working Men's Association and the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy" (pp. 34-36), defended the unity and structural principles of proletarian organisations. Marx exposed Bakunin's designs of gaining control of the International and subordinating it to his ideological influence by getting it to admit the Alliance as an independent international organisation with its own programme, organisational structure, and administrative bodies. The Alliance was denied admission to the International Working Men's Association, the reason given being that under its Rules it admitted only local and national organisations, and not international ones. For the time being Marx saw fit to refrain from any critical examination of the programme of the Alliance. But in his "Remarks on the Programme and Rules of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy" (given in this volume in the section "From the Preparatory Materials"), in which he also took note of Engels' opinion, Marx produced the first rough outline of a criticism of these documents. He revealed the confused, purely declarative and demagogical nature of the Bakuninist programme, whose main points—"equalisation of classes", "abolition of the right of inheritance", and abstention from political struggle—were likely seriously to damage the workers' movement. Probing the intentions of Bakunin and his followers in respect of the International, Marx pointed out that "they want to compromise us under our own patronage" (p. 209).

A criticism of the basic provision of the Bakuninist programme, that of the "political, economical, and social equalisation of classes", is given in a letter of the General Council to the Central Bureau of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy, drawn up by Marx on March 9, 1869 (pp. 45-46) in reply to the Alliance's second application for admission. Marx's reply is a model of principled tactics working for the unity of the labour movement. He pointed out that it was not the function of the General Council to examine the programmes of societies seeking admission, and that all it asked was whether their tendency did not run against the General Rules. Thereupon, Marx showed that the Bakuninists' demand for "political, economical, and social *equalisation of classes*" did run against the General Rules since it amounted to the bourgeois slogan of "harmony of capital and labour". He amplified: "It is not the logically impossible '*equalisation of classes*', but the historically necessary, superseding '*abolition of classes*'..., this true secret of the proletarian movement, which forms the great aim of the Int. W. Ass." (p. 46).

Again rejected by the General Council, the Central Bureau of the Alliance introduced a few amendments to its programme and publicly announced the dissolution of its international organisation, suggesting to its sections that they adhere to the International. But, in fact, Bakunin and his followers retained a secret Alliance.

The fight against the Bakuninists broke out in earnest at the Basle Congress (1869) over the right of inheritance, an item included in its agenda on their insistence.

Marx attached much importance to the question of inheritance, associating it with the attitude to the peasants, and the ways of winning them for the socialist transformation of the countryside. When the matter was discussed at a meeting of the General Council in the summer of 1869 preliminary to the Congress, and in a special report written for its delegates (pp. 65-67 and 394-97), Marx came to grips with Bakunin's idea of abolishing the right of inheritance as the starting point of the social revolution and the only way of eliminating private property in the means of production. Marx approached the issue in the light of historical materialism and concluded that to proclaim the abolition of the right of inheritance "would be a thing false in theory, and reactionary in practice" (p. 66). Like all civil legislation, he explained, the laws of inheritance were not the cause but the effect of the social order. What the working class must grapple with, he said, "is the cause and not the effect, the economical

basis—not its juridical superstructure” (p. 65). The beginning of the social revolution, he emphasised, “must be to get the means to socialise the means of labour” (p. 396).

Marx also saw the danger that Bakunin’s idea entailed for the tactical tasks of workers’ organisations. Any call for the abolition of the right of inheritance, he warned, would inevitably turn the peasants, the workers’ natural allies, away from them. Explaining the substance of the differences of opinion with Bakunin over this important point of revolutionary tactics in a letter to Paul Lafargue of April 19, 1870, Marx said: “The proclamation of the abolition of inheritance ... would be not a serious act, but a foolish menace, rallying the whole peasantry and the whole small middle class round the reaction” (see present edition, Vol. 43).

The Bakuninists’ abortive attempt to seize control of the International at the Basle Congress precipitated an open war against the General Council in the *Égalité*, organ of the Romance Federal Council, which then adhered to Bakunin’s views. The General Council was accused of breaching the Rules, of refusing to form a special federal council for Britain, of toying with matters that were of no concern to the working men’s movement, such as the Irish question, all of which was said to be doing untold harm to the international interests of the proletariat.

In “The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland” and the “Confidential Communication” which he addressed to the Committee of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany as the Corresponding Secretary for Germany, Marx criticised the Bakuninist papers, and explained the General Council’s position on a number of essential topics related to the international working-class movement. Scrutinising the International’s stand on the Irish question, for example, Marx demonstrated the connection between the social and national questions, and emphasised that the Bakuninist dogma about the non-connection between the social movement and the political movement ran counter to the Rules of the IWMA (see pp. 89, 120-21).

A sharp controversy with the Bakuninists developed in the years that followed. At the centre of it stood the workers’ attitude to the state and to political struggle. In the polemics with Bakunin at the Basle Congress, Marx’s comrades defended the need for the proletariat to fight for political power. Seeing the importance of the question, an item on the “relationship between the political action and the social movement of the working class” (p. 143) was, at Marx’s suggestion, put on the agenda of the next congress of the International to be held in Mainz in the summer of 1870. But that

congress was not destined to convene owing to the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war.

The Russian Section of the International, formed in Geneva in March 1870, gave the General Council considerable help in the fight against Bakuninism. In a letter to its members (pp. 110-11), Marx informed them officially of its admission to the International and wrote that he was pleased to accept their proposal to be their representative on the General Council. By that time, Marx was well enough acquainted with the struggle of the Russian revolutionary democrats against Tsarism, and with the thinking of Russian progressives, and had read the works of Russian economists. All of this led him to conclude that Russia "is also beginning to take part in the movement of our age" (p. 111).

With the international contradictions growing sharper in the late 1860s and a war threat hanging over Europe, the question of war and the position to be taken by the proletariat if it broke out, was still, as before, in the focus of Marx's attention and that of the International Association. It was also discussed at the Brussels Congress.

In a letter of September 10, 1868, which he wrote to Georg Eccarius and Friedrich Lessner who had gone to Brussels as delegates of the General Council, Marx observed that the working class was not yet sufficiently organised to throw any substantial weight into the scales. However, he pointed out that the Congress must protest in the name of the working class and denounce the instigators of a war between France and Germany that was "ruinous for both countries and ruinous for Europe in general" (see present edition, Vol. 43).

The resolution of the Brussels Congress reflected in the main the ideas of Marx and his followers, stating that a final end would be put to wars only by thorough social reform, and that the number of wars and the extent of the calamities wrought by them could be diminished if the peoples, above all the working classes, resisted their governments and exposed their policy of conquest by all available means. However, the resolution contained a number of concrete proposals which Marx subjected to criticism in the above-mentioned letter to Eccarius and Lessner.

The fight for peace was becoming one of the official aims of the international workers' movement, and its success depended in many ways on the international unity of the proletariat. In the "Address to the National Labour Union of the United States",

which Marx wrote on behalf of the General Council, he clearly saw that “the working classes are bestriding the scene of history no longer as servile retainers, but as independent actors, conscious of their own responsibility, and able to command peace where their would-be masters shout war” (p. 54).

Much space is devoted in this volume to the works, speeches, extracts and notes of Marx and Engels on the Irish question, an intricate amalgam of acute social and national contradictions. The national liberation movement in Ireland had grown to imposing proportion in the 1860s. This was due to the change in the methods of English colonial exploitation and the social and economic processes that were running their course in Ireland—the conversion from small-scale farming to large-scale, capitalist pasturage, accompanied by mass evictions of tenants, who were thus consigned to hunger or the agony of emigration. Marx described the system as a “quiet business-like extinction” (p. 192). The response to it was the Fenian movement, which “took root ... in the mass of the people, the lower orders” (p. 194). While giving their due to the courage and fighting spirit of the champions of Irish independence, Marx disapproved of their conspiratory tactics. The failed attempt of the Fenians to start an uprising in early 1867, their persecution and trial, aroused the public in Ireland and England.

In this setting, Marx and Engels faced the task of defining the proletariat's attitude to the national question, of working out the tactics in relation to the national liberation movement, and of instilling the spirit of proletarian internationalism among the workers. With Ireland as an example, Marx and Engels spelled out their views on the national liberation struggle of oppressed nations and its bearing on the world revolutionary process, the relationship between the national liberation movement and the international workers' movement, the attitude of the proletariat in the metropolitan countries towards the colonial policies of their governments, and the allies of the proletariat in the revolution. “The policy of Marx and Engels on the Irish question,” wrote Lenin, “serves as a splendid example of the attitude the proletariat of the oppressor nations should adopt towards national movements, an example which has lost none of its immense *practical* importance” (*Collected Works*, Vol. 20, Moscow, 1972, p. 442).

In a series of documents dating from November to December 1867, such as “The Fenian Prisoners at Manchester and the International Working Men's Association”, “Notes for an Undeli-

vered: Speech on Ireland”, “Outline of a Report on the Irish Question Delivered to the German Workers’ Educational Society in London on December 16, 1867”, and some later works, Marx formulated the General Council’s attitude to the struggle of the Irish people and called on the English working class and the international workers’ movement to support it. The discussions of the issue at General Council meetings witnessed clashes with George Odger, Benjamin Lucraft, and other right-wing trade union leaders, who, in effect, shared the anti-Irish sentiment of the bourgeois radicals.

Marx backed the historical right of oppressed peoples to fight for their liberation. The English, he noted sarcastically, claimed “a divine right to fight the Irish on their native soil, but every Irish fighting against the British Government in England is to be treated as an outlaw” (p. 189). Stigmatising the British Government’s policy towards the Fenians, he branded the death sentence passed on four of them as an act of political revenge (p. 3). Marx also outlined the attitude the English working class should adopt on the Irish question: “Repeal [of the Union with Great Britain forced on Ireland in 1801—*Ed.*] as one of the articles of the English Democratic Party” (p. 193). In the outline of a report to the German Workers’ Educational Society in London, Marx showed the pernicious effects for Ireland of the many centuries of British exploitation and oppression. He cited Thomas Francis Meagher, the Irish democrat, on the results of British rule in Ireland: “One business alone survives!... the Irish coffin-maker’s” (pp. 199-200). Marx looked closely into the process of the forcible expropriation of Irish farmers. Eccarius’ record of this report singles out Marx’s words that the Irish question is “not simply a question of nationality, but a question of land and existence” (p. 319).

Marx returned to the Irish question again in the autumn of 1869, when a broad movement was launched for the amnesty of imprisoned Fenians, in which the International took an active part. Speaking at a meeting of the General Council, Marx depicted the colonialist, anti-popular substance of the policy of Gladstone’s Liberal government, which “are the servants of the oppressors of Ireland” (p. 409). In the “Draft Resolution of the General Council on the Policy of the British Government Towards the Irish Prisoners”, submitted by Marx on November 16, 1869, he noted explicitly that the General Council “express their admiration of the spirited, firm and high-souled manner in which the Irish people carry on their Amnesty movement” (p. 83).

To impart international resonance to the Irish question and attract the attention of the European proletariat, the General



Council, on Marx's suggestion, had this resolution published in the organs of the International on the continent and in the European democratic press, as well as in the British labour press.

Marx's article, "The English Government and the Fenian Prisoners", exposed the brutal treatment of participants in the Irish national liberation movement by the British authorities. Marx's daughter Jenny wrote eight articles on this subject for the Paris *La Marseillaise*, the third of which was composed with Marx's assistance. They are given in the Appendices to this volume (pp. 414-41).

The most exhaustive exposition of the relation between the working-class and the national liberation movements was given by Marx in a General Council circular, "The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland" (January 1870), and in the "Confidential Communication" (March 1870). Coming to grips with the Bakuninists' nihilist attitude to the national liberation movement, Marx underlined the international significance of the Irish question and its bearing on the struggle of the English proletariat for radical social transformation in England itself. Marx stressed that the participants in the Irish independence movement were natural allies of the English working class. The proletariat of the two countries, therefore, he noted, must do all they can to overcome the antagonism between them artificially nourished by the bourgeoisie. "Any people that oppresses another people," Marx observed, "forgets its own chains." He argued for the necessity of granting Ireland independence, including complete separation from England. "The position of the International Association with regard to the Irish question is very clear," he states. "Its first concern is to advance the social revolution in England. To this end a great blow must be struck in Ireland" (p. 89).

All that Marx and the General Council did for the Irish national liberation movement attracted the attention of the Irish workers to the International and laid the ground for the founding of Irish sections, and, naturally, enlisted sympathy for the Irish revolutionary movement among the English workers and workers abroad.

The General Council's attitude to the Irish question and the analysis of its various aspects were based on the profound study Marx and Engels made of Ireland's history from ancient times. Their manuscripts (included in this volume), though uncompleted, present an integral view of Ireland's history on a historical materialist

basis. They define the main periods in the country's history and examine its key problems. This study has lost none of its relevance today. What distinguishes it is its broad view of the topics at hand. Marx and Engels used extensive source material to trace the stages, forms and methods of Ireland's colonial subjugation, the beginnings and gradual growth of the national liberation movement, and its specific features and peculiarities. Their manuscripts provide evidence of their deep interest in the history of pre-capitalist societies—an interest that did not slacken in later years.

Marx's manuscript, "Ireland from the American Revolution to the Union of 1801. Extracts and Notes" (see "From the Preparatory Materials" in this volume), was written preliminary to the discussion of the Irish question by the General Council.

His study of the period from 1776 to 1801 enabled him to determine the most typical features of the policy of the English ruling classes in Ireland. His attention was drawn to the colonialist nature of the Union of 1801 (abolition of the autonomy of Irish Parliament), the dissolution of which was sought by generation after generation of fighters for Ireland's independence. The thought Marx expressed in his letter to Engels of December 10, 1869 (see present edition, Vol. 43), that "the English reaction in England had its roots (as in Cromwell's time) in the subjugation of Ireland", is present throughout the manuscript.

Marx painted a picture of English rule in Ireland, and analysed the motive forces of the Irish national liberation movement and the role of the peasantry in it. He also produced a vivid portrayal of the Irish bourgeois revolutionaries, the left wing of the United Irishmen, pinpointing its weaknesses and the reasons for the failure of the uprising of 1798, whose lessons were of great significance for the Irish national liberation movement as a whole.

The manuscript shows the influence of the American War of Independence and, especially, the French Revolution on the emergence and growth of the independence movement in Ireland (pp. 238-39). Marx's observations are of immense relevance for understanding the international nature of these historic events.

The uncompleted manuscript of Engels' *History of Ireland*, like his preparatory material for it ("Notes on Goldwin Smith's Book *Irish History and Irish Character*" and "Varia on the History of the Irish Confiscations"), included in this volume, are evidence of his intention to produce a large, comprehensive history of Ireland from ancient times, shedding light on the phases of her subjugation and the fight of the Irish for liberation.

Engels completed only the first chapter of the manuscript of his *History of Ireland* ("Natural Conditions") and the beginning of the second ("Old Ireland"), both of which appear in the main section of this volume. The first chapter is devoted to the geological structure and climate of Ireland, though it also touches on questions of a political nature. Engels rejects the attempts of the English ruling classes to justify British colonial rule in Ireland with references to the unfavourable geographic conditions for independent economic development and the "ignorance and sloth" of the country's native population, from which it follows that Ireland's very climate condemned it to supplying beef and butter for the English rather than bread for the Irish (pp. 148, 161). Engels portrays Ireland's ancient history and the social and political system of the Celtic clans. Challenging the chauvinist idea of Ireland's backwardness, he demonstrates the contribution of the Irish Christian missionaries and scholars to European culture in the early Middle Ages (p. 171), and notes the bitter Irish resistance to the invasion of the Norsemen. The manuscript refutes the theories that attribute the foundation of many European states to the Northern conquerors. Engels shows, on the contrary, that the conquests of the Norsemen were really nothing more than piratic raids (p. 179). He denounces the tendency to portray the national liberation struggle as banditism or to ascribe to it merely religious motives. The hiding or the distortion of facts relating to the Irish people's struggle, he observes, is intended to vindicate English domination.

In his "Notes for the Preface to a Collection of Irish Songs", Engels speaks of the deliberate obliteration of Ireland's finest cultural traditions by the English conquerors from the seventeenth century on, with the result that Gaelic was understood in the country by only few people and the nation was forfeiting its rich culture (p. 141).

Two of Engels' manuscripts, "Notes on Goldwin Smith's Book *Irish History and Irish Character*" and "Varia on the History of the Irish Confiscations", reflect his views on the later period of Irish history. His précis of Goldwin Smith's book is of special interest. Goldwin Smith was an English liberal historian and economist, and his book attracted Engels' attention as an example of how Irish history was being falsified for the benefit of the liberal bourgeoisie to justify its colonial subjection and social and national oppression. Engels' polemical notes show that he saw one of his tasks as exposing this tendency, as well as the chauvinist conception of Irish history. Referring to Smith, he writes: "Behind the cloak of

objectivity, the apologetic English bourgeois professor” (p. 283). Smith extolled the English conquerors for bringing civilisation to the country, and denounced the Irish national liberation movement as lacking reason and national roots. The concessions that the Irish had wrested from the English in many centuries of continuous struggle Smith portrays as acts of “goodwill” on the part of the English. He ignores the strong influence of the American War of Independence and the French Revolution on the Irish movement for national liberation. The English concessions, as Engels observes, are ascribed by Smith to the English “spirit of toleration”, the “liberal ideas of the new era”, and the like. “These are the ‘*general causes*’ which have to be kept in mind,” Engels exclaims, “but by no means the real ones!” (p. 295).

Engels’ “*Varia on the History of the Irish Confiscations*” deals with the basic aspect of English rule in Ireland, that of the land confiscations in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Here he surveys the expropriation of the country’s native population and Ireland’s conversion into a stronghold of English landlordism. He traces England’s policy in Ireland over a century and a half, and offers evidence that the leaders of the seventeenth-century English Revolution inherited the colonialist tradition of their absolutist predecessors. Engels shows that the confiscations were accompanied by the ruthless suppression of the resistance put up by the native population. “The Irish,” he observes, “were denied all rights..., with resistance treated as rebellion” (pp. 297-98).

In the Appendices to this volume the reader will find Wilhelm Eichhoff’s pamphlet, *The International Working Men’s Association. Its Establishment, Organisation, Political and Social Activity, and Growth*, which appears in English translation for the first time. It is the first history of the First International. Written with the collaboration of Marx, it offers a detailed account of the foundation and the early years of the International, its class nature, and its responsibilities in organising the economic and political struggle of the proletariat in various countries. Eichhoff pays high tribute to Marx for his role in establishing and directing the International, and in drawing up its programmatic documents. The pamphlet contains the texts of a few of the most important ones, notably the Inaugural Address and the Provisional Rules.

Eichhoff’s pamphlet made an important contribution to the spread and propagation of the ideas of the First International, and to its struggle against trends that were hostile to Marxism. It was a

dependable source for later works on the history of the First International.

\* \* \*

The present volume contains 54 works of Marx and Engels, eight of which are appearing in English for the first time, including Marx's address "To the President and Executive Committee of the General Association of German Workers" and "Statement to the German Workers' Educational Society in London", and Engels' article "Karl Marx" and the plan of the second chapter of his *History of Ireland*. Among Appendices three documents appear in English for the first time.

In cases where documents of the International written by Marx or with his collaboration have reached us in more or less authentic versions in several languages, their publication in this volume is based on the English-language source, whether handwritten or printed. Any discrepancies in content or sense from sources in other languages are given in 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. Asterisks indicate footnotes by the author; editors' footnotes are indicated by index letters.

Misprints found in quotations, proper names, place names, figures, dates, and so on, have been checked and corrected with reference to the sources used by Marx and Engels. All known literary and documentary sources used by them are cited in footnotes and in the index of quoted and mentioned literature. Words written in English in the original are given in small caps.

The volume was compiled and the preface written by Marina Doroshenko and Valentina Ostrikova (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU). The documents of the First International in the main part of the volume, Marx's "Remarks on the Programme and Rules of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy" and the documents on the history of the First International in the Appendices, were prepared by Valentina Ostrikova, who also wrote the relevant notes. The index of quoted and mentioned literature to these documents is by Valentina Ostrikova, who was assisted by Yuri Vasin.

The basic works of Marx and Engels on the history of Ireland (Engels' *History of Ireland* and the section "From the Preparatory

Materials”), all of Jenny Marx’s articles on the Irish question (in the Appendices), and the relevant notes and bibliography were compiled by Marina Doroshenko.

The text of Wilhelm Eichhoff’s pamphlet, *The International Working Men’s Association* (in the Appendices), and the notes and bibliography for it, were prepared by Yuri Vasin.

The name index and the index of periodicals are by Yuri Vasin in collaboration with Yelena Kofanova, the subject index is by Vasily Kuznetsov, and the editor of the volume is Tatyana Yeremeyeva (all from the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU).

The English translations were made by Barrie Selman and Joan and Trevor Walmsley (Lawrence and Wishart), Kate Cook and Vic Schneierson (Progress Publishers), and edited by Nicholas Jacobs (Lawrence and Wishart), Lydia Belyakova, Victor Schnittke and Yelena Vorotnikova (Progress Publishers), and Vladimir Mosolov, scientific editor (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU).

The volume was prepared for the press by Lydia Belyakova, Anna Vladimirova and assistant editor Natalia Kim (Progress Publishers).



**KARL MARX**  
and  
**FREDERICK ENGELS**

**WORKS**

November 1867—mid-July 1870





## Karl Marx

### THE FENIAN PRISONERS AT MANCHESTER AND THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION<sup>1</sup>

At a special meeting of the General Council of the I.W.A. held at the office 16, Castle Street, East, W., on Wednesday evening<sup>a</sup> the following memorial was adopted:

“Memorial of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association.

“To the Right Hon. Gathorne-Hardy, her Majesty's Secretary of State.

“The memorial of the undersigned, representing working men's associations in all parts of Europe, showeth:

“That the execution of the Irish prisoners condemned to death at Manchester will greatly impair the moral influence of England upon the European Continent. The Execution of the four prisoners<sup>b</sup> resting upon the same evidence and the same verdict which, by the free pardon of Maguire, have been officially declared, the one false, the other erroneous, will bear the stamp not of a judicial act, but of political revenge. But even if the verdict of the Manchester jury and the evidence it rests upon had not been tainted by the British Government itself, the latter would now have to choose between the blood-handed practices of old Europe and the magnanimous humanity of the young Transatlantic Republic.<sup>2</sup>

“The commutation of the sentence for which we pray will be an act not only of justice, but of political wisdom.

<sup>a</sup> November 20, 1867.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Edward Condon, Michael Larkin, William Philip Allen, Michael O'Brien.—*Ed.*

“By order of the General Council of the I. W. Association,  
*John Weston*, Chairman  
*R. Shaw*, Secretary for America  
*Eugène Dupont*, Secretary for France  
*Karl Marx*, Secretary for Germany  
*Hermann Jung*, Secretary for Switzerland  
*P. Lafargue*, Secretary for Spain  
*Zabicki*, Secretary for Poland  
*Derkinderen*, Secretary for Holland  
*Besson*, Secretary for Belgium  
*G. Eccarius*, General Secretary.”<sup>a</sup>

November 20, 1867

Adopted by the General Council on  
 November 20, 1867

First published in French in *Le Courrier  
 français*, No. 163, November 24, 1867

Reproduced from the copy of  
 Marx's manuscript made by Marx's  
 wife, Jenny Marx

---

<sup>a</sup> In *Le Courrier français* the names of Hermann Jung and Anton Zabicki are omitted.— *Ed.*

## Karl Marx

### [THE POSITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ON PRUSSIAN PROTECTIONIST TARIFFS]<sup>3</sup>

The trades unions established in Germany by the agency and with the assistance of the International Working Men's Association have furnished the chiefs of the iron trade in the Rhenish province, with an argument against the Prussian Government with regard to a reduction of the import duties on foreign iron. The Chamber of Commerce of Elberfeld and Barmen is of opinion that a reduction of the import duties on iron will completely ruin the Prussian iron masters. The English capitalists maintain that they must reduce the wages of their workmen to be able to cope with the foreigners. The German iron masters demand the continuance of protection against the English to save themselves from utter ruin; yet the wages received by the Prussian workmen are less than half what the British workman receives, and the hours of labour are more. In its report of April 14th to the Government, the Chamber of Commerce states:

"The iron trade of Germany once prostrate a remedy is impossible. Much capital will then be lost, and thousands of working men deprived of the means of subsistence—a matter that would be the more critical, as the labour question becomes more and more serious, and the International Working Men's Association assumes a more and more active and menacing attitude."

This statement proves that the Association has not laboured in vain. The capitalists demand a public inquiry into the present state of the Prussian iron trade. The workmen insist that the inquiry shall include an investigation of the condition of the workpeople employed in the trade.

Written between May 5 and 12, 1868

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 344, May 16, 1868

Karl Marx

[RESOLUTION ON CHANGING THE PLACE  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL'S CONGRESS IN 1868]<sup>4</sup>

1. Considering, that the Belgian Parliament has just prolonged for three years the law by which every foreigner may be expelled [from] the country by the Belgian executive government<sup>5</sup>;

2. that the dignity of the I. W. Association is incompatible with the meeting of the Congress at a place where they would be at the mercy of the local police;

3. that Article 3 of the Rules of the I.W.A.<sup>a</sup> provides that the General Council may, in case of need, change the place of meeting of the Congress;

the General Council resolves that the Congress of the I.W.A. do assemble in London on the 5th of September, 1868.

Introduced at the General Council meeting of June 2, 1868

Reproduced from the Minute Book of the General Council

First published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 347, June 6, 1868

---

<sup>a</sup> *Rules of the International Working Men's Association. Founded September 28th, 1864, London [1867], p. 4.—Ed.*

Karl Marx

[RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
ON FÉLIX PYAT'S PROVOCATIVE BEHAVIOUR]<sup>6</sup>

Resolved. That the General Council of the I.W.A. repudiates all responsibility for the address<sup>a</sup> delivered at the public meeting in Cleveland Hall by Félix Pyat, who is in no way connected with the Association.

Adopted by the General Council on  
July 7, 1868

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published in French in *La Liberté*,  
No. 55, July 12, 1868

---

<sup>a</sup> *L'Espègle*, No. 25, July 5, 1868.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx  
[DECLARATION  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL CONCERNING  
THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT'S  
ATTITUDE TOWARDS TSARIST RUSSIA]<sup>7</sup>

The Council of the I. W. Association denounces the last manifestation of the subserviency to Russia of the British Government by suppressing the adjective "Polish" before the word "refugees" in the budget one month after the Russian Government had by an ukase<sup>a</sup> suppressed the name of Poland.

Adopted by the General Council on  
July 14, 1868

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 352,  
July 18, 1868

---

<sup>a</sup> Marx means Alexander II's ukase of February 29, 1868 abolishing the Government Commission for Home Affairs in the Kingdom of Poland and the additional rules to the Regulations on the Gubernia and Uyezd Administration in the Gubernias in the Kingdom of Poland approved by His Majesty on December 19 (31), 1866.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE CONSEQUENCES  
OF USING MACHINERY UNDER CAPITALISM  
PROPOSED BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
TO THE BRUSSELS CONGRESS]<sup>8</sup>

Resolved: that on the one side machinery has proved a most powerful instrument of despotism and extortion in the hands of the capitalist class;

that on the other side the development of machinery creates the material conditions necessary for the superseding of the wages-system by a truly social system of production.

Adopted by the General Council on  
August 11, 1868

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published in French in a special  
supplement to *Le Peuple Belge*, No. 38,  
September 11, 1868



Karl Marx

TO THE PRESIDENT AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
OF THE GENERAL ASSOCIATION OF GERMAN WORKERS<sup>9</sup>

London, August 18, 1868

In order to conclude preparations for the Brussels Congress a meeting of the Executive Committee of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association<sup>10</sup> has been called for August 22, and a plenary session of the General Council for August 25. As I have been given the task of making reports on both days I find that I am unable to accept the invitation,<sup>a</sup> by which I am greatly honoured, to attend the Congress of the General Association of German Workers in Hamburg.

I am happy to see that the programme of your Congress<sup>b</sup> lays down those points from which, in fact, any serious workers' movement must proceed: agitation for complete political freedom, regulation of the working day, and systematic international cooperation of the working class in the great, historical task which it has to accomplish for the whole of society. Good luck in your work!

With democratic greetings

*Karl Marx*

First published in *Der Social-Demokrat*,  
No. 100, August 28, 1868

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Published in English for the first  
time

<sup>a</sup> J. B. Schweitzer, "An Herrn Carl Marx in London. Berlin, 6. Juli 1868", *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 95, August 14, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. B. Schweitzer, "An die Mitglieder des Allgemeinen deutschen Arbeiter-Vereins", *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 80, July 10, 1868.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE REDUCTION  
OF THE WORKING DAY  
PROPOSED BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
TO THE BRUSSELS CONGRESS]<sup>11</sup>

A resolution having been passed unanimously by the Congress of Geneva 1866 to this effect: "That the legal limitation of the working day is a preliminary condition indispensable for the ulterior social improvements,"<sup>a</sup> the Council is of opinion that the time is now arrived when practical effect should be given to that resolution and that it has become the duty of all the branches to agitate that question practically in the different countries where the International Working Men's Association is established.

Adopted by the General Council on  
August 25, 1868

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 359,  
August 29, 1868

---

<sup>a</sup> *The International Working Men's Association. Resolutions of the Congress of Geneva, 1866, and the Congress of Brussels, 1868*, London [1869], pp. 4-5.—Ed.

Karl Marx

THE FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S  
ASSOCIATION<sup>12</sup>

The year 1867-68 will mark an epoch in the history of the Association. After a period of peaceable development it has assumed dimensions powerful enough to provoke the bitter denunciations of the ruling classes and the hostile demonstrations of governments.<sup>a</sup> It has entered upon the phases of strife.

The French Government took, of course, the lead in the reactionary proceedings against the working classes. Already last year we had to signalise some of its underhand manoeuvres. It meddled with our correspondence, seized our Statutes, and the Congress documents.<sup>b 13</sup> After many fruitless steps to get them back, they were at last given up only under the official pressure of Lord Stanley, the English Minister of Foreign Affairs.

But the Empire has this year thrown off the mask and tried to directly annihilate the International Association by *coups de police* and judiciary prosecution. Begot by the struggle of classes, of which the days of June, 1848, are the grandest expression, it could not but assume alternately the attitudes of the official saviour of the Bourgeoisie and of the paternal protector of the Proletariat. The growing power of the International having manifested itself in the strikes of Roubaix, Amiens, Paris, Geneva, &c.,<sup>14</sup> reduced our would-be patron to the necessity of turning our Society to his own account or of destroying it. In the beginning he was ready enough to strike a bargain on very moderate terms.<sup>c</sup> The manifesto of the Parisians read at the Congress of Geneva<sup>d 15</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The German text has "and persecutions by governments".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German text has "and the Geneva Congress documents on the French frontier".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The German text has: "In the beginning not much was demanded."—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The German text further has: "(1866) and published in Brussels in the following year".—*Ed.*

having been seized at the French frontier, our Paris Executive demanded of the Minister of the Interior the reasons of this seizure.<sup>a</sup> M. Rouher then invited one of the members of the Committee<sup>b</sup> to an interview, in the course of which he declared himself ready to authorise the entry of the manifesto on the condition of some modifications being inserted.<sup>c</sup> On the refusal of the delegate of the Paris Executive, he added,

“Still, if you would introduce some words of gratitude to the Emperor, who has done so much for the working classes, one might see what could be done.”<sup>d</sup>

M. Rouher's, the sub-Emperor's, insinuation was met by a blank rebuff. From that moment the Imperial Government looked out for a pretext to suppress the Association. Its anger was heightened by the anti-chauvinist agitation on the part of our French members after the German war. Soon after, when the Fenian panic had reached its climax, the General Council addressed to the English Government a petition<sup>e</sup> demanding the commutation of the sentence of the three victims of Manchester, and qualifying their hanging as an act of political revenge.<sup>f</sup> At the same time it held public meetings in London for the defence of the rights of Ireland. The Empire, always anxious to deserve the good graces of the British Government, thought the moment propitious for laying hands upon the International.<sup>g</sup> It caused nocturnal perquisitions to be made, eagerly rummaged the private correspondence, and announced with much noise<sup>h</sup> that it had discovered the centre of the Fenian conspiracy, of which the International was denounced as one of the principal organs.<sup>16</sup> All its laborious researches, however, ended in nothing.<sup>i</sup> The public prosecutor himself threw down his brief in disgust.<sup>j</sup> The attempt at converting the

<sup>a</sup> “A. M. le ministre de l'intérieur. Vendredi. 9 mars 1867”. In *Le Courrier français*, No. 112, May 1, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Antoine Marie Bourdon, the section's archivist.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Instead of “to an interview ... being inserted” the German has: “to an interview. In the course of the meeting that followed he first demanded that certain passages in the Manifesto should be moderated and altered”.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *Le Courrier français*, No. 112, May 1, 1868. The quotation gives the general meaning of Rouher's speech.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> See this volume, pp. 3-4.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> After the word “petition” the German has the following text: “in which the forthcoming execution of the three Manchester martyrs was described as a judicial murder” (the reference is to William Philip Allen, Michael Larkin and Michael O'Brien).—*Ed.*

<sup>g</sup> The German further has “on both sides of the Channel”.—*Ed.*

<sup>h</sup> The German has “in the English press”.—*Ed.*

<sup>i</sup> In the German text this sentence reads: “Much ado about nothing.”—*Ed.*

<sup>j</sup> In the German text this sentence reads: “The legal investigation found not a shadow of a *corpus delicti* despite its zeal.”—*Ed.*

International Association into a secret society of conspirators having miserably broken down, the next best thing was to prosecute our Paris branch as a non-authorized society of more than 20 members.<sup>17</sup> The French judges, trained by the Imperialist discipline, hastened, of course, to order the dissolution of the Association and the imprisonment of its Paris Executive.<sup>a</sup> The tribunal had the *naïveté* to declare in the preamble of its judgment that the existence of the French Empire was incompatible with<sup>b</sup> a working men's association that dared to proclaim truth, justice, and morality as its leading principles.<sup>c</sup> The consequences of these prosecutions made themselves felt in the departments, where paltry vexations on the part of the Prefects succeeded to the condemnations of Paris. This Governmental chicanery, however, so far from annihilating the Association, has given it a fresh impulse<sup>d</sup> by forcing the Empire to drop its patronising airs to the working classes.

In Belgium the International Association has made immense strides. The coal lords of the basin of Charleroi, having driven their miners to riots by incessant exactions, let loose upon those unarmed men the armed force which massacred many of them.<sup>e</sup> It was in [the] midst of the panic thus created that our Belgian branch took up the cause of the miners, disclosed their miserable economical condition,<sup>f</sup> rushed to the rescue of the families of the dead and wounded, and procured legal counsel for the prisoners, who were finally all of them acquitted by the jury.<sup>18</sup> After the affair of Charleroi the success of the International in Belgium was assured. The Belgian Minister of Justice, Jules Bara, denounced the International Association in the Chamber of Deputies and made of its existence the principal pretext for the renewal of the law against foreigners.<sup>19</sup> He even dared to threaten he should

<sup>a</sup> Instead of "and the imprisonment of its Paris Executive" the German text has "and fined the Committee members and sentenced them to imprisonment".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the German text the beginning of this sentence reads as follows: "Yet the tribunal had the *naïveté* to state two things, in the preamble of its judgement: on the one hand that the power of the I.W.A. was growing and, on the other, that the December Empire was incompatible with...."—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See the tribunal's sentences of March 20 and May 22, 1868 in *Procès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Bureau de Paris*, Paris, 1868, pp. 39-40 and 128.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In the German text then follows a separate sentence: "Nothing has enhanced its influence in France more strongly than the fact that it finally forced the December government to break clearly with the working class."—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> In the German text the words "which massacred many of them" are omitted.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> The German text has "in the press and at public meetings".—*Ed.*

prevent the Brussels Congress from being held.<sup>a</sup> The Belgian Government ought at last to understand that petty States have no longer any *raison d'être* in Europe except they be the asylums of liberty.

In Italy, the progress of the Association has been impeded by the reaction following close upon the ambushade of Mentana<sup>20</sup>; one of the first consequences was the restriction put upon the right of association and public meeting. But the numerous letters which have come to our hands fully prove that the Italian working class is more and more asserting its individuality quite independently of the old parties.

In Prussia, the International cannot exist legally, on account of a law which forbids all relations with foreign societies.<sup>21</sup> Moreover, in regard to the General Union of the German Working Men, the Prussian Government has imitated Bonapartism on a shabby scale. Always ready to fall foul of each other, the military Governments are cheek by jowl when entering upon a crusade against their common enemy, the working classes. In spite, however, of all these petty tribulations, small groups spread over the whole surface of Germany had long since rallied round our Geneva centre.<sup>22</sup> The General Union of the German Working Men, whose branches are mostly confined to Northern Germany, have in their recent Congress held at Hamburg decided to act in concert with the International Working Men's Association,<sup>23</sup> although debarred from joining it officially.<sup>b</sup> In the programme of the Nuremberg Congress, representing upwards of 100 working men's societies, which mostly belong to Middle and Southern Germany, the direct adhesion to the International has been put on the order of the day.<sup>c</sup> At the request of their leading committee we have sent a delegate to Nuremberg.<sup>24</sup>

In Austria the working-class movement assumes a more and more revolutionary aspect.<sup>d</sup> In the beginning of September a congress was to meet at Vienna, aiming at the fraternisation of the working men of the different races of the Empire. They had also sent an address to the English and French working men, in which they declared for the principles of the International.<sup>e</sup> Your

<sup>a</sup> Marx refers to Jules Bara's speech in the Chamber of Deputies on May 16, 1868, published in *La Liberté*, No. 47, May 17, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the German text the end of the sentence reads: "although by law it is unable to join the I.W.A. officially".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 35, August 29, 1868, pp. 275-76.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The German text has "distinct character".—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> "Die Arbeiter Wien's an die französischen und englischen Arbeiter", *Der Vorbote*, No. 8, August 1868, pp. 120-22.—*Ed.*

General Council had already appointed a delegate to Vienna<sup>a</sup> when the Liberal Government of Austria, on the very point of succumbing to the blows of the feudal reaction, had the shrewdness to stir the anger of the working men by prohibiting their congress.

In the struggle maintained by the building trades of Geneva the very existence of the International in Switzerland was put on its trial. The employers made it a preliminary condition of coming to any terms with their workmen that the latter should forsake the International. The working men indignantly refused to comply with this dictate. Thanks to the aid received<sup>b</sup> from France, England, Germany, &c., through the medium of the International, they have finally obtained a diminution of one hour<sup>c</sup> of labour and 10 per cent<sup>d</sup> increase of wages. Already deeply rooted in Switzerland, the International has witnessed since that event a rapid increase in the number of its members. In the month of August last the German working men residing in Switzerland (about 50 societies) passed at their Congress in Neuenburg a unanimous vote of adhesion to the International.<sup>25</sup>

In England the unsettled state of politics,<sup>e</sup> the dissolution of the old parties, and the preparations for the coming electoral campaign have absorbed many of our most active members, and, to some degree, retarded our propaganda. Nevertheless, we have entered into correspondence with numerous provincial trades' unions, many of which have sent in their adhesion. Among the more recent London affiliations those of the Curriers' Society and the City Men's Shoemakers are the most considerable as regards numbers.

Your General Council is in constant communication with the National Labour Union of the United States. On its last Congress of August, 1867, the American Union had resolved to send a delegate to the Brussels Congress,<sup>f</sup> but, pressed for time, was unable to take the special measures necessary for carrying out the vote.<sup>26</sup>

The latent power of the working classes of the United States has recently manifested itself in the legal establishment of a working

---

<sup>a</sup> Peter Fox.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German text has "by them in Switzerland itself as well as".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The words "one hour" are omitted in the German text.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> "10 per cent" omitted in the German text.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The German text has "the political movement" instead of "the unsettled state of politics".—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> Richard Trevellick.—*Ed.*

day of eight hours in all the workshops of the Federal Government, and in the passing [of] laws to the same effect by many State Legislatures.<sup>27</sup> However, at this very moment the working men of New York, for example, are engaged in a fierce struggle for enforcing the eight hours' law, against the resistance of rebellious capital. This fact proves that even under the most favourable political conditions all serious success of the proletariat depends upon an organisation that unites and concentrates its forces; and even its national organisation is still exposed to split on the disorganisation of the working classes in other countries, which one and all compete in the market of the world, acting and reacting the one upon the other. Nothing but an international bond of the working classes can ever ensure their definitive triumph. This want has given birth to the International Working Men's Association. That Association has not been hatched by a sect or a theory. It is the spontaneous growth of the proletarian movement, which itself is the offspring of the natural and irrepressible tendencies of modern society. Profoundly convinced of the greatness of its mission, the International Working Men's Association will allow itself neither to be intimidated nor misled. Its destiny, henceforward, coalesces with the historical progress of the class that bear in their hands the regeneration of mankind.<sup>a</sup>

London, September 1

Adopted by the General Council on  
September 1, 1868

First published in French in a special  
supplement to *Le Peuple Belge*, September  
8, 1868: "Troisième congrès de l'Associa-  
tion Internationale des Travailleurs.  
Compte rendu officiel", Bruxelles, 1868;  
in English in *The Times*, No. 26225,  
September 9, 1868

Reproduced from *The Times* and  
checked with the copy of the  
German manuscript made by  
Marx's wife, Jenny Marx

---

<sup>a</sup> In the manuscript there follows: "For the General Council: *Robert Shaw*,  
Chairman *J. George Eccarius*, General Secretary."—*Ed.*



Frederick Engels  
 TO THE DIRECTORATE  
 OF THE SCHILLER INSTITUTE<sup>28</sup>

Manchester, September 16, 1868

Mr. Davisson has informed me that at its meeting of September 7 the Directorate took the decision to invite Mr. Karl Vogt to give a lecture at the Institute.

Much as I regret it, this decision obliges me to resign my post as chairman as well as that of member of the Directorate.

I do not need to enter here into the objective grounds on which, had I been present, I would have voted against the decision. It is not these reasons which make my decision a duty.

My resignation stems only from reasons not connected with the Institute. During 1859 and 1860 my political friends and I levelled grave charges of a political nature against Mr. Vogt, presenting evidence to support them. (See the work *Herr Vogt* by Karl Marx, London, 1860.) Mr. Vogt has so far remained silent in the face of these accusations, which have subsequently been repeated by other quarters.

This entire affair, as well as the polemic about it at the time, is probably unknown to the other members of the Directorate, or forgotten by them. They are quite entitled to disregard Mr. Vogt's political character and regard him as the more or less agreeable populariser of the scientific discoveries of others. I cannot afford to do so. Were I to remain in the Directorate after the above decision, I would be denying my entire political past and my political friends. I would be giving a vote of confidence to a man who, I consider it proved, was in 1859 a paid agent of Bonapartism.

Only such a compelling necessity could induce me to resign from a post in which I considered it my duty to remain under difficulties now fortunately overcome.<sup>29</sup>

I thank the members of the Directorate cordially for the confidence they have so lavishly bestowed on me, and leave them with the request to retain towards me the same friendly sentiments that I shall always cherish for them.

Yours faithfully,  
*F. E.*

First published in German in the *Bulletin of the International Institute of Social History*, Amsterdam, No. 2, 1950

Printed according to the manuscript draft

Published in English for the first time

# Demokratisches Wochenblatt.

Organ der deutschen Volkspartei.

No. 40.

Leipzig, den 3. Oktober.

1868.

Frederick Engels

## ON THE DISSOLUTION OF THE LASSALLEAN WORKERS' ASSOCIATION<sup>30</sup>

“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,<sup>31</sup> when it was similarly only *tolerated* but imagined it was 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.”

These words may be found on pages 50 and 51 of a pamphlet, *Die preussische Militärfrage und die deutsche Arbeiterpartei*, by

Frederick Engels, Hamburg, 1865.<sup>a</sup> At that time the attempt was made to bring the General Association of German Workers—in its time the only organised association of social-democratic workers in Germany—under the wing of the Bismarck ministry by presenting the workers with the prospect of the government granting universal suffrage. “Universal, equal and direct suffrage” was of course preached by Lassalle as the sole and infallible means for the working class to win political power<sup>b</sup>; is it any wonder that under these circumstances such subordinate things as freedom of the press and the right of association and assembly, which even the bourgeoisie stood for, or at least claimed to stand for, should be looked down upon? If the bourgeoisie took an interest in such things was that not a good reason for the workers to steer clear of the agitation for them? This view was opposed by the pamphlet mentioned above. The leaders of the General Association of German Workers knew better, and the author only had the satisfaction that the Lassalleans of his hometown Barmen declared him and his friends outlawed and excommunicated.

And what is the state of affairs today? “Universal, direct and equal suffrage” has existed for two years. Two parliaments have already been voted in. The workers, instead of sitting at the helm of state and decreeing “state aid” according to Lassalle’s directions, manage with the utmost difficulty to get half a dozen deputies elected into parliament. Bismarck is Federal Chancellor, and the *General Association of German Workers has been dissolved*.

But why universal suffrage failed to bring the workers the promised millennium, they were already able to find out from Engels. In the above pamphlet it says on page 48<sup>c</sup>:

“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<sup>d</sup> 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.

---

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 75-76 (Engels introduced some additional italics in quoting this passage in the present article).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> F. Lassalle, *Offenes Antwortschreiben an das Central-Comité zur Berufung eines Allgemeinen deutschen Arbeiter-Congresses zu Leipzig*, Zurich, 1863, p. 5.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 74-75.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In Engels’ pamphlet: “universal direct.”—*Ed.*

“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! The feudalists exploit twice as many workers in Germany as the bourgeoisie.... 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 proletariat 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 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 feuda’ 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<sup>a</sup> 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.”

The General Association of German Workers has been dissolved

---

<sup>a</sup> In Engels’ pamphlet: “universal direct”.—*Ed.*

not merely under the rule of universal suffrage but also precisely *because* universal suffrage rules. Engels had predicted that it would be suppressed as soon as it became *dangerous*. At its last general assembly<sup>32</sup> the Association had decided: 1. to work for **full political liberty** and 2. to cooperate with the International Working Men's Association.<sup>a</sup> These two resolutions comprise a complete break with the entire past of the Association. With them, it emerged from its previous sectarian position into the broad field of the workers' movement. But in higher places they seem to have imagined that this was to a certain extent a breach of agreement. At other times it would not have mattered so much; but since the introduction of universal suffrage, when they have to be careful to shield their rural and provincial proletariat from such subversive tendencies! Universal suffrage was the last nail in the coffin of the General Association of German Workers.

It does the Association credit that it foundered precisely on this breach with narrow-minded Lassalleanism. Whatever may take its place will consequently be built on a far more general, principled basis than the few incessantly reiterated Lassallean phrases about state aid could offer. The moment the members of the dissolved Association started thinking instead of believing, the last obstacle in the way of an amalgamation of all German social-democratic workers into one big party disappeared.

Written at the end of September 1868

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 40, October 3, 1868

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> "Die Generalversammlung des Allg. deutsch. Arbeiter-Vereins", *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nos. 100 and 102, August 28 and September 2, 1868.— *Ed.*

Frederick Engels  
ON THE DISSOLUTION  
OF THE LASSALLEAN WORKERS' ASSOCIATION  
(POSTSCRIPT)<sup>33</sup>

In the article which appeared under the above heading (in the previous issue), the following note should be added at the end of the quotation from the pamphlet by Engels on universal suffrage<sup>a</sup>:

At that time the "President of Mankind", *Bernhard Becker*, bequeathed by Lassalle to the Association,<sup>34</sup> was heaping the vilest insults on "the Marx Party", *i. e. Marx, Engels and Liebknecht*.\* Now, in his obscene screed *Enthüllungen über das tragische Lebensende Ferdinand Lassalle's*, which lays bare his own piteous soul and is only of interest because of the suppressed documents it reproduces, the very same Becker bowdlerises Engels in the following way:

"Yet, why is there no *agitation for unconditional freedom of association and assembly and freedom of the press?* Why do the workers not seek to remove the fetters placed on them in the period of reaction?" (P. 133.) "...Only by further development of the democratic basis can Lassalleanism be renewed and led over into pure socialism. To this end it is necessary among other things that the interests of the *Junkers* or wealthy landowners *should no longer be spared* but that socialist theory should be supplemented and completed by *applying it to the great mass of agricultural labourers* who in Prussia outnumber by far the population of the towns." (P. 134.)

It can be seen that the author of the pamphlet (F. Engels) may be content with its effect on his opponents.

Written at the beginning of October 1868

First published in *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 41, October 10, 1868

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time

\* This pretty business is now being continued by Countess *Hatzfeldt*, the "mother" of the Försterling-Mende caricature of the General Association of German Workers.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>a</sup> See previous article.—*Ed.*

## Karl Marx

[CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION AND  
ENGLISH WORKING MEN'S ORGANISATIONS]<sup>36</sup>

The unusual seriousness with which the English and particularly the London press treats the *International Working Men's Association* and its *Brussels Congress* (*The Times* alone devoted four leading articles to it<sup>a</sup>) has stirred up a real devil's sabbath in the German bourgeois press. It, the German press, takes the English press to task for its error in believing that such importance is attached to the International Working Men's Association in England! It has discovered that the English TRADES UNIONS, which, through the International Working Men's Association, have given considerable financial support to the Paris, Geneva and Belgian workers in their fight against capital,<sup>37</sup> have absolutely *no* connection with that very same International Working Men's Association!

"Apparently all this is based," we have in writing from London, "on the assertion of a certain *M. Hirsch*\* whom Schulze-Delitzsch sent specially to London to kick up such a fuss. *M. Hirsch* says so, and *M. Hirsch* is an honourable man! The honourable Hirsch aroused the suspicions of London trade unionists because [he] bore *no* letters of recommendation from the International Working Men's Association. They simply *made a fool of him*. No wonder then that Hirsch got it all wrong. If he had been taken seriously, he could have been told, without being entrusted with

\* Reference is to Dr. *Max Hirsch*, the "famous" economist of the *Duncker Volks-Zeitung*. Until his voyage of discovery into the English unknown, apparently no one in London had any idea of the existence of this new saviour of society.

<sup>a</sup> *The Times*, Nos. 26225, 26228, 26230 and 26234, September 9, 12, 15 and 19, 1868.—*Ed.*



anything really confidential, what the whole of London knows—that the General Council of TRADES UNIONS in London<sup>38</sup> consists of six or seven people, of whom three, *Odger* (Secretary of the General Trades Council and shoemakers' delegate), *R. Applegarth* (delegate of the Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners) and *Howell* (delegate of the bricklayers and Secretary of the Reform League<sup>39</sup>), are at the same time members of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association. He would have discovered further that the rest of the affiliated TRADES UNIONS (there are about 50 in London alone, not counting the provincial TRADES UNIONS) are represented on the General Council of the International Working Men's Association by another *five members*, namely, *R. Shaw*, *Buckley*, *Cohn*, *Hales* and *Maurice*; furthermore every union has the right and makes a practice of sending delegates to the General Council for special purposes. Further, the following English organisations are represented on the General Council of the International Working Men's Association:

“*co-operative societies*, which sent three delegates<sup>a</sup> to the Brussels Congress, by *Wlm. Weston*<sup>b</sup> and *Williams*;

“the *Reform League*, by *Dell*, *Cowell Stepney* and *Lucraft*, all three are also on the Executive Committee of the Reform League;

“the *National Reform Association*,<sup>40</sup> set up by the late agitator *Bronterre O'Brien*, by its President *A. A. Walton* and *Milner*;

“lastly, the *atheist* popular movement by its famous orator *Mrs. Harriet Law* and *Mr. Copeland*.

“It is clear that not one significant organisation of the British proletariat exists which is not directly, by its own leaders, represented on the General Council of the International Working Men's Association. Finally, there is *The Bee-Hive*, under *George Potter*'s management, the official organ of the English TRADES UNIONS, which is at the same time the official organ of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, on whose meetings it reports weekly.

“The discoveries of the honourable *Hirsch* and the subsequent jubilation in the German bourgeois press have provided just the right fodder for the London correspondent of the *Weser-Zeitung* and the London correspondent of the *Augsburgerin*,<sup>c</sup> who signs himself Δ. This person—for one and the same person writes for

<sup>a</sup> Frederick Dean (a smith), John Foster Sr (a carpenter) and John Foster Jr (a mechanic)—all three members of co-operative societies in Hull.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> John Weston is more likely the man meant here.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

the two papers—lives, for reasons best known to himself, in a remote corner a few hours away from London. There he coyly culls his extracts from *The Times*, *The Morning Star* and *The Saturday Review*, and serves them up with an aesthetic fish sauce to suit the taste of his public. From time to time, as is the case here, he also digs up the gossip of German papers and has it reprinted under a false date in the *Weser-Zeitung* and the *Augsburgerin*. The said correspondent of the *Weser-Zeitung* and the *Augsburgerin* is none other than the notorious literary lumpenproletarian *Elard Biscamp*. Long rejected by any decent society, this unfortunate seeks consolation in the bottle for the broken heart caused him by Prussia annexing his native Hesse-Cassel as well as his friend *Edgar Bauer*.<sup>41</sup>"

Written on October 4, 1868

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 42, October 17, 1868

## Karl Marx

HOW MR. GLADSTONE'S BANK LETTER OF 1866  
PROCURED A LOAN OF SIX MILLIONS  
FOR RUSSIA<sup>42</sup>

Mr. Gladstone's letter of the 11th of May, 1866,<sup>a</sup> suspended the Bank Charter Act of 1844<sup>43</sup> on the following conditions:—

1. That the minimum rate of discount should be raised to 10 per cent.

2. That if the Bank overstepped the legal limitation of its note issue, the profits of such overissue should be transferred from the Bank to the Government.

Consequently the Bank raised its minimum rate of discount to 10 per cent. (which means 15 to 20 per cent. for the common run of merchants and manufacturers), and *did not* infringe the *letter* of the Act in regard to the *note issue*. They collected, in the evening, notes from their banking friends and other connexions in the City to reissue them in the morning. They infringed, however, the spirit of the Act by allowing, under the Government letter, their *Reserve* to dwindle down to zero, and *that Reserve*, according to the contrivances of the Act of 1844, forms the only available assets of the Bank as against the liabilities of its banking department.

Mr. Gladstone's letter, therefore, suspended Peel's Act in such a way as to perpetuate and even artificially exaggerate its worst effects. Neither Sir G. C. Lewis's letter of 1857 nor Lord John Russell's letter of 1847<sup>44</sup> lay open to the same censure.

The Bank maintained the 10 per cent. minimum rate of discount for more than 3 months. This rate was regarded by Europe as a danger signal.

The most morbid sense of distrust in English solvency having thus been created by Mr. Gladstone, out comes Lord Clarendon,

<sup>a</sup> W. E. Gladstone and J. Russell, "To the Governor and Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England. May 11, 1866", *The Times*, No. 25497, May 14, 1866.—*Ed.*

the man of the Paris Conference,<sup>45</sup> with an explanatory letter, published in *The Times*, to the English Embassies on the Continent.<sup>a</sup> He told the Continent, in so many words, that the *Bank of England* was *not bankrupt* (although it was *really so*, according to the Act of 1844), but that, to a certain degree, *English* industry and commerce were so. The immediate effect of his letter was not a "run" of the Cockneys upon the Bank, but a "run" (for money) of *Europe upon England*. (That expression was used at the time by Mr. Watkin in the House of Commons.<sup>b</sup>) Such a thing was quite unheard of in the annals of English commercial history. Gold was shipped from London to France, while, simultaneously, the official minimum rate of discount was 10 *per cent. in London*, and 3½ to 3 *per cent. at Paris*. This proves that the withdrawal of gold was no regular commercial transaction. It was solely the effect of Lord Clarendon's letter.

The 10 per cent. minimum rate of discount having thus been kept up for more than three months, there followed the inevitable reaction. From 10 per cent. the minimum rate receded by quick steps to 2 per cent., which, a few days ago, was still the official Bank rate.<sup>46</sup> Meanwhile, all *English* securities, railway shares, bank shares, mining shares, every sort of home investment, had become utterly depreciated, and was anxiously shunned. Even the Consols declined. (On one day, during the Panic, the Bank *declined* making advances upon Consols.) Then the hour had struck for *Foreign Investments*. Foreign Government Loans were contracted, under the most facile conditions, on the London market. At their head stood a *Russian Loan for 6 millions sterling*.<sup>47</sup> This Russian Loan, which, a few months ago, had miserably broken down at the Paris Bourse, was now hailed as a godsend on the London Stock Exchange. Last week only Russia has come out with a new loan for 4 millions sterling. Russia was in 1866, as she is now (November 9, 1868), almost breaking down under financial difficulties, which, consequent on the agricultural revolution she is undergoing, have assumed a most formidable aspect.

This, however, is the least thing Peel's Act does for Russia—to keep the English money-market open to her. That Act puts England, the richest country in the world, *literally at the mercy of the Muscovite Government*, the most bankrupt Government in Europe.

---

<sup>a</sup> G. W. Clarendon, "Foreign Office. May 12", *The Times*, No. 25504, May 22, 1866.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Marx refers to Watkin's speech of July 31, 1866, published in *The Times*, No. 25565, August 1, 1866.—*Ed.*

Suppose the Russian Government had had lodged, in the name of a private firm, German or Greek, from one to one and a half millions sterling at the beginning of May, 1866, in the banking department of the Bank of England. By the sudden and unexpected withdrawal of that sum, she might have forced the banking department to stop payment at once, although there were more than thirteen millions sterling of gold in the issue department. The bankruptcy of the Bank of England might, then, have been enforced by a telegram from St. Petersburg.

What Russia was not prepared for in 1866, she may make ready to do—if Peel's Act be not repealed—in 1876.

Written on November 9, 1868

Reproduced from the journal

First published in *The Diplomatic Review*,  
December 2, 1868

## Karl Marx

### [PREAMBLE TO THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENEVA (1866) AND BRUSSELS (1868) CONGRESSES OF THE INTERNATIONAL]<sup>48</sup>

As some of the resolutions passed at the first Congress may be considered as part of the platform of principles of the International Working Men's Association, and the reports of that Congress have had but a limited circulation, the General Council deems it advisable to republish them with the issue of the resolutions passed at the last Congress.

Amongst the various subjects that came under the consideration of the first—the Geneva Congress—the following are the most important.<sup>49</sup>

Written at the end of October-November 3, 1868

Reproduced from the newspaper

Adopted by the General Council on November 3, 1868

First published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 371, November 21, 1868

Karl Marx  
[STATEMENT  
TO THE GERMAN WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY  
IN LONDON]<sup>50</sup>

November 23, 1868  
1 Modena Villas, Maitland Park,  
Haverstock Hill, London

*To Mr C. Speyer, Secretary of the German Workers' Educational Society*

Dear friend,

I have been informed that the Society has decided to issue a circular letter to the German workers,<sup>a</sup> the theme of which is said to be the "mass unification of the German workers of South and North in consequence of the Berlin Congress of September 26".<sup>51</sup>

In these circumstances I am obliged to announce my *resignation from the Workers' Society*.

Such a letter is obviously intended as, or implies, a public alignment of the London German Workers' Educational Society for Schweitzer and his organisation and *against* the organisation of the Nuremberg Congress,<sup>52</sup> which embraces most of South Germany and various parts of North Germany. As I am known in Germany as a member of the Society, in fact its oldest member, I would be held responsible for this step in spite of all possible assurances to the contrary.

You must, however, realise that I cannot accept such responsibility.

*Firstly:* During the disputes between the Nuremberg organisation, represented by Liebknecht, Bebel, etc., and the Berlin organisation, represented by Schweitzer, both parties have contacted me in writing. I have replied that as the Secretary of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association

---

<sup>a</sup> K. Speyer, "Der deutsche Arbeiter-Bildungsverein in London an die Arbeiter Deutschlands", *Der Vorbote*, No. 12, December 1868; No. 1, January 1869.—*Ed.*

for Germany I have to maintain an *impartial* position. I have advised both parties, if they cannot and will not amalgamate with each other, to look for ways and means of working for the common goal peacefully *side by side*.

*Secondly*: In reply to a letter from Herr von Schweitzer to me, I have set out for him in detail the reasons why I can neither approve the manner in which the Berlin Congress was managed nor the statutes adopted by it.<sup>53</sup>

*Thirdly*: The Nuremberg Congress has affiliated itself *directly* to the International Working Men's Association. The Hamburg Congress—of which the Berlin Congress was a continuation—has *only indirectly* affiliated itself by a statement of sympathy, owing to the obstacles placed in its path by the Prussian legislation. In spite of these obstacles, however, the newly formed Democratic Workers' Association of Berlin,<sup>54</sup> which belongs to the Nuremberg organisation, has publicly and officially affiliated itself to the International Working Men's Association.

I repeat that in these circumstances the decision of the Society leaves me no other choice than to announce my resignation from it. I trust you will be so kind as to convey these lines of mine to the Society.

Yours sincerely,  
*Karl Marx*

First published in *Briefe und Auszüge aus Briefen von J. Ph. Becker, J. Dietzgen, F. Engels, K. Marx u. A. an F. A. Sorge u. A.*, Stuttgart, 1906

Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time



## Karl Marx

THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION  
AND THE INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE  
OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY<sup>55</sup>

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

The programme and rules printed by this Initiatory Committee<sup>a</sup> were only communicated to the *General Council* of the *International Working Men's Association* at its meeting on December 15. According to these documents, the said "*International Alliance is merged entirely in the International Working Men's Association*", at the same time as it is *established* entirely outside this Association.

Besides the *General Council* of the *International Association*, elected at the Geneva, Lausanne and Brussels working men's congresses, there is to be, in line with the initiatory rules, another *Central Council* in Geneva, which is self-appointed. Besides the local groups of the *International Association*, there are to be local groups of the *International Alliance*, which "through their national bureaux", operating outside the national bureaux of the *International Association*, "shall ask the *Central Bureau of the Alliance* to admit them into the *International Working Men's Association*"; the Alliance Central Committee thereby takes upon itself the right of admittance to the *International Association*. Lastly, the *General Congress of the International Association* will have its parallel in the

---

<sup>a</sup> *Programme et Règlement de l'Alliance Internationale de la Démocratie Socialiste*, Genève [1868] (see this volume, pp. 207-09). Here and below Marx quotes this document.—Ed.

*General Congress of the International Alliance*, for, as the initiatory rules say,

“At the annual Working Men’s Congress *the delegation of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, as a branch of the International Working Men’s Association, shall hold public meetings in a separate building.*”<sup>a</sup>

Considering,

That the presence of a second international body operating within and outside the *International Working Men’s Association* would be the infallible means of its disorganisation;

That every other group of individuals, residing anywhere at all, would have the right to imitate the Geneva initiatory group and, under more or less plausible excuses, to bring into the *International Working Men’s Association* other international associations with other “*special missions*”;

That the *International Working Men’s Association* would thereby soon become a plaything for intriguers of all race and nationality<sup>b</sup>;

That, moreover, the *Rules of the International Working Men’s Association* admit only local and national branches into its ranks (see Article 1 and Article 6 of the *Rules*);

That *sections of the International Association* are forbidden to give themselves rules or administrative regulations *contrary to the General Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Association* (see *Article 12 of the Administrative Regulations*<sup>c</sup>);

That the *Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Association* can only be revised by the *General Congress* in the event of two-thirds of the delegates present voting in favour of such a revision (see *Article 13 of the Administrative Regulations*),<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 209.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Les prétendues scissions dans l’Internationale* by Marx and Engels (Genève, 1872, p. 7) has: “for intriguers of any nationality and any party”.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Rules of the International Working Men’s Association. Founded September 28th, 1864*, London [1867], pp. 4-5, 7.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> During discussion of the draft resolution at the General Council meeting on December 22, 1868, on Dupont’s proposal an addition was made to this part of the resolution which was not recorded in full in the Minute Book. The text of this addition, edited apparently by Marx, was included in the final version of the circular (see K. Marx and F. Engels, *Les prétendues scissions dans l’Internationale*, Genève, 1872, p. 8) and reads as follows:

“That this question was decided beforehand in the resolutions against the *Peace League*, unanimously passed at the General Congress in Brussels<sup>56</sup>;

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

“That a few members of the Geneva *Initiatory* group, as delegates to the Brussels Congress, had voted for these resolutions.”—*Ed.*

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

- 1) All articles of the *Rules* of the *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, defining its relations with the *International Working Men's Association*, are declared null and void;
- 2) *The International Alliance of Socialist Democracy* may not be admitted as a branch of the *International Working Men's Association*;
- 3) These resolutions be published in all countries where the *International Working Men's Association* exists.<sup>a</sup>

By order of the *General Council*  
of the *International Working Men's Association*

London, December 22, 1868

Adopted by the General Council on  
December 22, 1868

First published in the pamphlet *Les prétendues scissions dans l'Internationale*,  
Genève, 1872

Printed according to the manu-  
script, checked with various copies  
and the pamphlet

Translated from the French

---

<sup>a</sup> Point 3 was not included in the final text of the resolution. Neither was it included in the pamphlet *Les prétendues scissions dans l'Internationale*.— Ed.

Karl Marx

[RESUMÉ OF THE MEETINGS  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL]<sup>57</sup>

INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION  
TO THE EDITOR OF *THE BEE-HIVE*

Sir,—At the meeting of this Association, held on the 5th inst., letters were read from Germany announcing the adhesion of 2,000 miners, from Lugau, in Saxony, and arrangements are in progress with two other bodies, of 7,000 miners each, with a view of their joining the International Working Men's Association.<sup>58</sup>

A democratic Working Men's Club has been formed at Berlin<sup>59</sup>; the members have joined the International Working Men's Association, and declared themselves opposed to the Prussian Government and to Schultze-Delitzsch. The trades' unions in Germany, on the model of the English ones, with some improvements suggested by the resolutions of the Geneva, Lausanne, and Brussels Working Men's Congresses, brought into existence by the efforts of the International Working Men's Association, number already 110,000 members.

The Belgian secretary<sup>a</sup> stated that in Belgium they had sixty branches, and that they were getting new members at the rate of 1,000 per week.<sup>60</sup>

The secretary for Switzerland<sup>b</sup> stated that he had received information concerning some riband weavers of Basel, who had been locked out.<sup>61</sup> The matter will come up again on Tuesday, when the Council will be in possession of the facts.

The secretary for France<sup>c</sup> reported an agreement come to between the cotton masters of Rouen, the northern and some other departments of France, to reduce the workmen's wages, in

---

<sup>a</sup> Marie Bernard.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Hermann Jung.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Eugène Dupont.—*Ed.*

order to undersell the English manufacturers in their own markets.<sup>a</sup>

The following resolution, proposed by Citizen Applegarth, and seconded by Citizen Marx, was unanimously agreed to:—

Resolved—That in the opinion of this Council the attempt of the employers of Rouen, of the northern and other departments of France, to reduce the wages of their workpeople with the avowed object of underselling the manufacturers of England in their own markets is deserving the reprobation of the workmen and employers of all nations. That while recognising the right of free competition carried on by legitimate means, we utterly deprecate the extension of trade by reducing the wages of workpeople already underpaid.

Resolved—That the various societies be invited to send delegates to the next meeting of the Council, to be held on Tuesday 19 inst. at eight p. m., to devise the best means to frustrate the unwarrantable attempts of the French manufacturer, and to render to the workmen concerned such assistance as they may need.<sup>62</sup>

*Hermann Jung*,<sup>b</sup> Sec. pro. tem.

6th Jan. 1869

First published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 379,  
January 16, 1869

Reproduced from the newspaper

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 388.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *The Bee-Hive* has a mistake: "Henry Lang".—*Ed.*

## Frederick Engels

### REPORT ON THE MINERS' GUILDS IN THE COALFIELDS OF SAXONY<sup>63</sup>

The first *wage scale* we take, e. g., that of the Niederwürschnitz Company, shows us the overall condition of the miners in the collieries of the Erzgebirge. A week's wage for adult miners amounts to from 2 talers to 3 talers 12 silver groschen 6 pfennigs, for juveniles between 1 taler 10 silver groschen and 1 taler 20 silver groschen. A week's wage for an average miner amounts approximately to  $2\frac{2}{3}$  talers. At the demand of the owners the workers have to work at piece rates. The *wage scale* is arranged in such a way that the piece rate will not usually exceed the normal rate for a day's work. Every worker must give a month's notice to leave, and that on the first day of the month. Consequently, if he refuses to work at piece rates on the terms proposed, he can be *forced* to it for 4-8 weeks at the least. Such being the circumstances, it is simply ridiculous to talk of regulating the piece rate by mutual agreement, of a free contract between worker and capitalist!

Wages are paid in two instalments; an advance is made on the 22nd of the month, the remainder for that month being paid on the 8th of the following month. The capitalist therefore retains wages that he *owes* his workers for a full three weeks on the average—this compulsory loan to the employer is all the more agreeable since money is thus obtained without the payment of interest.

As a rule the miners work in twelve-hour shifts, and the afore-mentioned weekly wages are paid for 6 twelve-hour working days. The twelve-hour working day includes 2 hours (2 half hours and 1 full hour) for meals, or so-called *rest periods*. If the work is urgent, shifts last eight hours (i. e., each man does 3 shifts in 48 hours) with *half an hour for meals*; they may even last six hours, in which case "*no rest period is granted*".

These facts offer a gloomy picture of the condition of the miners. But to appreciate their serf-like status we must also examine the *rules of the miners' guilds*. Let us take the rules for the coal-mines, those of (I) the high and mighty *Prince Schönburg*, (II) the *Niederwürschnitz Company*, (III) the *Niederwürschnitz-Kirchberg Company*, and (IV) the *Joint Lugau companies*.

The income of the miners' guilds consists of (1) the workers' entrance fees and dues, fines, unclaimed wages, etc., and (2) contributions from the capitalists. The workers pay 3 or 4 per cent of their wages, the owners of (I) pay 7 silver groschen 5 pfennigs monthly for every paid-up miner, of (II) 1 pfennig for every scheffel<sup>a</sup> of coal sold, of (III) as initial contribution and to found a miners' guild fund—500 talers; after that the same dues as the workers, and of (IV) like those of (II), plus a membership fee of 100 talers from each of the joint companies.

Are we not overwhelmed by this picture of friendly harmony between capital and labour? After that, who will dare to go on harping on their contradictory interests? But, as the great German thinker Hansemann once said, "business is business".<sup>b</sup> So we might ask what the worker has to pay for the magnanimity of the "exalted coal-owners". Let's see.

The capitalists contribute in one instance (III) as much as the workers, in all other instances appreciably less. For this they lay claim to the following rights in respect of *the property of the guild*:

I. "*No property rights in respect of the guild fund shall accrue to members of the miners' guild, and they shall not expect to obtain more from the fund than the amount to which they, according to the rules, are entitled in certain circumstances, in particular they shall not be able to propose sharing the fund and its ready cash even in the event of any of the works ceasing to operate. Should there be a complete shut-down in the coal-mines of Prince Schönburg in Oelsnitz*", then, after satisfaction of ready claims, "*the right to dispose of the remainder is vested in the Prince, owner of the coalfields.*"

II. "In the event of the joint Niederwürschnitz Coal Company closing down, the miners' guild fund shall also be closed down, and *the right to dispose of the remaining money is vested in the management.*"

Members of the guild fund have *no property rights in respect of the guild fund*.

### III. as in II.

IV. "The guild fund shall be considered the *inalienable property* of its present members and those who join it in future. Only in the unexpected event of the

<sup>a</sup> 1 scheffel is one-eighth of a ton.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> From Hansemann's speech in the first United Diet on June 8, 1847 (see *Preussens erster Reichstag*, Th. 7, Berlin, 1847, p. 55).—*Ed.*

complete liquidation of all the joint coal-mines and the consequent closing down of the miners' guild"—now, in this unexpected event one might have expected the workers to be able to divide up among themselves any money remaining. Nothing of the sort! In this case "the management of the last closed trust shall direct suggestions to the *Royal District Board*. The last-named authority shall *decide* how this sum of money is to be used."

In other words, the workers pay the greater part of the contributions to the guild fund, but the capitalists *arrogate to themselves the ownership of the fund*. The capitalists seem to make the workers a present. Actually, the workers are forced to make a present to their capitalists. Together with the property right, the latter obtain control of the fund.

The *chairman* of the fund board is the coalfield manager. He is the chief administrator of the fund, he decides all disputed issues, determines the amount of fines, etc. Next below him is the *secretary of the guild*, who is also the treasurer. He is either appointed by the capitalist or has to get the latter's approval if he is elected by the workers. Then come the ordinary *members of the board*. They are usually elected by the workers, but in one instance (III) the capitalist appoints three members of the board. What sort of "board" this actually is can be seen from the rule obliging "*it to hold a meeting at least once a year*". Actually it is run by the chairman, and the board members carry out his orders.

This Mr. Chairman, the coalfield manager, is a powerful person in other respects too. He can reduce the probation period for new members, issue extra allowances, even (III) expel workers whose reputation he deems poor, and he can always appeal to the capitalist, whose decision is final on *everything concerning the miners' guild*. Prince Schönburg and the managers of the joint stock companies can, for instance, alter the guild rules, raise the workers' dues, reduce sick benefits and pensions, create new obstacles or formalities in dealing with claims on the fund. In short, they *can do what they like with the workers' money*, with the one reservation that they need the sanction of the government authorities, who have never yet displayed any *desire* to know anything about the condition or needs of the workers. In enterprise III the managers even reserve themselves the right to expel from the guild any worker *who has been brought to trial by them, even if he has been acquitted!*

And what are the benefits for which the miners so blindly subordinate their own affairs to an alien despotism? Listen to this!

1) In the event of sickness they receive medical treatment and a weekly allowance, in enterprise I—up to a third of their wages, in



III—up to a half of their wages, in II and IV—up to a half or, if the illness is due to an accident at work,  $\frac{2}{3}$  and  $\frac{3}{4}$  respectively. 2) The incapacitated receive a pension depending on their length of service, and hence on their contributions to the guild fund, from  $\frac{1}{20}$  to  $\frac{1}{2}$  of their last wages. 3) If a member dies his widow receives an allowance of between  $\frac{1}{5}$  and  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the pension which her husband was entitled to, and a weekly pittance for each child. 4) A burial allowance in the event of death in the family.

The noble prince and enlightened capitalists who compiled these rules, and the paternal government which endorsed them, owe the world the solution of this problem: if a miner with the full average wage of  $2\frac{2}{3}$  talers a week is half starved, how can he live on a pension of, say,  $\frac{1}{20}$  of this wage, some 4 silver groschen a week?

The tender concern which the rules display for the interests of capital comes out clearly in the way mine accidents are treated. With the exception of enterprises II and IV there is no special allowance if illness or death occurs through an accident “in the course of duty”. *In not a single case is the pension increased if disability follows from a mine accident.* The reason is very simple. This clause would substantially increase payments out of the fund and very soon make even the most short-sighted see the real nature of *presents* from the capitalist gentlemen.

The rules imposed by the capitalists of Saxony differ from the constitution imposed by Louis Bonaparte<sup>a</sup> in that the latter still awaits the crowning touch whereas the former already have it in the form of the following article applicable to all:

“Every worker who *leaves* the company, be it voluntarily, *be it compulsorily*, thereby leaves the guild and *forfeits all rights and claims both to its fund and to the money he himself has contributed.*”

Thus, a man who has worked 30 years in one mine and contributed his share to the guild fund, forfeits all his hard-earned rights to a pension as soon as the capitalist *chooses to sack him!* This article turns the wage-worker into a serf, ties him to the soil, exposes him to the most shameful mistreatment. If he is no lover of kicks, if he resists the cutting of wages to starvation level, if he refuses to pay arbitrarily imposed fines, if he dares to insist on official verification of weights and measures—he will always receive the same old answer: get out, but your fund contributions and your fund rights stay with us!

It seems paradoxical to expect manly independence and self-respect from people in such a humiliating position. Yet these

<sup>a</sup> *Constitution faite en vertu des pouvoirs délégués par le peuple français à Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte, par le vote des 20 et 21 décembre 1851.—Ed.*

miners can be counted—much to their credit—among the vanguard fighters of the German working class. Their masters are therefore beginning to be greatly worried, despite the tremendous hold the present organisation of the miners' guilds gives them. The most recent and meanest of their rules (III, dating from 1862) contains the following grotesque clause against strikes and associations:

"Every guild member *must always be satisfied with the pay accruing to him in accordance with the wage scale*, he must never take part in joint action to force higher wages, to say nothing of inciting his workmates to the same, but should, rather, etc."

Why have the Lycurguses of the *Niederwürschnitz-Kirchberg* Coalfield Company, Messrs. *B. Krüger*, *F. W. Schwamkrug* and *F. W. Richter* not also deigned to make it a rule that henceforward every coal purchaser "*must always be satisfied*" with the coal prices fixed by their exalted selves? This is too much even for Herr von Rochow's "limited understanding of the loyal subject".<sup>64</sup>

As a result of agitation among the miners, *preliminary draft rules* for the unification of miners' guilds of all coalfields in Saxony were recently published (Zwickau 1869). They were drawn up by a workers' committee under the chairmanship of Mr. *J. G. Dinter*. The main points are: 1) All guilds to be united in a single guild. 2) Members retain their rights as long as they live in Germany and pay their dues. 3) A general meeting of all adult members constitutes the supreme authority. It elects an executive committee, etc. 4) Contributions by the masters to the guild fund must make up half those paid by the workers.

This draft in no way reflects the views of the most intelligent miners of Saxony. It comes rather from a section which prefers reforms with the permission of capital. It bears the stamp of unpracticality on its brow. What a naïve idea indeed that the capitalists, unrestrained rulers over the miners' guilds up to now, will surrender their power to a democratic general workers' meeting and still pay their contributions!

The *basic evil* lies in the very fact that the capitalists *contribute*. As long as this continues, they cannot be removed from running the guild and the fund. To be genuine workers' societies, the miners' guilds must rely exclusively on workers' contributions. Only thus can they become TRADES UNIONS which protect individual workers from the arbitrariness of individual masters. The insignificant and dubious advantages which come from the capitalists' contributions—can they ever compensate for the state of serfdom into which they force the workers? Let the Saxon miners always

remember that what the capitalist puts into the guild fund he *gets it all back, and more, from the workers' wages*. Guilds of this type have the unique effect of *suspending the operation of the law of supply and demand to the exclusive advantage of the capitalist*. In other words, by the *unusual hold* which they give capital over individual workers, they press down wages even *below* their usual average level.

But should the workers then present the existing funds—naturally after compensation for the acquired rights—to the capitalists? This question can only be decided by *law*. Although *endorsed by the supreme royal authority*, certain articles in the rules patently conflict with generally accepted legal regulations concerning contracts. In all circumstances, however, the separation of the workers' money from the capitalists' money remains the essential precondition to any reform of the miners' guilds.

The contributions of the Saxon coalfield owners to the guild funds are an involuntary admission that capital is up to a certain point responsible for accidents which threaten the wage worker with mutilation or death during the execution of his duty at his place of work. But instead of allowing this responsibility to be made the pretext for extending the despotism of capital, as is the case now, the workers must agitate for *this responsibility being regulated by the law*.

Written between February 17 and 21,  
1869

Published according to the news-  
paper

First published as a supplement to  
*Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 12,  
March 20, 1869

## Karl Marx

THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION TO THE  
CENTRAL BUREAU OF THE INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE  
OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY<sup>65</sup>

London, 9 March, 1869

Citizens,

According to Article I of its<sup>a</sup> Statutes, the Int. W. Ass.<sup>b</sup> admits "all working men's societies ... aiming at the same end, viz., the protection, advancement, and *complete emancipation of the working classes*".<sup>c</sup>

Since the various sections of working men in the same country, and the working classes in different countries, are placed under different circumstances and have attained to different degrees of development, it seems almost necessary that their theoretical notions, which reflect the real movement, should also diverge.

The community of action, however, called into life by the Intern. W. Ass., the exchange of ideas facilitated by the public organs of the different national sections, and the direct debates at the General Congresses, are sure by and by to engender a common theoretical programme.

Consequently, it belongs not to the functions of the General Council to subject the programme of the Alliance to a critical examination.<sup>d</sup> We have not to inquire whether, yes or no, it be a true scientific expression of the working-class movement.<sup>e</sup> All we have to ask is whether its *general tendency* does not run against the

<sup>a</sup> The clean copy in French has "our".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Here and below in the French copy the name of the International is given in full.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Rules of the International Working Men's Association*, London [1867], p. 4.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See this volume, pp. 207-10.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The clean copy in French has "an adequate expression of the proletarian movement" instead of "a true scientific expression of the working-class movement".—*Ed.*

general tendency of the<sup>a</sup> Int. W. Ass., viz., *the complete emancipation of the working class?*

One phrase in your programme lies open to this objection. It occurs [in] Article 2:

“Elle (l'Alliance) veut avant tout *l'égalisation* politique, économique et sociale des classes.” (“The Alliance aims above all at the political, economical, and social equalisation ... of classes.”<sup>66</sup>)

The “*égalité des classes*”, literally interpreted, comes to the “*Harmony of Capital and Labour*” (“l'harmonie du capital et du travail”) so persistently preached by the bourgeois socialists. It is not the logically impossible “*equalisation of classes*”, but the historically necessary, superseding “*abolition of classes*” (abolition des classes), this true secret of the proletarian movement, which forms the great aim of the Int. W. Ass.

Considering, however, the context, in which that phrase “*égalité des classes*” occurs, it seems to be a mere slip of the pen, and the General Council feels confident that you will be anxious to remove from your programme an expression which offers such a dangerous misunderstanding.

It suits the *principles* of the Int. W. Ass. to let every section freely shape its own theoretical programme, except the single case of an infringement upon its general tendency. There exists, therefore, no obstacle to the transformation of the sections of the Alliance into sections of the Int. W. Ass.

The dissolution of the Alliance, and the entrance of its sections into the Int. W. Ass, once settled, it would, according to our Regulations, become necessary to inform the General Council of the residence and the numerical strength of each new section.<sup>b</sup>

Adopted by the General Council on  
March 9, 1869

First published in the pamphlet *Les  
prétendues scissions dans l'Internationale*,  
Genève, 1872

Reproduced from the English  
rough copy, checked with Marx's  
clean copy in French

<sup>a</sup> The clean copy in French has “our”.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the English manuscript the following text is crossed out: “It is self-understood that every section is bound to admit all workmen who accept the general statutes of the I. W. Association without adopting the special programme of the section.”—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

THE BELGIAN MASSACRES<sup>67</sup>

TO THE WORKMEN OF EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES

There passes hardly a week in England without strikes—and strikes upon a grand scale. If, on such occasions, the Government was to let its soldiers loose upon the Working Class, this land of strikes would become a land of massacres, but not for many a week. After a few such physical force experiments, the powers that be would be nowhere. In the United States, too, the number and scale of strikes have continued to increase during the last few years, and even sometimes assumed a riotous character. But no blood was spilt. In some of the great military states of continental Europe, the era of strikes may be dated from the end of the American Civil War. But here, again, no blood was spilt. There exists but one country in the civilised world where every strike is eagerly and joyously turned into a pretext for the official massacre of the Working Class. That country of single blessedness is *Belgium!* the model state of continental constitutionalism, the snug, well-hedged, little paradise of the landlord, the capitalist, and the priest. The earth performs not more surely its yearly revolution than the Belgian Government its yearly Working Men's massacre. The massacre of this year does not differ from last year's massacre,<sup>a</sup> but by the ghastlier number of its victims, the more hideous ferocity of an otherwise ridiculous army, the noisier jubilation of the clerical and capitalist press, and the intensified frivolity of the pretexts put forward by the Governmental butchers.

It is now proved, even by the involuntary evidence of the

---

<sup>a</sup> Marx refers to the events in Charleroi (Belgium) in March 1868. See this volume, pp. 14-15.—*Ed.*

capitalist press,<sup>a</sup> that the quite legitimate strike of the puddlers in the Cockerill Ironworks, of Seraing, was only converted into a riot by a strong posse of cavalry and gendarmerie suddenly launched upon that place in order to provoke the people. From the 9th to the 12th of April these stout warriors not only recklessly charged with sabre and bayonet the unarmed workmen, they indiscriminately killed and wounded harmless passers-by, forcibly broke into private houses, and even amused themselves with repeated furious onslaughts on the travellers pent up in the Seraing Railway Station. When these days of horror had passed away, it became bruited about that Mr. *Kamp*, the mayor of Seraing, was an agent of the Cockerill Joint Stock Company, that the Belgian Home Minister, a certain Mr. *Pirmez*, was the largest shareholder in a neighbouring colliery also on strike, and that His Royal Highness the Prince of Flanders had invested 1,500,000 francs in the Cockerill concern.<sup>68</sup> Hence people jump to the truly strange conclusion that the Seraing massacre was a sort of joint stock company *coup d'état*, quietly plotted between the firm Cockerill and the Belgian Home Minister, for the simple purpose of striking terror unto their disaffected subjects. This calumny, however, was soon after victoriously refuted by the later events occurring in Le Borinage, a colliery district where the Belgian Home Minister, the said Mr. *Pirmez*, seems not to be a leading capitalist. An almost general strike having broken out amongst the miners of that district, numerous troops were concentrated, who opened their campaign at Frameries by a fusillade, which killed nine and grievously wounded twenty miners, *after* which little preliminary exploit the Riot Act, singularly enough styled in French "*les sommations préalables*",<sup>69</sup> was read, and then the butchery proceeded with.

Some politicians trace these incredible deeds to motives of a sublime patriotism. While just negotiating on some ticklish points with their French neighbour,<sup>70</sup> the Belgian Government, they say, were bound in duty to show off the heroism of their army. Hence that scientific division of arms, displaying, first, the irresistible impetuosity of the Belgian cavalry at Seraing, and then the steady vigour of the Belgian infantry at Frameries. To frighten the foreigner, what means more infallible than such homely battles, which one does not know how to lose, and such domestic battlefields, where the hundreds of workmen killed, mutilated,

---

<sup>a</sup> See "Moralités de l'affaire de Seraing" and "Episodes de troubles de Seraing et du Borinage", *L'Internationale*, Nos. 14 and 15, April 18 and 25, 1869.—*Ed.*

and made prisoners, shed so glorious a lustre upon those invulnerable warriors, who, all of them, to a man, get off with their skins safe.

Other politicians, on the contrary, suspect the Belgian ministers to be sold to the Tuileries, and to periodically enact these horrible scenes of a mock civil war, with the deliberate aim of affording Louis Bonaparte a pretext for saving society in Belgium as he has saved it in France. But was Ex-Governor Eyre ever accused of having organised the Negro massacre at Jamaica in order to wrest that island from England and place it into the hands of the United States?<sup>71</sup> No doubt the Belgian ministers are excellent patriots of the Eyre pattern. As he was the unscrupulous tool of the West-Indian planter, they are the unscrupulous tools of the Belgian capitalist.

The Belgian capitalist has won fair fame in the world by his eccentric passion for, what he calls, *the liberty of labour* (*la liberté du travail*). So fond is he of the liberty of his hands to labour for him all the hours of their life, without exemption of age or sex, that he has always indignantly repulsed any factory law encroaching upon that liberty. He shudders at the very idea that a common workman should be wicked enough to claim any higher destiny than that of enriching his master and natural superior. He wants his workman not only to remain a miserable drudge, overworked and underpaid, but, like every other slave-holder, he wants him to be a cringing, servile, broken-hearted, morally prostrate, religiously humble drudge. Hence his frantic fury at strikes. With him, a strike is a blasphemy, a slave's revolt, the signal of a social cataclysm. Put, now, into the hands of such men—cruel from sheer cowardice—the undivided, uncontrolled, absolute sway of the state power, as is actually the case in Belgium, and you will no longer wonder to find the sabre, the bayonet, and the musket working in that country as legitimate and normal instruments for keeping wages down and screwing profits up. But, in point of fact, what other earthly purpose could a Belgian army serve? When, by the dictation of official Europe, Belgium was declared a *neutral country*,<sup>72</sup> it ought, as a matter of course, have been forbidden the costly luxury of an army, save, perhaps, a handful of soldiers, just sufficient to mount the royal guard and parade at a royal puppet-show. Yet, within its 536 square leagues of territory, Belgium harbours an army greater than that of the United Kingdom or the United States. The field service of this neutralised army is fatally computed by the number of its *razzias* upon the working class.



It will easily be understood that the *International Working Men's Association* was no welcome guest in Belgium. Excommunicated by the priest, calumniated by the respectable press, it came soon to loggerheads with the Government. The latter tried hard to get rid of it by making it responsible for the Charleroi colliery strikes of 1867-68, strikes wound up, after the invariable Belgian rule, by official massacres, followed by the judicial prosecution of the victims. Not only was this cabal baffled, but the Association took active steps, resulting in a verdict of *not guilty* for the Charleroi miners, and, consequently, in a verdict of *guilty* against the Government itself.<sup>73</sup> Fretting at this defeat, the Belgian ministers gave vent to their spleen by fierce denunciations, from the tribune of the Chamber of Deputies, against the *International Working Men's Association*, and pompously declared they should never allow its General Congress to meet at Brussels.<sup>a</sup> In the teeth of their menaces the Congress met at Brussels. But now at last the *International* is to succumb before the 536 square leagues of Belgian Omnipotence. Its culpable complicity during the recent events has been proved beyond the possibility of doubt. The emissaries of the Brussels Central Committee for Belgium and some of the Local Committees stand convicted of several flagrant crimes. In the first instance, they have tried hard to calm the excitement of the workmen on strike, and warn them off the Government traps. In some localities they have actually prevented the effusion of blood. And last, not least, these ill-boding emissaries observed on the spot, verified by witnesses, noted carefully down and publicly denounced the sanguinary vagaries of the defenders of order. By the simple process of imprisonment they were at once converted from the accusers into the accused. Then the domiciles of the members of the Brussels Committee were brutally invaded, all their papers seized, and some of them arrested on the charge of belonging to an association "*founded for the purpose of attempting the lives and properties of individuals*".<sup>b</sup> In other words, they were impeached of belonging to an *Association of Thugs*,<sup>74</sup> commonly styled the *International Working Men's Association*. Hunted on by the raving capucinades of the clerical and the savage howls of the capitalist press, this swaggering pigmy government is decidedly anxious to drown itself in a morass of ridicule, after having weltered in a sea of blood.

<sup>a</sup> A reference to the speech of Jules Bara, the Belgian Minister of Justice, in the Chamber of Deputies on May 16, 1868, published in *La Liberté*, No. 47, May 17, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "Arrestations et condamnations", *L'Internationale*, No. 16, May 2, 1869.—*Ed.*

Already the Belgian Central Committee at Brussels has announced its intention to institute, and afterwards publish the results of, a full inquiry into the massacres of Seraing and Le Borinage.<sup>a</sup> We will circulate their revelations all over the world, in order to open the eyes of the world on the pet funfaronade of the Belgian capitalist: *La liberté, pour faire le tour du monde, n'a pas besoin de passer par ici (la Belgique).*\*

Perhaps, the Belgian Government flatters itself that having, after the revolutions of 1848-49, gained a respite of life by becoming the police agent of all the reactionary governments of the Continent, it may now again avert imminent danger by conspicuously playing the gendarme of capital against labour. This, however, is a serious mistake. Instead of delaying, they will thus only hasten the catastrophe. By making Belgium a byword and a nickname with the popular masses all over the world, they will remove the last obstacle in the way of the despots bent upon wiping that country's name off the map of Europe.

The General Council of the *International Working Men's Association* hereby calls upon the workmen of Europe and the United States to open monetary subscriptions for alleviating the sufferings of the widows, wives, and children of the Belgian victims, and also for the expenses incident upon the legal defence of the arrested workmen, and the inquiry proposed by the Brussels Committee.

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

R. Applegarth, Chairman  
 R. Shaw, Secretary for America  
 Bernard, Secretary for Belgium  
 Eugène Dupont, Secretary for France  
 Karl Marx, Secretary for Germany  
 Jules Johannard, Secretary for Italy  
 A. Zabicki, Secretary for Poland  
 H. Jung, Secretary for Switzerland  
 Cowell Stepney, Treasurer

J. G. Eccarius, Secretary to the General Council

London, May 4th, 1869

\* Liberty in travelling round the world has no need of passing through Belgium.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *L'Internationale*, No. 15, April 25, 1869.—Ed.

All contributions for the victims of the Belgian massacre to be sent to the Office of the General Council, 256, High Holborn, London, W.C.

Adopted by the General Council on May 4,  
1869

Reproduced from the leaflet

First published as a leaflet, *The Belgian  
Massacres. To the Workmen of Europe and  
the United States*, May 1869

## Karl Marx

ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL LABOUR UNION  
OF THE UNITED STATES<sup>76</sup>

Fellow-workmen,

In the initiatory programme of our Association we stated: "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>a</sup> Your turn has now come to stop a war, the clearest result of which would be, for an indefinite period, to hurl back the ascendant movement of the working class on both sides of the Atlantic.

We need hardly tell you that there exist European powers anxiously bent upon hurrying the United States into a war with England. A glance at commercial statistics will show that the Russian export of raw produce, and Russia has nothing else to export, was rapidly giving way before American competition, when the civil war suddenly turned the scales. To convert the American ploughshares into swords would just now rescue from impending bankruptcy that despotic power which your republican statesmen have, in their wisdom, chosen for their confidential adviser. But quite apart from the particular interests of this or that government, is it not the general interest of our common oppressors to turn our fast-growing international cooperation into an internecine war?

In a congratulatory address to Mr. Lincoln on his re-election as president, we expressed our conviction that the American civil war

---

<sup>a</sup> *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association*, London, 1864.—*Ed.*

would prove of as great import to the advancement of the working class as the American war of independence had proved to that of the middle class.<sup>a</sup> And, in point of fact, the victorious termination of the anti-slavery war has opened a new epoch in the annals of the working class. In the States themselves, an independent working-class movement, looked upon with an evil eye by your old parties and their professional politicians, has since that date sprung into life. To fructify it wants years of peace. To crush it, a war between the United States and England is wanted.

The next palpable effect of the civil war was, of course, to deteriorate the position of the American workman. In the United States, as in Europe, the monster incubus of a national debt was shifted from hand to hand, to settle down on the shoulders of the working class. The prices of necessaries, says one of your statesmen, have since 1860 risen 78 per cent, while the wages of unskilled labour rose 50 per cent, those of skilled labour 60 per cent only. "Pauperism," he complains, "grows now in America faster than population." Moreover, the sufferings of the working classes set off as a foil the new-fangled luxury of financial aristocrats, shoddy aristocrats,<sup>77</sup> and similar vermin bred by wars. Yet for all this the civil war did compensate by freeing the slave and the consequent moral impetus it gave to your own class movement. A second war, not hallowed by a sublime purpose and a great social necessity, but of the Old World's type, would forge chains for the free labourer instead of tearing asunder those of the slave. The accumulated misery left in its track would afford your capitalists at once the motive and the means to divorce the working class from its bold and just aspirations by the soulless sword of a standing army.

On you, then, depends the glorious task to prove to the world that now at last the working classes are bestriding the scene of history no longer as servile retainers, but as independent actors, conscious of their own responsibility, and able to command peace where their would-be masters shout war.

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

British nationality: *R. Applegarth*, carpenter<sup>b</sup>;  
*M. J. Boon*, engineer; *J. Buckley*, painter; *J. Hales*,  
elastic web-weaver; *Harriet Law*; *B. Lucraft*, chair-

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, "To Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America" (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 20).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> At its meeting on May 11, 1869 the General Council decided that all Council members signing the address should indicate their profession.—*Ed.*

maker; *J. Milner*, tailor; *G. Odger*, shoemaker; *J. Ross*, bootcloser; *B. Shaw*, painter; *Cowell Stepney*; *J. Warren*, trunk-maker; *J. Weston*, handrail-maker. French nationality: *E. Dupont*, instrument-maker; *Jules Johannard*, lithographer; *Paul Lafargue*. German nationality: *G. Eccarius*, tailor; *F. Les-sner*, tailor; *W. Limburg*, shoemaker; *Marx, Karl*. Swiss nationality: *H. Jung*, watchmaker; *A. Müller*, watchmaker. Belgian nationality: *M. Bernard*, painter. Danish nationality: *J. Cohn*, cigar-maker. Polish nationality: *Zabicki*, compositor.

*B. Lucraft*, Chairman  
*Cowell Stepney*, Treasurer  
*J. George Eccarius*, General Secretary

London, May 12th, 1869

Adopted by the General Council on May  
 11, 1869

Reproduced from the leaflet

First published as a leaflet, *Address to the  
 National Labour Union of the United States*,  
 London, 1869

Karl Marx

PREFACE  
 [TO THE SECOND EDITION  
 OF *THE EIGHTEENTH BRUMAIRE*  
 OF LOUIS BONAPARTE]<sup>78</sup>

My friend *Joseph Weydemeyer*,\* who died so early, intended to publish a political weekly in New York starting from January 1, 1852. He invited me to provide a history of the coup d'état for it. Down to the middle of February, I accordingly wrote him weekly articles under the title: *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. Meanwhile Weydemeyer's original plan had failed. Instead, in the spring of 1852 he began to publish a monthly, *Die Revolution*, the first issue of which consists of my *Eighteenth Brumaire*.<sup>79</sup> A few hundred copies of this found their way into Germany at that time, without, however, getting into the actual book trade. A German bookseller of extremely radical pretensions to whom I offered the sale of my book was most virtuously horrified at a "presumption" so "contrary to the times".<sup>80</sup>

It will be seen from the above that the present work was written under the immediate pressure of events and its historical material does not extend beyond the month of February (1852). Its republication now is due in part to the demand of the book trade, in part to the urgent requests of my friends in Germany.

Of the works on the same subject written at approximately the *same time* as mine, only two deserve notice: Victor Hugo's *Napoléon le petit* and Proudhon's *Coup d'état*.<sup>a</sup>

Victor Hugo confines himself to bitter and witty invective against the responsible publisher of the coup d'état. The event itself

---

\* Military commandant of the St. Louis district during the American Civil War.

<sup>a</sup> V. Hugo, *Napoléon le petit*, London, 1852; P. J. Proudhon, *La Révolution sociale démontrée par le coup d'état du 2 décembre*, Paris, 1852.—Ed.

appears in his work like a bolt from the blue. He sees in it only the violent act of a single individual. He does not notice that he makes this individual great instead of little by ascribing to him a personal power of initiative such as would be without parallel in world history. Proudhon, for his part, seeks to represent the coup d'état as the result of preceding historical development. Unnoticeably, however, his historical construction of the coup d'état becomes a historical apologia for its hero. Thus he falls into the error of our so-called *objective* historians. In contrast to this, I demonstrate how the *class struggle* in France created circumstances and relations that made it possible for a grotesque mediocrity to play a hero's part.

A revision of the present work would have robbed it of its specific colouring. Accordingly I have confined myself to mere correction of printer's errors and to striking out allusions now no longer intelligible.

The concluding words of my work<sup>a</sup>: "But when the imperial mantle finally falls on the shoulders of Louis Bonaparte, the bronze statue of Napoleon will crash from the top of the Vendôme Column<sup>81</sup>", have already been fulfilled.

Colonel Charras opened the attack on the Napoleon cult in his work on the campaign of 1815.<sup>b</sup> Subsequently, and particularly in the last few years, French literature made an end of the Napoleon legend with the weapons of historical research, of criticism, of satire and of wit. Outside France this violent breach with the traditional popular belief, this tremendous mental revolution, has been little noticed and still less understood.

Lastly, I hope that my work will contribute towards eliminating the school-taught phrase now current, particularly in Germany, of so-called *Caesarism*. In this superficial historical analogy the main point is forgotten, namely, that in ancient Rome the class struggle took place only within a privileged minority, between the free rich and the free poor, while the great productive mass of the population, the slaves, formed the purely passive pedestal for these combatants. People forget *Sismondi's* significant saying: The Roman proletariat lived at the expense of society, while modern society lives at the expense of the proletariat.<sup>c</sup> With so complete a difference between the material, economic conditions of the ancient

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 11, p. 197.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. B. A. Charras, *Histoire de la campagne de 1815. Waterloo*, Brussels, 1857.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> J. C. L. Simonde de Sismondi, *Études sur l'économie politique*, t. 1, Paris, 1837, p. 24.—*Ed.*



and the modern class struggles, the political figures produced by them can likewise have no more in common with one another than the Archbishop of Canterbury has with the High Priest Samuel.

*Karl Marx*

*London, June 23, 1869*

First published in the second edition of  
Marx's *Der Achtzehnte Brumaire des Louis  
Bonaparte*, Hamburg, July 1869

Printed according to the text of  
the 1869 edition

## Frederick Engels

KARL MARX<sup>82</sup>

It has become the habit in Germany to regard Ferdinand Lassalle as the founder of the German workers' movement. And yet nothing could be less correct. If six or seven years ago in all the manufacturing districts, in all the major towns, the centres of the working population, the proletariat flooded to see him in vast numbers, and his journeys were triumphal processions which the reigning princes might have envied—had the ground not been quietly fertilized beforehand for it to bear fruit so rapidly? If the workers acclaimed his teachings, was this because those teachings were new to them, or because they had long been more or less familiar to the thinkers amongst them?

Life moves quickly for today's generation and they are quick to forget. The movement of the forties, which culminated in the revolution of 1848 and ended with the reaction of 1849 to 1852, has already been forgotten together with its political and socialist literature. It is therefore necessary to recall that before and during the revolution of 1848 there existed amongst the workers, precisely in western Germany, a well-organised socialist party,<sup>83</sup> which broke up after the Cologne Communist trial,<sup>84</sup> it is true, but whose individual members continued quietly to prepare the ground of which Lassalle later took possession. One must further recall that there existed a man who, as well as organising that party, had devoted his life's work to the scientific study of what was called the social question, i. e. the critique of political economy, and even prior to 1860 had published some of the significant results of his researches.<sup>a</sup> Lassalle was a highly talented

<sup>a</sup> This refers to Marx's work *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*.—Ed.

and well-educated fellow, a man of great energy and almost boundless versatility; he was clearly cut out to play a part in politics whatever the circumstances. But he was neither the initial founder of the German workers' movement, nor was he an original thinker. Everything he wrote was derived from elsewhere, not without some misunderstandings either; he had a forerunner and an intellectual superior, whose existence he kept a secret, of course, whilst he vulgarised his writings, and the name of that intellectual superior is Karl Marx.<sup>85</sup>

*Karl Marx* was born on May 5, 1818 in Trier, where he received a classical education. He studied jurisprudence at Bonn and later in Berlin, where, however, his preoccupation with philosophy soon turned him away from law. In 1841, after spending five years in the "metropolis of intellectuals", he returned to Bonn intending to habilitate. At that time the first "New Era"<sup>86</sup> was in vogue in Prussia. Frederick William IV had declared his love of a loyal opposition, and attempts were being made in various quarters to organise one. Thus the *Rheinische Zeitung* was founded at Cologne; with unprecedented daring Marx used it to criticise the deliberations of the Rhine Province Assembly, in articles which attracted great attention.<sup>a</sup> At the end of 1842 he took over the editorship himself and was such a thorn in the side of the censors that they did him the honour of sending a censor<sup>b</sup> from Berlin especially to take care of the *Rheinische Zeitung*. When this proved of no avail either the paper was made to undergo dual censorship, since, in addition to the usual procedure, every issue was subjected to a second stage of censorship by the office of Cologne's Regierungspräsident.<sup>c</sup> But nor was this measure of any avail against the "obdurate malevolence" of the *Rheinische Zeitung*, and at the beginning of 1843 the ministry issued a decree declaring that the *Rheinische Zeitung* must cease publication at the end of the first quarter. Marx immediately resigned as the shareholders wanted to attempt a settlement, but this also came to nothing and the newspaper ceased publication.<sup>87</sup>

His criticism of the deliberations of the Rhine Province Assembly compelled Marx to study questions of material interest. In pursuing that he found himself confronted with points of view which neither jurisprudence nor philosophy had taken account of.<sup>88</sup> Proceeding from the Hegelian philosophy of law, Marx came

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, "Proceedings of the Sixth Rhine Province Assembly".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Wilhelm Saint-Paul.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Karl Heinrich von Gerlach.—*Ed.*

to the conclusion that it was not the state, which Hegel had described as the "top of the edifice", but "civil society", which Hegel had regarded with disdain, that was the sphere in which a key to the understanding of the process of the historical development of mankind should be looked for. However, the science of civil society is political economy, and *this* science could not be studied in Germany, it could only be studied thoroughly in England or France.

Therefore, in the summer of 1843, after marrying the daughter of Privy Councillor von Westphalen in Trier (sister of the von Westphalen who later became Prussian Minister of the Interior), Marx moved to Paris, where he devoted himself primarily to studying political economy and the history of the great French Revolution. At the same time he collaborated with Ruge in publishing the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, of which, however, only one issue was to appear. Expelled from France by Guizot in 1845, he went to Brussels and stayed there, pursuing the same studies, until the outbreak of the February revolution. Just how little he agreed with the commonly accepted version of socialism there, even in its most erudite-sounding form, was shown in his critique of Proudhon's major work *Philosophie de la misère*,<sup>a</sup> which appeared in 1847 in Brussels and Paris under the title of *The Poverty of Philosophy*. In that work can already be found many essential points of the theory which he has now presented in full detail. The *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, London, 1848, written before the February revolution and adopted by a workers' congress in London, is also substantially his work.<sup>b</sup>

Expelled once again, this time by the Belgian government under the influence of the panic caused by the February revolution, Marx returned to Paris at the invitation of the French provisional government. The tidal wave of the revolution pushed all scientific pursuits into the background; what mattered now was to become involved in the movement. After having worked during those first turbulent days against the absurd notions of the agitators, who wanted to organise German workers from France as volunteers to fight for a republic in Germany,<sup>89</sup> Marx went to Cologne with his friends and founded there the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, which appeared until June 1849 and which people on the Rhine still remember well today. The freedom of the press of 1848 was

<sup>a</sup> P. J. Proudhon, *Système des contradictions économiques, ou Philosophie de la misère*, t. 1-2, Paris, 1846.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Written by Marx and Engels, the *Manifesto* was adopted at the second congress of the Communist League (November 29-December 8, 1847).—*Ed.*

probably nowhere so successfully exploited as it was at that time, in the midst of a Prussian fortress, by that newspaper. After the government had tried in vain to silence the newspaper by persecuting it through the courts—Marx was twice brought before the assizes for an offence against the press laws and for inciting people to refuse to pay their taxes, and was acquitted on both occasions—it had to close at the time of the May revolts of 1849 when Marx was expelled on the pretext that he was no longer a Prussian subject, similar pretexts being used to expel the other editors. Marx had therefore to return to Paris, from where he was once again expelled and from where, in the summer of 1849,<sup>a</sup> he went to his present domicile in London.

In London at that time was assembled the entire *fine fleur*<sup>b</sup> of the refugees from all the nations of the continent. Revolutionary committees of every kind were formed, combinations, provisional governments *in partibus infidelium*,<sup>c</sup> there were quarrels and wrangles of every kind, and the gentlemen concerned no doubt now look back on that period as the most unsuccessful of their lives. Marx remained aloof from all of those intrigues. For a while he continued to produce his *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in the form of a monthly review (Hamburg, 1850), later he withdrew into the British Museum and worked through the immense and as yet for the most part unexamined library there for all that it contained on political economy. At the same time he was a regular contributor to the *New-York Tribune*, acting, until the outbreak of the American Civil War, so to speak, as the editor for European politics of this, the leading Anglo-American newspaper.

The coup d'état of December 2 induced him to write a pamphlet, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, New York, 1852, which is just now being reprinted (Meissner, Hamburg),<sup>d</sup> and will make no small contribution to an understanding of the untenable position into which that same Bonaparte has just got himself. The hero of the coup d'état is presented here as he really is, stripped of the glory with which his momentary success surrounded him. The philistine who considers his Napoleon III to be the greatest man of the century and is unable now to explain to

<sup>a</sup> About August 26, 1849.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Flower.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *In partibus infidelium*—literally: in parts inhabited by infidels. The words are added to the title of Roman Catholic bishops appointed to purely nominal dioceses in non-Christian countries. Here the words mean "in exile".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> K. Marx, *Der achtzehnte Brumaire des Louis Bonaparte*, 2 Ausg., Hamburg, 1869.—*Ed.*

himself how this miraculous genius suddenly comes to be making bloomer after bloomer and one political error after the other—that same philistine can consult the aforementioned work of Marx for his edification.

Although during his whole stay in London Marx chose not to thrust himself to the fore, he was forced by Karl Vogt, after the Italian campaign of 1859, to enter into a polemic, which was brought to an end with Marx's *Herr Vogt* (London, 1860). At about the same time his study of political economy bore its first fruit: *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Part One, Berlin, 1859. This instalment contains only the theory of money, presented from completely new aspects. The continuation was some time in coming, since the author discovered so much new material in the meantime that he considered it necessary to undertake further studies.

At last, in 1867, there appeared in Hamburg: *Capital. A Critique of Political Economy*, Volume I. This work contains the results of studies to which a whole life was devoted. It is the political economy of the working class, reduced to its scientific formulation. This work is concerned<sup>a</sup> not with rabble-rousing phrasemongering, but with strictly scientific deductions. Whatever one's attitude to socialism, one will at any rate have to acknowledge that in this work it is presented for the first time in a scientific manner, and that it was precisely Germany that accomplished this. Anyone still wishing to do battle with socialism, will have to deal with Marx, and if he succeeds in that then he really does not need to mention the *dei minorum gentium*.<sup>b</sup>

But there is another point of view from which Marx's book is of interest. It is the first work in which the actual relations existing between capital and labour, in their classical form such as they have reached in England, are described in their entirety and in a clear and graphic fashion. The parliamentary inquiries provided ample material for this, spanning a period of almost forty years and practically unknown even in England, material dealing with the conditions of the workers in almost every branch of industry, women's and children's work, night work, etc.<sup>90</sup>; all this is here made available for the first time. Then there is the history of factory legislation in England which, from its modest beginnings with the first acts of 1802,<sup>91</sup> has now reached the point of limiting working hours in nearly all manufacturing or cottage industries to

<sup>a</sup> Added in the manuscript: "not with political propaganda".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Gods of lesser stock; approximate meaning: celebrities of lesser stature.—*Ed.*

60 hours per week for women and young people under the age of 18, and to 39 hours per week for children under 13.<sup>92</sup> From this point of view the book is of the greatest interest for every industrialist.

For many years Marx has been the “best-maligned” of the German writers, and no one will deny that he was unflinching in his retaliation and that all the blows he aimed struck home with a vengeance. But polemics, which he “dealt in” so much, was basically only a means of self-defence for him. In the final analysis his real interest lay with his science, which he has studied and reflected on for twenty-five years with unrivalled conscientiousness, a conscientiousness which has prevented him from presenting his findings to the public in a systematic form until they satisfied him as to their form and content, until he was convinced that he had left no book unread, no objection unconsidered, and that he had examined every point from all its aspects. Original thinkers are very rare in this age of epigones; if, however, a man is not only an original thinker but also disposes over learning unequalled in his subject, then he deserves to be doubly acknowledged.

As one would expect, in addition to his studies Marx is busy with the workers’ movement; he is one of the founders of the International Working Men’s Association, which has been the centre of so much attention recently and has already shown in more than one place in Europe that it is a force to be reckoned with. We believe that we are not mistaken in saying that in this, at least as far as the workers’ movement is concerned, epoch-making organisation the German element—thanks precisely to Marx—holds the influential position which is its due.

Written on about July 28, 1869

First published in *Die Zukunft*, No. 185,  
August 11, 1869

Printed according to the newspaper, checked against the manuscript

Published in English for the first time

## Karl Marx

REPORT OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
ON THE RIGHT OF INHERITANCE<sup>93</sup>

1. The right of inheritance is only of social import, in so far as it leaves to the heir the power which the deceased wielded *during his lifetime*, viz., *the power of transferring to himself*, by means of his property, the *produce of other people's labour*. For instance, land gives the living proprietor the power to transfer to himself, under the name of rent, without any equivalent, the produce of other people's labour. Capital gives him the power to do the same under the name of profit and interest. The property in public funds gives him the power to live without labour upon other people's labour, &c.

*Inheritance* does not *create* that power of transferring the produce of one man's labour into another man's pocket—it only relates to the change in the individuals who yield that power. Like all other civil legislation, the laws of inheritance are not the *cause*, but the *effect*, the *juridical consequence* of the *existing economical organisation of society*, based upon private property in the means of production, that is to say, in land, raw material, machinery, &c. In the same way the right of inheritance in the slave is not the cause of slavery, but, on the contrary, slavery is the cause of inheritance in slaves.

2. What we have to grapple with, is the cause and not the effect, the economical basis—not its juridical superstructure. Suppose the means of production transformed from private into social prosperity, then the right of inheritance—(so far as it is of any social importance)—would die of itself, because a man only leaves after his death what he possessed during his lifetime. Our great aim must, therefore, be to supersede those institutions which give to some people, *during their lifetime*, the economical power of



transferring to themselves the fruits of the labour of the many. Where the state of society is far enough advanced, and the working class possesses sufficient power to abrogate such institutions, they must do so in a *direct way*. For instance, by doing away with the public debt, they get of course, at the same time, rid of the inheritance in public funds. On the other hand, if they do not possess the power to abolish the public debt, it would be a foolish attempt to abolish the right of inheritance in public funds.

*The disappearance of the right of inheritance* will be the natural result of a social change superseding private property in the means of production; but the *abolition of the right of inheritance* can never be the *starting-point* of such a social transformation.

3. It was one of the great errors committed about 40 years since by the disciples of St. Simon, to treat the *right of inheritance*, not as the *legal effect*, but as the economical cause of the present social organisation.<sup>94</sup> This did not at all prevent them from perpetuating in their system of society private property in land, and the other means of production. Of course elective and life-long proprietors, they thought, might exist as elective kings have existed.

To proclaim the abolition of the *right of inheritance* as the *starting-point* of the social revolution, would only tend to lead the working class away from the true point of attack against present society. It would be as absurd a thing as to abolish the laws of contract between buyer and seller, while continuing the present state of exchange of commodities.

It would be a thing false in theory, and reactionary in practice.

4. In treating of the laws of inheritance, we necessarily suppose that *private property* in the means of production continues to exist. If it did no longer exist amongst the living, it could not be transferred from them, and by them, after their death. All measures, in regard to the right of inheritance, can therefore only *relate* to a state of *social transition*, where, on the one hand, the present economical base of society is not yet transformed, but where, on the other hand, the working masses have gathered strength enough to *enforce transitory measures* calculated to bring about an ultimate radical change of society.

Considered from this standpoint, changes of the laws of inheritance form only part of a *great many other transitory measures* tending to the same end.

These transitory measures, as to inheritance, can only be:

(a) Extension of the inheritance duties already existing in many states, and the application of the funds hence derived to purposes of social emancipation.

(b) Limitation of the testamentary right of inheritance, which— as distinguished from the *intestate* or *family right of inheritance*— appears an arbitrary and superstitious exaggeration even of the principles of private property themselves.

Written on August 2-3, 1869

Reproduced from the pamphlet

Adopted by the General  
Council on August 3, 1869

First published in the pamphlet *Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association, held at Basle, in Switzerland, London [1869]*

Karl Marx

REPORT OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
TO THE FOURTH ANNUAL CONGRESS  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION<sup>95</sup>

Citizens,<sup>a</sup>

The delegates of the different sections will give you detailed reports on the progress of our Association in their respective countries. The report of your General Council will mainly relate to the guerilla fights between capital and labour—we mean the strikes which during the last year have perturbed the continent of Europe, and were said to have sprung neither from the misery of the labourer nor from the despotism of the capitalist, but from the secret intrigues of our Association.

A few weeks after the meeting of our last Congress, a memorable strike on the part of the ribbon-weavers and silk-dyers occurred in Basle, a place which to our days has conserved much of the features of a mediaeval town with its local traditions, its narrow prejudices, its purse-proud patricians, and its patriarchal rule of the employer over the employed. Still, a few years ago a Basle manufacturer boasted to an English secretary of embassy, that

“the position of the master and the man was on a better footing here than in England”, that “in Switzerland the operative who leaves a good master for better wages would be *despised* by his own *fellow-workmen*”, and that “our advantage lies principally in the length of the working time and the moderation of the wages”.

You see, *patriarchalism*, as modified by modern influences, comes to this—that the master is good, and that his wages are bad, that the labourer feels like a mediaeval vassal, and is exploited like a modern wages-slave.

---

<sup>a</sup> The word “Citizens” is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

That patriarchalism may further be appreciated from an official Swiss inquiry into the factory employment of children and the state of the primary public schools. It was ascertained that

“the Basle school atmosphere is the worst in the world, that while in the free air carbonic acid forms only 4 parts of 10,000, and in closed rooms should not exceed 10 parts, it rose in Basle common schools to 20-81 parts in the forenoon, and to 53-94 in the afternoon”.<sup>a</sup>

Thereupon a member of the Basle Great Council, Mr. Thurneysen, coolly replied,

“Don't allow yourselves to be frightened. The parents have passed through schoolrooms as bad as the present ones, and yet they have escaped with their skins safe”.<sup>b</sup>

It will now be understood that an economical revolt on the part of the Basle workmen could not but mark an epoch in the social history of Switzerland. Nothing more characteristic than the starting-point of the movement. There existed an old custom for the ribbon-weavers to have a few hours' holiday on Michaelmas.<sup>c</sup> The weavers claiming this small privilege at the usual time in the factory of Messrs. Dubary and Sons, one of the masters declared, in a harsh voice and with imperious gesticulation,

“Whoever leaves the factory will be dismissed at once and for ever”.<sup>d</sup>

Finding their protestations in vain, 104 out of 172 weavers left the workshop without, however, believing in their definite dismissal, since master and men were bound by written contract to give a fourteen days' notice to quit. On their return the next morning they found the factory surrounded by gendarmes, keeping off the yesterday's rebels, with whom all their comrades now made common cause.<sup>e</sup> Being thus suddenly thrown out of work, the weavers with their families were simultaneously ejected

---

<sup>a</sup> See Report of the commission inquiring into the state of public schools in Switzerland. Quoted from J. Ph. Becker, *Die Internationale Arbeiter-Association und die Arbeiterbewegung in Basel im Winter 1868 auf 1869*, Genf, 1869, S. 34.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> In the German pamphlet this sentence reads: “According to an old custom the workers in Basle take a quarter of a day off on the last day of the Autumn Fair.” The next sentence begins as follows: “When, on November 9, 1868 the weavers claimed...”.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See “Bericht über die Arbeiterbewegung in Basel”, *Der Vorbote*, No. 12, December 1868, p. 177.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Instead of “with whom all their comrades now made common cause” the German pamphlet has two separate sentences: “Even the weavers who had not taken a quarter of a day off did not want to go in either. The general slogan was: ‘All or none’”.—*Ed.*

from the cottages they rented from their employers, who, into the bargain, sent circular letters round to the shopkeepers<sup>a</sup> to debar the houseless ones from all credit for victuals.<sup>b</sup> The struggle thus begun lasted from the 9th of November, 1868, to the spring of 1869. The limits of our report do not allow us to enter upon its details. It suffices to state that it originated in a capricious and spiteful act of capitalist despotism, in a cruel lock-out, which led to strikes, from time to time interrupted by compromises, again and again broken on the part of the masters, and that it culminated in the vain attempt of the Basle "High and Honourable State Council" to intimidate the working people by military measures and a quasi state of siege.

During their sedition the workmen were supported by the International Working Men's Association. But that was not all.<sup>c</sup> That society the masters said had first smuggled the modern spirit of rebellion into the good old<sup>d</sup> town of Basle. To again expel that mischievous intruder from Basle became, therefore, their great preoccupation. Hard they tried, though in vain, to enforce the withdrawal from it as a condition of peace, upon their subjects. Getting generally worsted in their war with the International they vented their spleen in strange pranks. Owing some industrial branch establishments at Lörrach, in Baden,<sup>e</sup> these republicans induced the grand-ducal official<sup>f</sup> to suppress the International section at that place, a measure which, however, was soon after rescinded by the Baden Government. The Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*, a paper of world-wide circulation, presuming to report on the Basle events in an impartial spirit, the angry worthies threatened it in foolish letters with the withdrawal of their subscriptions.<sup>g</sup> To London they expressly sent a messenger on the fantastic errand of ascertaining the dimensions of the International general "treasury-box". Orthodox Christians as they are, if they had lived at the time of nascent Christianity, they would, above all things, have spied into St. Paul's banking accounts at Rome.

Their clumsily savage proceedings brought down upon them some ironical lessons of worldly wisdom on the part of the Geneva

<sup>a</sup> The German pamphlet has "butchers, bakers, grocers".— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. Ph. Becker, op. cit., p. 5.— *Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> This sentence is omitted in the German pamphlet.— *Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In the German pamphlet the word "Imperial" has been added.— *Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The German pamphlet has "at Lörrach, a Baden border village situated near Basle".— *Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> The German has "local magistrate".— *Ed.*

<sup>g</sup> *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Nos. 9 and 13, January 9 and 13, 1869.— *Ed.*

capitalist organs.<sup>a</sup> Yet, a few months later, the uncouth Basle vestrymen might have returned the compliment with usurious interest to the Geneva men of the world.

In the month of March there broke out in Geneva a buildings' trade strike, and a compositors' strike, both bodies being affiliated to the International. The builders' strike was provoked by the masters setting aside a convention solemnly entered upon with their workmen a year ago. The compositors' strike was but the winding-up of a ten years' quarrel which the men had during all that time in vain tried to settle by five consecutive commissions. As in Basle, the masters transformed at once their private feuds with their men into a state crusade against the International Working Men's Association.<sup>b</sup>

The Geneva State Council dispatched policemen to receive at the railway stations, and sequester from all contact with the strikers, such foreign workmen as the masters might contrive to inveigle from abroad. It allowed the "Jeunesse Dorée", the hopeful loafers of "La Jeune Suisse",<sup>c</sup> armed with revolvers, to assault, in the streets and places of public resort, workmen and workwomen. It launched its own police ruffians on the working people on different occasions, and signally on the 24th May, when it enacted at Geneva, on a small scale, the Paris scenes which Raspail has branded as "Les orgies infernales des casse-têtes".<sup>97</sup> When the Geneva workmen passed in public meeting an address to the State Council, calling upon it to inquire into these infernal police orgies,<sup>d</sup> the State Council replied by a sneering rebuke.<sup>e</sup> It evidently wanted, at the behest of its capitalist superiors,<sup>f</sup> to madden the Geneva people into an *émeute*, to stamp that *émeute* out by the armed force, to sweep the International from the Swiss soil, and to subject the workmen to a Decembrist regime. This scheme was baffled by the energetic action and moderating influence of our Geneva Federal Committee.<sup>98</sup> The masters had at last to give way.

<sup>a</sup> The German pamphlet has "the Geneva capitalists".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See *L'Égalité*, Nos. 10, 11 and 13, March 27, April 3 and 17, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The words "the hopeful loafers of 'La Jeune Suisse'" are omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> "Adresse au Conseil d'État de la République de Genève. Genève, le 31 mai 1869", *L'Égalité*, No. 20, June 5, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> E. Morhardt, "Genève, le 2 mai (lisez juin) 1869. Le Chancelier de la République et Canton de Genève", *L'Égalité*, No. 20, June 5, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> The words "at the behest of its capitalist superiors" are omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

And now listen to some of the invectives of the Geneva capitalists and their press-gang against the International. In public meeting they passed an address to the State Council, where the following phrase occurs:

"The International Committee at Geneva ruins the Canton of Geneva by decrees sent from London and Paris; it wants here to suppress all industry and all labour."<sup>a</sup>

One of their journals stated

"That the leaders of the International were secret agents of the Emperor,<sup>b</sup> who, at the opportune moment, were very likely to turn out public accusers against this little Switzerland of ours".<sup>c</sup>

And this on the part of the men who had just shown themselves so eager to transplant at a moment's notice the Decembrist regime to the Swiss soil, on the part of financial magnates, the real rulers of Geneva and other Swiss towns, whom all Europe knows to have long since been converted from citizens of the Swiss republic into mere feudatories of the French *Crédit Mobilier*<sup>99</sup> and other international swindling associations.

The massacres by which the Belgian Government did answer in April last to the strikes of the puddlers at Seraing and the coal-miners of Borinage, have been fully exposed in the address of the General Council to the workmen of Europe and the United States.<sup>d</sup> We considered this address the more urgent since, with that constitutional model government, such working men's massacres are not an accident, but an institution. The horrid military drama was succeeded by a judicial farce. In the proceedings against our Belgian General Committee at Brussels, whose domiciles were brutally broken in by the police, and many of whose members were placed under secret arrest, the judge of instruction finds the letter of a workman, asking for 500 "*Internationales*", and he at once jumps to the conclusion that 500 fighting-men were to be dispatched to the scene of action. The 500 "*Internationales*" were 500 copies of the *Internationale*, the weekly organ of our Brussels Committee.

A telegram to Paris by a member of the International, ordering a certain quantity of powder, is raked up.<sup>e</sup> After a prolonged research, the dangerous substance is really laid hand on at

<sup>a</sup> *L'Égalité*, No. 11, April 3, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German pamphlet has "Emperor Napoleon".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *L'Égalité*, No. 13, April 17, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See this volume, pp. 47-52.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The German pamphlet has the verb *stiebert* coined from *Stieber* (sleuth, detective)—an allusion to the Chief of the Prussian police Stieber.—*Ed.*

Brussels. It is powder for killing vermin. Last, not least, the Belgian police flattered itself, in one of its domiciliary visits, to have got at that phantom treasure which haunts the great mind of the continental capitalist, viz.: the International treasure, the main stock of which is safely hoarded at London, but whose offsets travel continually to all the continental seats of the Association. The Belgian official inquirer thought it buried in a certain strong box, hidden in a dark place. He gets at it, opens it forcibly, and there was found—some pieces of coal. Perhaps, if touched by the hand of the police, the pure International gold turns at once into coal.

Of the strikes that, in December, 1868, infested several French cotton districts, the most important was that at Sotteville-lès-Rouen. The manufacturers of the Department de la Somme had not long ago met at Amiens, in order to consult how they might undersell<sup>a</sup> the English manufacturers in the English market itself. Having made sure that, besides protective duties, the comparative lowness of French wages had till now mainly enabled them to defend France from English cottons, they naturally inferred that a still further lowering of French wages would allow them to invade England with French cottons. The French cotton-workers, they did not doubt, would feel proud at the idea of defraying the expenses of a war of conquest which their masters had so patriotically resolved to wage on the other side of the Channel. Soon after it was bruited about that the cotton manufacturers of Rouen and its environs had, in secret conclave, agreed upon the same line of policy. Then an important reduction of wages was suddenly proclaimed at Sotteville-lès-Rouen, and then for the first time the Normand weavers rose against the encroachments of capital. They acted under the stir of the moment. Neither had they before formed a trades union nor provided for any means of resistance. In their distress they appealed to the International committee at Rouen, which found for them some immediate aid from the workmen of Rouen, the neighbouring districts, and Paris. Towards the end of December, 1868, the General Council was applied to by the Rouen Committee, at a moment of utmost distress throughout the English cotton districts, of unparalleled misery in London, and a general depression in all branches of British<sup>b</sup> industry. This state of things has continued in England to this moment. Despite such

---

<sup>a</sup> In the German text this word is given in brackets after the German verb *unterkaufen*.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "British" is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*



highly unfavourable circumstances, the General Council thought that the peculiar character of the Rouen conflict would stir the English workmen to action. This was a great opportunity to show the capitalists that their international industrial warfare, carried on by screwing wages down now in this country, now in that, would be checked at last by the international union of the working classes. To our appeal the English workmen replied at once by a first contribution to Rouen, and the London Trades Council resolved to summon, in unison with the General Council, a metropolitan monster meeting on behalf of their Normand brethren.<sup>100</sup> These proceedings were stopped by the news of the sudden cessation of the Sotteville strike. The miscarriage of that economical revolt was largely compensated for by its moral results. It enlisted the Normand cotton-workers into the revolutionary army of labour, it gave rise to the birth of trades unions at Rouen, Elboeuf, Darnétal, and the environs; and it sealed anew the bond of fraternity between the English and French working classes.

During the winter and spring of 1869 the propaganda of our Association in France was paralysed, consequent upon the violent dissolution of our Paris section in 1868,<sup>101</sup> the police chicaneries in the departments, and the absorbing interest of the French general elections.

The elections once over, numerous strikes exploded in the Loire mining districts, at Lyons, and many other places. The economical facts revealed during these struggles between masters and men, struck the public eye like so many dissolving views of the high-coloured fancy pictures of working-class prosperity under the auspices of the Second Empire. The claims of redress on the part of the workmen were of so moderate a character, and so urgent a nature that, after some show of angry resistance, they had to be conceded, one and all. The only strange feature about those strikes was their sudden explosion after a seeming lull, and the rapid succession in which they followed each other. Still, the reason of all this was simple and palpable. Having, during the elections, successfully tried their hands against their public despot, the workmen were naturally led to try them after the elections against their private despots. In one word, the elections had stirred their animal spirits. The governmental press, of course, paid as it is to misstate and misinterpret unpleasant facts, traced these events to a secret *mot d'ordre* from the London General Council, which, they said, sent their emissaries, from place to place, to teach the otherwise highly satisfied French workmen that it was a bad thing to be overworked, underpaid, and brutally

treated. A French police organ, published at London, the "*International*"—(see its number of August 3)—has condescended to reveal to the world the secret motives of our deleterious activity.

"The strangest feature," it says, "is that the strikes were ordered to break out in such countries where misery is far from making itself felt. These unexpected explosions, occurring so opportunely for certain neighbours of ours, who had first to apprehend war, make many people ask themselves whether these strikes took place on the request of some foreign Machiavelli, who had known how to win the good graces of this all-powerful Association."<sup>a</sup>

At the very moment when this French police print impeached us of embarrassing the French Government by strikes at home, in order to disembarrass Count Bismarck from war abroad, a Prussian paper<sup>b</sup> accused us of embarrassing the Northern German Bund<sup>102</sup> with strikes, in order to crush German industry for the benefit of foreign manufactures.

The relations of the International to the French strikes we shall illustrate by two cases of a typical character. In the one case, the strike of St. Étienne and the following massacre at Ricamarie, the French Government itself will no longer dare to pretend that the International had anything whatever to do with it. In the Lyons case, it was not the International that threw the workmen into strikes, but, on the contrary, it was the strikes that threw the workmen into the International.

The miners of St. Étienne, Rive-de-Giers, and Firminy had calmly, but firmly, requested the managers of the mining companies to reduce the working day, numbering 12 hours hard underground labour, and revise the wages tariff. Failing in their attempt at a conciliatory settlement, they struck on the 11th of June. For them it was of course a vital question to secure the co-operation of the miners that had not yet turned out to combine with them.<sup>c</sup> To prevent this, the managers of the mining companies requested and got from the Prefect of the Loire a forest of bayonets. On the 12th of June, the strikers found the coal pits under strong military guard. To make sure of the zeal of the soldiers thus lent to them by the government, the mining companies paid each soldier a franc daily. The soldiers paid the companies back by catching, on the 16th June,<sup>d</sup> about 60 miners eager to get at a conversation with their brethren in the coal pits. These prisoners were in the afternoon of the same day escorted to

<sup>a</sup> "La Dictature universelle", *L'International*, No. 2345, August 3, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German pamphlet has "a paper of Rhenish-Prussian manufacturers".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The German pamphlet has "the miners who continued to work".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The date is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

St. Étienne by a detachment (150 men), of the fourth regiment of the line. Before these stout warriors set out, an engineer of the Dorian mines distributed them 60 bottles of brandy, telling them at the same time, they ought to have a sharp eye on their prisoners' gang, these miners being savages, barbarians, ticket-of-leave men. What with the brandy, and what with the sermon, a bloody collision was thus prepared for. Followed on their march by a crowd of miners, with their wives and children, surrounded by them on a narrow defile on the heights of the Moncel, Quartier Ricamarie, requested to surrender the prisoners, and, on their refusal, attacked by a volley of stones, the soldiers, without any preliminary warning, fired with their *chassepots*<sup>a</sup> pell-mell into the crowd, killing 15 persons, amongst whom were two women and an infant, and dangerously wounding a considerable number. The tortures of the wounded were horrible. One of the sufferers was a poor girl of 12 years, Jenny Petit, whose name will live immortal in the annals of the working-class martyrology. Struck by two balls from behind, one of which lodged in her leg, while the other passed through her back, broke her arm, and escaped through her right shoulder. "Les chassepots avaient encore fait merveille."<sup>103</sup>

This time, however, the government was not long in finding out that it had committed not only a crime, but a blunder. It was not hailed as the saviour of society by the middle class. The whole municipal council of St. Étienne tendered its resignation in a document, denouncing the scoundrelism of the troops, and insisting upon their removal from the town.<sup>b</sup> The French press rung with cries of horror! Even such conservative prints as the *Moniteur universel* opened subscriptions for the victims.<sup>c</sup> The government *had* to remove the odious regiment from St. Étienne.

Under such difficult circumstances, it was a luminous idea to sacrifice on the altar of public indignation a scapegoat always at hand,<sup>d</sup> the International Working Men's Association. At the judicial trial of the so-called rioters, the act of accusation divided them into 10 categories, very ingeniously shading their respective darkness of guilt. The first class, the most deeply tinged, consisted of workmen<sup>e</sup> more particularly suspected to have obeyed some secret *mot d'ordre* from abroad, given out by the International. The

<sup>a</sup> The words "with their *chassepots*" are omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "Massacres de Saint-Étienne", *La Liberté*, No. 105, June 27, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 172, June 21, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The words "always at hand" are omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The German pamphlet has "5 workmen".—*Ed.*

evidence was, of course, overwhelming, as the following short extract from a French paper will show:

"The interrogatory of the witnesses did not allow '*neatly*' to establish the participation of the International Association. The witnesses affirm *only* the presence, at the head of the bands, of some *unknown* people, wearing white frocks and caps. *None of the unknown ones have been arrested, or appear in the dock.* To the question: do you *believe* in the intervention of the International Association? a witness replies: I *believe* it but *without any proofs whatever!*"<sup>a</sup>

Shortly after the Ricamarie massacres, the dance of economical revolts was opened at Lyons by the silk-winders, most of them females. In their distress they appealed to the International,<sup>b</sup> which, mainly by its members in France and Switzerland, helped them to carry the day. Despite all attempts at police intimidation, they publicly proclaimed their adhesion to our Society,<sup>c</sup> and entered it formally by paying the statutory contributions to the General Council. At Lyons, as before at Rouen, the female workers played a noble and prominent part in the movement. Other Lyons trades have since followed in the track of the silk-winders. Some 10,000 new members were thus gained for us in a few weeks amongst that heroic population which more than thirty years ago inscribed upon its banner the watchword of the modern Proletariat: "Vivre en travaillant ou mourir en combatant!"<sup>d 104</sup>

Meanwhile the French Government continues its petty tribulations against the International. At Marseilles our members were forbidden meeting for the election of a delegate to Basle. The same paltry trick was played in other towns. But the workmen on the Continent, as elsewhere, begin at last to understand that the surest way to get one's natural rights is to exercise them at one's personal risk.

The Austrian workmen, and especially those of Vienna, although entering their class<sup>e</sup> movement only after the events of 1866,<sup>105</sup> have at once occupied a vantage-ground. They marched at once under the banners of socialism and the International,

---

<sup>a</sup> "L'Internationalomanie", *L'Internationale*, No. 33, August 29, 1869 (italics by Marx in the quotation).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> A. Richard, "Aux membres du Conseil général des sections belges. 6 juillet 1869", *L'Internationale*, No. 26, July 11, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> "Déclaration au Conseil général de Londres. Lyon, 6 juillet 1869", *L'Internationale*, No. 26, July 11, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> "Live working or die fighting." In the German pamphlet the French sentence is followed by the German translation of it in brackets.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The word "class" is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

which, by their delegates at the recent Eisenach Congress,<sup>106</sup> they have now joined *en masse*.

If anywhere, the liberal middle class has exhibited in Austria its selfish instincts, its mental inferiority, and its petty spite against the working class. Their ministry, seeing the empire distracted and threatened by an internecine struggle of races and nationalities, pounces upon the workmen who alone proclaim the fraternity of all races and nationalities. The middle class itself, which has won its new position not by any heroism of its own, but only by the signal disaster of the Austrian army,<sup>107</sup> hardly able as it is, and knows itself to be, to defend its new conquests from the attacks of the dynasty, the aristocracy, and the clerical party, nevertheless wastes its best energies in the mean attempt to debar the working class from the rights of combination, public meeting, free press and free thought. In Austria, as in all other states of continental Europe, the International has supplanted the *ci-devant spectre rouge*.<sup>a</sup> When, on the 13th of July, a workmen's massacre on a small scale was enacted at Brünn, the cottonopolis of Moravia, the event was traced to the secret instigations of the International, whose agents, however, were unfortunately invested with the rare gift of rendering themselves invisible.<sup>b</sup> When some leaders of the Vienna work-people figured before the judicial bench, the public accuser stigmatised them as tools of the foreigner. Only, to show how conscientiously he had studied the matter, he committed the little error of confounding the middle-class League of Peace and Liberty<sup>108</sup> with the working men's International Association.<sup>109</sup>

If the workmen's movement was thus harassed in Cis-Leithanian Austria,<sup>110</sup> it has been recklessly prosecuted in Hungary. On this point the most reliable reports from Pest and Pressburg have reached the General Council. One example of the treatment of the Hungarian workmen by the public authorities may suffice. Herr von Wenckheim, the Hungarian Home Minister, was just staying at Vienna on public business.<sup>c</sup> Having for months been interdicted from public meetings and even from entertainments destined for the collection of the funds of a sick club, the Pressburg workmen sent at last delegates to Vienna,<sup>d</sup> then and there to lay their

---

<sup>a</sup> Old red spectre (see A. Romieu, *Le spectre rouge de 1852*, Bruxelles, 1851).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German pamphlet has: "whose agents were in possession of magic caps".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The German pamphlet has "with the Hungarian delegation".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In the German pamphlet the following words have been added: "among whom was the well-known agitator Niemtzik".—*Ed.*

grievances before the illustrious Herr von Wenckheim.<sup>a</sup> Puffing and blowing his cigar, the illustrious one received them with the bullying apostrophe,<sup>b</sup> “Are you workmen? Do you work hard?” For nothing else you have to care. You do not want public clubs; and if you dabble in politics, we shall know what measures to take against you. I shall do nothing for you. Let the workmen grumble to their heart’s content!” To the question of the workmen, whether the good pleasure of the police was still to rule uppermost, the liberal<sup>d</sup> minister replied: “Yes, under my responsibility.” After a somewhat prolonged but useless explanation the workmen left the minister telling him, “Since state matters influence the workmen’s condition, the workmen must occupy themselves with politics, and they will certainly do so.”<sup>c</sup>

In Prussia and the rest of Germany, the past year was distinguished by the formation of trades unions all over the country. At the recent Eisenach Congress the delegates of 150,000<sup>f</sup> German workmen, from Germany proper, Austria, and Switzerland, have organised a new democratic social party, with a programme literally embodying the leading principles of our Statutes.<sup>g</sup> Debarred by law from forming sections of our Association, they have, nevertheless, formally entered it by resolving<sup>h</sup> to take individual cards of membership from the General Council. At its congress at Barmen,<sup>111</sup> the Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterverein has also reaffirmed its adhesion to the principles of our Association, but simultaneously declared the Prussian law forbade them joining us.<sup>i</sup>

New branches of our Association have sprung up at Naples, in Spain, and in Holland.

<sup>a</sup> The German pamphlet has “before the Home Minister”.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Instead of “Puffing and blowing his cigar ... with the bullying apostrophe” the German pamphlet has: “It was hard to receive audience from this high gentleman, and when the ministerial room at last opened, the workers were met by the minister in a manner which was quite disrespectful.”—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> In the German pamphlet the following words have been added: “asked the minister puffing his cigar and twisting it in his mouth”.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The word “liberal” is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> See *Volksstimme*, No. 9, August 8, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> The German pamphlet has “more than 150,000”.—*Ed.*

<sup>g</sup> “Programm und Statuten der social-demokratischen Arbeiter-Partei”, *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 33, August 14, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>h</sup> The German pamphlet has “they resolved”.—*Ed.*

<sup>i</sup> This sentence is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

At Barcelona a Spanish, and at Amsterdam a Dutch organ of our Association is now being issued.<sup>a</sup>

The laurels plucked by the Belgian Government on the glorious battlefields of Seraing and Frameries seem really to have roused the angry jealousy of the Great Powers. No wonder, then, that *England* also had this year to boast a workman's massacre of its own. The Welsh coal-miners, at Leeswood Great Pit, near Mold, in Denbighshire, had received sudden notice of a reduction of wages by the manager of those works, whom, long since, they had reason to consider a most incorrigible petty oppressor. Consequently, they collected aid from the neighbouring collieries, and, besides assaulting him, attacked his house, and carried all his furniture to the railway station, these wretched men fancying in their childish ignorance thus to get rid of him for good and all. Proceedings were of course taken against the rioters; but one of them was rescued by a mob of 1,000 men, and conveyed out of the town.<sup>b</sup> On the 28th May, two of the ringleaders were to be taken before the magistrates of Mold by policemen under the escort of a detachment of the 4th Regiment of the line, "The King's Own". A crowd of miners, trying to rescue the prisoners, and, on the resistance of the police and the soldiers, showering stones at them, the soldiers—without any previous warning—returned the shower of stones by a shower of bullets from their breechloaders (Snider fusils).<sup>c</sup> Five persons, two of them females,<sup>d</sup> were killed, and a great many wounded. So far there is much analogy between the Mold and the Ricamarie massacres, but here it ceases. In France, the soldiers were only responsible to their commander. In England, they had to pass through a coroner's jury inquest; but this coroner was a deaf and daft of fool, who had to receive the witnesses' evidence through an ear trumpet, and the Welsh jury, who backed him, were a narrowly prejudiced class jury. They declared the massacre "Justifiable Homicide".<sup>e</sup>

In France, the rioters were sentenced from 3 to 18 months' imprisonment, and soon after, amnestied. In England, they were condemned to 10 years' penal servitude! In France, the whole press resounded with cries of indignation against the troops. In England, the press was all smiles for the soldiers, and all frowns for their victims! Still the English workmen have gained much by

<sup>a</sup> *La Federacion and De Werkman*.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> This sentence is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The words in brackets are omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The German pamphlet has "and a child".—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> See "Riot at Mold", *The Bee-Hive*, No. 400, June 12, 1869.—*Ed.*

losing a great and dangerous illusion. Till now they fancied to have their lives protected by the formality of the Riot Act,<sup>112</sup> and the subordination of the military to the civil authorities. They know now, from the official declaration of Mr. Bruce, the liberal Home Minister, in the House of Commons—firstly, that without going through the premonitory process of reading the Riot Act, any country magistrate, some fox-hunter or parson, has the right to order the troops to fire on what he may please to consider a riotous mob; and, secondly, that the soldier may give fire on his own hook, on the plea of self-defence.<sup>a</sup> The liberal Minister forgot to add that, under these circumstances, every man ought to be armed, at public expense, with a breachloader, in self-defence against the soldier.

The following resolution was passed at the recent General Congress of the English Trades Unions at Birmingham:

“That as local organisations of labour have almost disappeared before organisations of a national character, so we believe the extension of the principle of free trade, which induces between nations such a competition that the interest of the workman is liable to be lost sight of and sacrificed in the fierce international race between capitalists, demands that such organisations should be still further extended and made international. And as the International Working Men’s Association endeavours to consolidate and extend the interests of the toiling masses, which are everywhere identical, this Congress heartily recommends that Association to the support of the working men of the United Kingdom, especially of all organised bodies, and strongly urges them to become affiliated to that body, believing that the realisation of its principles would also conclude to lasting peace between the nations of the earth.”<sup>113</sup>

During last May, a war between the United States and England seemed imminent. Your General Council, therefore, sent an address to Mr. Sylvis, the President of the American National Labour Union,<sup>114</sup> calling on the United States’ working class to command peace where their would-be masters shouted war.<sup>b</sup>

The sudden death of Mr. Sylvis, that valiant champion of our cause, will justify us in concluding this report, as an homage to his memory, by his reply to our letter<sup>c</sup>:

“Your favour of the 12th instant, with address enclosed, reached me yesterday. I am very happy to receive such kindly words from our fellow-working men across the water: our cause is a common one. It is war between poverty and wealth: labour occupies the same low condition, and capital is the same tyrant in all parts

<sup>a</sup> Marx refers to Bruce’s speech in the House of Commons on June 7, 1869, published in *The Times*, No. 26442, June 8, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 53-55.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> In the German pamphlet the reply is datelined: “Philadelphia, May 26, 1869”.—*Ed.*



of the world. Therefore I say our cause is a common one. I, in behalf of the working people of the United States, extend to you, and through you to those you represent, and to all the downtrodden and oppressed sons and daughters of toil in Europe, the right hand of fellowship. Go ahead in the good work you have undertaken, until the most glorious success crowns your efforts. That is our determination. Our late war resulted in the building up of the most infamous monied aristocracy on the face of the earth. This monied power is fast eating up the substance of the people. We have made war upon it, and we mean to win. If we can, we will win through the ballot-box: if not, then we will resort to sterner means. A little blood-letting is sometimes necessary in desperate cases."<sup>a</sup>

By order of the Council,

*R. Applegarth*, Chairman  
*Cowell Stepney*, Treasurer

*J. George Eccarius*, General Secretary<sup>b</sup>

First published in English in the pamphlet *Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association, held at Basle, in Switzerland*, London [1869], and in German as a separate pamphlet in Basle in September 1869

Reproduced from the text in the *Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association*, checked with the German pamphlet

---

<sup>a</sup> Sylvis' reply of May 26, 1869 to the General Council's letter was published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 400, June 12, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> At the end of the report the German pamphlet has: "London, September 1, 1869. Office: 256, High Holborn, W.C."—*Ed.*

## Karl Marx

[DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
ON THE POLICY  
OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT TOWARDS  
THE IRISH PRISONERS]<sup>115</sup>

Resolved,

that in his reply to the Irish demands for the release of the imprisoned Irish patriots—a reply contained in his letter to Mr. O’Shea etc., etc.<sup>a</sup>—Mr. Gladstone deliberately insults Irish Nation;

that he clogs political amnesty with conditions alike degrading to the victims of misgovernment and the people they belong to;

that having, in the teeth of his responsible position, publicly and enthusiastically cheered on the American slave-holders’ Rebellion,<sup>116</sup> he now steps in to preach to the Irish people the doctrine of passive obedience;

that his whole proceedings with reference to the Irish Amnesty question are the true and genuine offspring of that “*policy of conquest*” by the fiery denunciation of which Mr. Gladstone ousted his Tory rivals from office<sup>117</sup>;

that the *General Council of the “International Working Men’s Association”* express their admiration of the spirited, firm and high-souled manner in which the Irish people carry on their Amnesty movement;

that these resolutions be communicated to all the branches of, and working men’s bodies connected with, the “*International Working Men’s Association*” in Europe and America.

Introduced by Marx on November 16,  
1869

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

Adopted by the General Council on  
November 30, 1869

First published in *Reynolds’s Newspaper*,  
No. 1006, November 21, 1869

<sup>a</sup> In the Minute Book of the General Council this text in parentheses reads as follows: “in a reply contained in his letter to Mr. O’Shea d. d. Oct. 18, 1869, and to Mr. Isaac Butt d. d. Oct. 23, 1869” (see W. E. Gladstone, “The Government and the Fenians. Hawarden, Chester, Oct. 18” and “Hawarden, Chester, Oct. 23”, *The Times*, Nos. 26579 and 26583, October 23 and 27, 1869).—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE FEDERAL COUNCIL  
OF ROMANCE SWITZERLAND<sup>118</sup>

At its extraordinary meeting on January 1, 1870, the *General Council* resolved:

1) We read in the *Égalité* of December 11, 1869:

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

The General Council does not know of any article, either in the Rules or in the Regulations, which *would oblige it* to enter into correspondence or into polemic with the *Égalité* or to provide "*replies*" to "*questions*" from newspapers. The *Federal Council* of Romance Switzerland alone represents the branches of Romance Switzerland vis-à-vis the General Council. When the Romance Federal Council addresses requests or reprimands to us through the only legitimate channel, that is to say through its *secretary*, the General Council will always be ready to reply. But the *Romance Federal Council* has no right either to *abdicate* its functions in favour of the *Égalité* and the *Progrès*, or to let these newspapers *usurp* its functions. Generally speaking, the General Council's correspondence with the national and local committees cannot be published without greatly prejudicing the Association's general interests. Consequently, if other organs of the International were to follow the example of the *Progrès* and the *Égalité*, the General Council would be faced with the alternative of either discrediting

<sup>a</sup> See "Réflexions", *L'Égalité*, No. 47, December 11, 1869.—*Ed.*

itself publicly by its silence or violating its obligations by replying publicly.<sup>a</sup>

The *Égalité* joins the *Progrès* (a paper which is not sent to the General Council) in inviting *Le Travail* (a Paris paper which has not hitherto declared itself an organ of the *International*, and which is also not sent to the General Council) to demand an explanation from the General Council.<sup>b</sup> That is almost a League of Public Welfare.<sup>119</sup>

2) Now, assuming that the questions put by the *Égalité* come from the Romance Federal Council, we shall answer them on condition that such questions do not reach us in such a manner in future.

3) *Question of a Bulletin.* In the resolutions of the Geneva<sup>c</sup> Congress, which are inserted in the regulations, it is laid down that the national committees shall send the General Council *documents* dealing with the proletarian movement<sup>d</sup> and that the General Council shall thereupon publish a bulletin in the *different languages* as often as *its means permit* ("As often as its means permit, the General Council shall publish a report, etc.")<sup>e</sup>

The General Council's obligation was thus made dependent on *conditions* that have never been fulfilled. Even the statistical inquiry provided for by the Rules, decided by consecutive General Congresses, and demanded yearly by the General Council, has never been made. No document has been presented to the General Council. As far as the *means* are concerned, the General Council would have long since ceased to exist had it not been for

<sup>a</sup> In the manuscript, after the word "publicly", Marx had crossed out the words: "The *Progrès* (which is not sent to the General Council as it *should be* in accordance with resolutions thrice adopted by General Congresses) has taken the initiative in usurping the Federal Council's functions."—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The manuscript has the following passage crossed out: "The same people who last year, immediately after their tardy entry into our Association, formed the dangerous project of founding another international association within the International Working Men's Association, under their personal control and based in Geneva, have returned to their project and still believe in their special mission to usurp the supreme authority of the International Association. The General Council reminds the Romance Federal Council that it is *responsible* for the question of the newspapers *L'Égalité* and *Le Progrès*."—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The manuscript mistakenly has "Lausanne".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *Congrès ouvrier de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs tenu à Genève du 3 au 8 septembre 1866*, Geneva, 1866, pp. 13 and 26.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> *Rules of the International Working Men's Association. Founded September 28th, 1864*, London [1867], p. 6. The sentence in brackets is given by Marx in English.—*Ed.*

local contributions from England and the personal sacrifices of its members.

Thus, the Regulations passed at the Geneva<sup>a</sup> Congress have remained a dead letter.<sup>b</sup>

As regards the Basle Congress, it did not discuss the *fulfilment* of these existing Regulations. It discussed the possibility of issuing a bulletin in good time and *it did not pass any resolution* (see the *German report* published in Basle under the eyes of the Congress<sup>c</sup>).

For the rest, the General Council believes that the purpose of the bulletin is at the moment perfectly fulfilled by the different organs of the *International* published in the different languages and exchanged among them. It would be absurd to do by costly bulletins what is being done already without any expense. On the other hand, a bulletin which would print what is not contained in the organs of the *International* would only help our enemies to see behind the scenes.

4) *Question of separating the General Council from the Federal Council for England.*

Long before the foundation of the *Égalité*, this proposition was made periodically inside the General Council by one or two of its English members.<sup>120</sup> It was always rejected almost unanimously.

Although revolutionary *initiative* will probably come from France, England alone can serve as the *lever* for a serious *economic* Revolution. It is the only country where there are no more peasants and where landed property is concentrated in a few hands. It is the only country where the *capitalist form*, that is to say combined labour on a large scale under capitalist masters, embraces virtually the whole of production. It is the only country *where the great majority of the population consists of WAGES-LABOURERS*. It is the only country where the class struggle and the organisation of the working class by the *TRADES UNIONS* have *acquired* a certain degree of maturity and universality. It is the only country where, because of its domination on the world market, every revolution in economic matters must immediately affect the whole world. If landlordism and capitalism are classical features in England, on the other hand, the *material conditions* for their *destruction* are the most mature here. The General Council now being in the *happy* position of *having its hand*

<sup>a</sup> The manuscript mistakenly has "Lausanne".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the manuscript, after the words "dead letter", the following is crossed out: "They were treated as such by the Basle Congress."—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Verhandlungen des IV. Congresses des internationalen Arbeiterbundes in Basel*, Nos. 1-7, 7-14, September 1869, p. 90.—*Ed.*

directly on this great lever of the proletarian revolution, what folly, we might say even what a crime, to let this lever fall into purely English hands!

The English have all the *material* necessary for the social revolution. What they lack is the *spirit of generalisation and revolutionary ardour*. It is only the General Council that can provide them with this, that can thus accelerate the truly revolutionary movement in this country, and consequently *everywhere*. The great results we have already achieved in this respect are attested to by the most intelligent and influential of the newspapers of the ruling classes, as e.g. *The Pall Mall Gazette*, *Saturday Review*, *The Spectator* and *The Fortnightly Review*, to say nothing of the so-called radicals in the *COMMONS* and the *LORDS* who, a little while ago, still exerted a great influence on the leaders of the English workers. They accuse us publicly of having poisoned and almost extinguished the *English spirit* of the working class and of having pushed it into revolutionary socialism.

The only way to bring about this change is to act like the *General Council* of the *International Association*. As the General Council we can initiate measures (e.g., the founding of the *Land and Labour League*<sup>121</sup>) which later, in the process of their execution, will appear to the public as spontaneous movements of the English working class.

If a *Federal Council* were formed apart from the *General Council*, what would be the immediate results?

Placed between the *General Council* and the *General Council of Trades Unions*,<sup>122</sup> the *Federal Council* would have no authority whatever. On the other hand, the *General Council of the International* would lose control of the *great lever*. If we had preferred the showman's chatter to serious and unostentatious work, we would perhaps have committed the mistake of replying publicly the *Égalité's* question as to why the *General Council* permits "such a burdensome combination of functions".

England cannot be treated simply as a country along with other countries. It must be treated as the *metropolis of capital*.

5) *Question of the General Council Resolution on the Irish Amnesty.*<sup>a</sup>

If England is the *BULWARK* of landlordism and European capitalism, the only point where official England can be struck a great blow is *Ireland*.

In the first place, Ireland is the *BULWARK* of English landlordism. If it fell in Ireland, it would fall in England. In Ireland this is a hundred

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 83.—*Ed.*

times easier because *the economic struggle there is concentrated exclusively on landed property*, because this struggle is at the same time national, and because the people there are more revolutionary and more exasperated than in England. Landlordism in Ireland is maintained solely by the *English army*. The moment the *forced union* between the two countries<sup>128</sup> ends, a social revolution will immediately break out in Ireland, though in outmoded forms. English landlordism would not only lose a great source of its wealth, but also its *greatest moral force*, i.e., that of *representing the domination of England over Ireland*. On the other hand, by maintaining the power of its landlords in Ireland, the English proletariat makes them invulnerable in England itself.

In the second place, the English bourgeoisie has not only exploited Irish poverty to keep down the working class in England by *forced immigration* of poor Irishmen, but it has also divided the proletariat into two hostile camps. The revolutionary fire of the Celtic worker does not go well with the solid but slow nature of the Anglo-Saxon worker. On the contrary, in all *the big industrial centres in England* there is profound antagonism between the Irish proletariat and the English proletariat. The average English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers wages and the *STANDARD OF LIFE*. He feels national and religious antipathies for him. He regards him somewhat like the *POOR WHITES* of the Southern States of North America regarded black slaves. This antagonism among the proletarians of England is artificially nourished and kept up by the bourgeoisie. It knows that this scission is the true secret of maintaining its power.

Moreover, this antagonism is reproduced on the other side of the Atlantic. The Irish, chased from their native soil by the *bulls* and the sheep, reassemble in North America where they constitute a huge, ever-growing section of the population. Their only thought, their only passion, is hatred for England. The English and American governments (that is to say, the classes they represent) play on these feelings in order to perpetuate the covert struggle between the United States and England. They thereby prevent a sincere and serious alliance between the working classes of both sides of the Atlantic, and, consequently, their common emancipation.

Furthermore, Ireland is the only pretext the English Government has for retaining a *big standing army*, which, if need be, as has happened before, can be used against the English workers after having had its drill in Ireland.

Lastly, England today is seeing a repetition of what happened

on a monstrous scale in ancient Rome. Any people that oppresses another people forges its own chains.

Thus, the position of the International Association with regard to the Irish question is very clear. Its first concern is to advance the social revolution in England. To this end a great blow must be struck in Ireland.<sup>a</sup>

The General Council's resolutions on the Irish amnesty<sup>b</sup> serve only as an introduction to other resolutions<sup>124</sup> which will affirm that, quite apart from international justice, it is a *precondition to the emancipation of the English working class* to transform the present *forced union* (i.e., the enslavement of Ireland) into *equal and free confederation* if possible, into *complete separation* if need be.<sup>c</sup>

For the rest, the naïve doctrines of the *Égalité* and the *Progrès* about the CONNEXION, or rather, the NON-CONNEXION, between the social movement and the political movement have never, as far as we know, been recognised by any of our International congresses. They run counter to our Rules. The Rules say<sup>125</sup>:

"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*."<sup>d</sup>

The words "*as a means*"<sup>e</sup> were omitted in the French translation made in 1864 by the Paris Committee.<sup>f</sup> When questioned by the General Council, the Paris Committee excused itself by the difficulties of its political situation.<sup>g</sup>

<sup>a</sup> After the words "in Ireland" the manuscript has the following words crossed out: "and the Irish economic-national struggle must be exploited in all ways possible".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 3-4 and 83.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> After "if need be" the following words are crossed out in the manuscript: "The difficulties and even personal dangers which face General Council members who take such a stand may be judged by the fact that *The Bee-Hive* in its reporting of our meetings not only omitted *our resolutions* but did not even mention the fact that the General Council is concerned with the Irish question. The General Council was thus obliged to print its resolutions and send them to all TRADES UNIONS separately. The oracles of *L'Égalité* are now at liberty to say that it is a '*local political movement*', that, in their opinion, a *Federal Council* should deal with such bagatelle, and that there is no need to '*better* the existing governments'. *L'Égalité* might just as well have said that we intend to '*better* the Belgian Government' by denouncing its massacres."—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Here and below quotations from the Provisional Rules of the Association are given in English in the manuscript (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 14).—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Marx uses the English phrase and gives the French equivalent "*comme moyen*" in parentheses.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> *Congrès ouvrier. Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Règlement Provisoire* [Paris, 1864], p. 1.—*Ed.*

<sup>g</sup> The next five paragraphs were added by Marx on a separate sheet.—*Ed.*



There are other mutilations of the authentic text. Thus the first clause of the preamble to the Rules reads: "The struggle for the emancipation of the working classes means ... a struggle ... for equal rights and duties, and the *abolition of all class rule*."<sup>a</sup>

The Paris translation has "equal rights and duties", i.e., it reproduces a general phrase which may be found virtually in *all democratic manifestoes* of the last hundred years and which means different things in the mouth of different classes, but leaves out the concrete demand: "*the abolition of all class rule*"<sup>b</sup>.

Further, in the second clause of the preamble to the Rules we read: "That the economical subjection of the *man of labour* to the *monopoliser of the means of labour*, that is, *the sources of life*, etc."

The Paris translation substitutes the word "*capital*" for "*the means of labour, that is, the sources of life*", an expression which includes the land as well as the other means of labour.

The original authentic text was, however, restored in the French translation published in pamphlet form in Brussels by the *Rive Gauche* (1866).<sup>126</sup>

#### 6) *Liebknecht-Schweitzer Question*.

The *Égalité* writes:

"Both these groups belong to the *International*."

That is incorrect. The Eisenachers' group (which the *Progrès* and the *Égalité* would like to turn into Citizen Liebknecht's group) belongs to the *International*. *Schweitzer's group does not belong to it*.<sup>c</sup>

Schweitzer himself explained at length in his newspaper (*Social-Demokrat*) why the *Lassallean organisation* could not join the *International* without destroying itself.<sup>d</sup> Without realising it, he was speaking the truth. His artificial *sectarian organisation* is opposed to the *historical and spontaneous organisation* of the working class.

The *Progrès* and the *Égalité* have summoned the General Council to state publicly its "*opinion*" on the personal differences between Liebknecht and Schweitzer. Since Citizen *Johann Philipp Becker* (who is *slandered* as much as Liebknecht in Schweitzer's paper<sup>e</sup>) is a member of the *Égalité's editorial board*, it seems most strange that its editors are not better informed about the facts. They should have known that Liebknecht, in the *Demokratisches*

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 20, p. 14.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Marx uses the English phrase and gives the French equivalent in brackets. "l'abolition des classes".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The rest of the text was inserted by Marx.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Marx is referring to Schweitzer's leading article in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 82, July 16, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 24, February 24, 1869.—*Ed.*

*Wochenblatt*,<sup>a</sup> publicly invited Schweitzer to accept the General Council as *arbiter of their differences*,<sup>b</sup> and that Schweitzer no less publicly refused to acknowledge the authority of the General Council.<sup>c</sup>

For its part the General Council has employed all possible means to put an end to this scandal.<sup>d</sup> It instructed its Secretary for Germany<sup>e</sup> to correspond with Schweitzer; this has been done for two years, but all attempts by the Council have broken down in the face of Schweitzer's firm resolution to preserve at all cost his autocratic power together with the sectarian organisation. It is up to the General Council to determine the favourable moment when its public intervention in this quarrel will be more useful than damaging.

7) Since the *Égalité's* accusations are public and could be considered as emanating from the Romance Committee of Geneva, the General Council is to communicate this reply to all committees corresponding with it.

*By order of the General Council*

Written on about January 1, 1870

Approved by the General Council on January 1, 1870

Published in part in the pamphlet *Les prétendues scissions dans l'Internationale*, Genève, 1872

Printed according to the manuscript copy made by Marx's wife and checked by the author

Translated from the French

<sup>a</sup> A mistake in the original: *Volksstaat* instead of *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> W. Liebknecht, "Erklärung. Leipzig, 18. Februar 1869", *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 8, February 20, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 24, February 24, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The copy of the manuscript in Jung's handwriting further has: "which casts aspersions on the proletarian party in Germany".—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Karl Marx.—*Ed.*

# L'INTERNATIONALE

ORGANE DES SECTIONS BELGES

DE L'ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DES TRAVAILLEURS.

PARAISANT LE SAMEDI.

Karl Marx

OBITUARY<sup>127</sup>

Citizen Robert Shaw, Correspondent of the London General Council for North America, and one of the founders of the International, died this week of pulmonary tuberculosis.

He was one of the most active members of the Council. A pure heart, iron character, passionate temperament, truly revolutionary intelligence, quite above any petty ambition or personal interest. A poor worker himself, he could always find a worker poorer than himself to help. As meek as a child in personal affairs, he indignantly rejected all manner of compromise in his public life. It is principally due to his constant efforts that the TRADES UNIONS have rallied around us. But this same work made him plenty of implacable foes. The English TRADES UNIONS, all of local origin, all originally founded with the exclusive purpose of maintaining wages, etc., were all more or less afflicted by the narrowness that characterised the medieval guilds. There was a little conservative party that wanted at all cost to preserve the basic framework of unionism. Since the foundation of the International, Shaw made it his life's aim to break these voluntary chains and transform the unions into organised centres of the proletarian revolution. Success almost always crowned his efforts, but ever since that moment his life became a terrible battle in which his feeble health had to give way. He was already dying when he left for the Brussels Congress (September 1868). After his return, his good bourgeois masters banned him from all their works. He leaves a wife and daughter in poverty, but the English workers will not leave them in the lurch.

Written after January 4, 1870

First published in *L'Internationale*,  
No. 53, January 16, 1870

Printed according to the newspaper

Translated from the French

## Frederick Engels

### PREFACE [TO THE SECOND EDITION OF *THE PEASANT WAR IN GERMANY*]<sup>128</sup>

The following work was written in London in the summer of 1850, the recent counter-revolution still fresh in mind; it appeared in the 5th and 6th issues of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, edited by Karl Marx, Hamburg, 1850. My political friends in Germany desire it to be reprinted, and I accede to their desire, because, to my regret, the work is still timely today.

It makes no claim to providing material derived from independent research. On the contrary, all the material on the peasant risings and on Thomas Münzer is taken from Zimmermann.<sup>a</sup> His book, despite gaps here and there, is still the best compilation of factual data. Moreover, old Zimmermann enjoyed his subject. The same revolutionary instinct, which prompted him throughout the book to champion the oppressed class, made him later one of the best of the extreme Left<sup>129</sup> in Frankfurt.<sup>b</sup>

If, nevertheless, Zimmermann's presentation lacks inner cohesion; if it does not succeed in showing the political and religious controversies of the times as a reflection of the contemporary class struggles; if it sees in these class struggles only oppressors and oppressed, evil folk and good folk, and the ultimate victory of the evil ones; if its exposition of the social conditions which determined both the outbreak and the outcome of the struggle is extremely defective, it was the fault of the time in which the book

---

<sup>a</sup> W. Zimmermann, *Allgemeine Geschichte des grossen Bauernkrieges*, Th. 1-3, Stuttgart, 1841-1843.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The third edition (1875) further has: "It is true that since then he is said to have aged somewhat."—*Ed.*

came into existence. On the contrary, for its time, it is written quite realistically and is a laudable exception among the German idealist works on history.

My presentation, while sketching the historical course of the struggle only in its bare outlines, attempted to explain the origin of the Peasant War, the position of the various parties that played a part in it, the political and religious theories by which those parties sought to clarify their position in their own minds, and finally the result of the struggle itself as following logically from the historically established social conditions of life of these classes; that is to say, it attempted to demonstrate the political structure of Germany at that time, the revolts against it, and the contemporary political and religious theories not as causes but as results of the stage of development of agriculture, industry, roads and waterways, commerce in commodities and money then obtaining in Germany. This, the only materialist conception of history, originates not with myself but with Marx, and can also be found in his works on the French Revolution of 1848-49, in the same *Revue*, and in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.<sup>130</sup>

The parallel between the German Revolution of 1525 and that of 1848-49 was too obvious to be altogether ignored at that time. Nevertheless, despite the uniformity in the course of events, where various local revolts were crushed one after another by one and the same princely army, despite the often ludicrous similarity in the behaviour of the city burghers in both cases, the difference was also clear and distinct.

“Who profited from the Revolution of 1525? The *princes*. Who profited from the Revolution of 1848? The *big* princes, Austria and Prussia. Behind the minor princes of 1525 stood the petty burghers, who chained the princes to themselves by taxes. Behind the big princes of 1850, behind Austria and Prussia, there stand the modern big bourgeois, rapidly getting them under their yoke by means of the national debt. And behind the big bourgeois stand the proletarians.”<sup>a</sup>

I regret to have to say that in this paragraph much too much honour was done to the German bourgeoisie. Both in Austria and in Prussia it has indeed had the opportunity of “rapidly getting” the monarchy “under its yoke by means of the national debt”, but nowhere did it ever make use of this opportunity.

As a result of the war of 1866 Austria fell into the lap of the bourgeoisie as a gift. But it does not know how to rule, it is

<sup>a</sup> F. Engels, *The Peasant War in Germany* (present edition, Vol. 10, p. 482).—*Ed.*

powerless and incapable of anything. It can do only one thing: savagely attack the workers as soon as they begin to stir. It still remains at the helm solely because the *Hungarians* need it.

And in Prussia? True, the national debt has increased by leaps and bounds, the deficit has become a permanent feature, state expenditure grows from year to year, the bourgeoisie have a majority in the Chamber and without them taxes cannot be increased nor loans floated. But where is their power over the state? Only a few months ago, when there was again a deficit, the bourgeoisie occupied a most favourable position. By holding out only just *a little*, they could have forced far-reaching concessions. What do they do? They regard it as a sufficient concession that the government *allows them* to lay at its feet close on 9 millions, not just *one year*, oh no, but *every year*, and for all time to come.<sup>131</sup>

I do not want to blame the poor National-Liberals<sup>132</sup> in the Chamber more than they deserve. I know they have been left in the lurch by those who stand behind them, by the mass of the bourgeoisie. This mass does not *want* to rule. It still has 1848 in its bones.

Why the German bourgeoisie exhibits this astonishing cowardice will be discussed later.

In other respects the above statement has been fully confirmed. Beginning with 1850, the more and more definite recession into the background of the small states, which serve now only as levers for Prussian or Austrian intrigues; the increasingly violent struggle between Austria and Prussia for supremacy; finally, the forcible settlement of 1866,<sup>133</sup> under which Austria retains its own provinces, while Prussia subjugates, directly or indirectly, the whole of the North, and the three states of the Southwest<sup>a</sup> are left out in the cold for the time being.

In all this grand performance<sup>134</sup> only the following is of importance for the German working class:

First, that through universal suffrage the workers have got the power of being directly represented in the legislative assembly.

Secondly, that Prussia has set a good example by swallowing three other crowns held by the grace of God.<sup>135</sup> Even the National-Liberals do not believe that *after* this operation it still possesses the same immaculate crown, held by the grace of God, which it formerly ascribed to itself.

Thirdly, that there is now only *one* serious adversary of the revolution in Germany—the Prussian government.

<sup>a</sup> Bavaria, Baden, Württemberg.—*Ed.*

And fourthly, that the German-Austrians will now at last have to make up their minds as to which they want to be, Germans or Austrians; whom they prefer to belong to—Germany or their extra-German trans-Leithan appendages.<sup>136</sup> It has been obvious for a long time that they have to give up one or the other, but this has been continually glossed over by the petty-bourgeois democrats.

As regards the other important issues relative to 1866, which since then have been thrashed out *ad nauseam* between the National-Liberals on the one hand, and the People's Party<sup>137</sup> on the other, the history of the next few years should prove that these two standpoints are so bitterly hostile to one another solely because they are the opposite poles of one and the same narrow-mindedness.

The year 1866 has changed almost nothing in the social relations of Germany. The few bourgeois reforms—uniform weights and measures, freedom of movement, freedom of occupation, etc., all within limits acceptable to the bureaucracy—do not even come up to what the bourgeoisie of other West European countries have enjoyed for a long time, and leave the main abuse, the bureaucratic license system, untouched.<sup>138</sup> For the proletariat all laws concerning freedom of movement, the right of naturalisation, the abolition of passports, etc., are anyhow made quite illusory by the common police practices.

What is much more important than the grand performance of 1866 is the growth of German industry and commerce, of railways, telegraphs and ocean steam shipping since 1848. However much this progress lags behind that of England, or even of France, during the same period, it is unprecedented for Germany and has accomplished more in twenty years than was previously done in a whole century. Only now has Germany been drawn, seriously and irrevocably, into *world commerce*. The capital of the industrialists has multiplied rapidly; the social position of the bourgeoisie has risen accordingly. The surest sign of industrial prosperity—*swindling*—has become very widespread and chained counts and dukes to its triumphal chariot. German capital is now constructing Russian and Romanian railways—may it not come to grief!—whereas only fifteen years ago, German railways went begging to English entrepreneurs. How, then, is it possible that the bourgeoisie has not conquered political power as well, that it behaves so cowardly towards the government?

It is the misfortune of the German bourgeoisie to arrive too late, as is the favourite German manner. The period of its florescence is occurring at a time when the bourgeoisie of the other West

European countries is already politically in decline. In England, the bourgeoisie could get its real representative, Bright, into the government only by an extension of the franchise, whose consequences are bound to put an end to all bourgeois rule. In France, where the bourgeoisie as such, as a class in its entirety, held power for only two years, 1849 and 1850, under the republic, it was able to continue its social existence only by abdicating its political power to Louis Bonaparte and the army. And in view of the enormously increased interaction of the three most advanced European countries, it is today no longer possible for the bourgeoisie to settle down to comfortable political rule in Germany after this rule has had its day in England and France.

It is a peculiarity of the bourgeoisie, in contrast to all former ruling classes, that there is a turning point in its development after which every further expansion of its agencies of power, hence primarily of its capital, only tends to make it more and more unfit for political rule. "*Behind the big bourgeois stand the proletarians.*"<sup>a</sup> In proportion as the bourgeoisie develops its industry, commerce and means of communication, in the same proportion it increases the numbers of the proletariat. At a certain point—which is not necessarily reached everywhere at the same time or at the same stage of development—it begins to notice that its proletarian double is outgrowing it. From that moment on, it loses the strength required for exclusive political rule; it looks around for allies with whom to share its rule, or to whom to cede it entirely, as circumstances may require.

In Germany this turning point for the bourgeoisie came as early as 1848. To be sure, at that time the German bourgeoisie was less frightened by the German proletariat than by the French. The June 1848 battle in Paris showed the bourgeoisie what it had to expect; the German proletariat was restless enough to prove to it that the seed for the same crop had already been sown on German soil, too; from that day on the edge was taken off all bourgeois political action. The bourgeoisie looked around for allies, sold itself to them regardless of the price—and even today it has not advanced one step.

These allies are all reactionary by nature. There is the monarchy with its army and its bureaucracy; there is the big feudal nobility; there are the small country squires, and there are even the priests. With all of these the bourgeoisie made pacts and bargains, if only to save its dear skin, until in the end it had nothing left to barter.

---

<sup>a</sup> F. Engels, *The Peasant War in Germany* (present edition, Vol. 10, p. 482).—Ed.



And the more the proletariat developed, the more it became aware of itself as a class and acted as a class, the more faint-hearted did the bourgeois become. When the astonishingly bad strategy of the Prussians triumphed over the astonishingly worse strategy of the Austrians at Sadowa, it was difficult to say who heaved a deeper sigh of relief—the Prussian bourgeois, who was also defeated at Sadowa, or the Austrian.

In 1870 our big bourgeois are acting exactly the same way as the middle burghers acted in 1525. As to the petty bourgeois, artisans and shopkeepers, they will always be the same. They hope to swindle their way up into the big bourgeoisie; they are afraid of being pushed down into the proletariat. Hovering between fear and hope, they will save their precious skins during the struggle and join the victor when the struggle is over. Such is their nature.

The social and political activity of the proletariat has kept pace with the rise of industry since 1848. The role that the German workers play today in their trade unions, cooperative societies, political associations and at meetings, elections and in the so-called Reichstag, is by itself sufficient proof of the transformation Germany has imperceptibly undergone in the last twenty years. It redounds to the credit of the German workers that *they alone* have succeeded in sending workers and workers' representatives into parliament, whereas neither the French nor the English have so far achieved this.

But even the proletariat has not yet outgrown the parallel of 1525. The class exclusively dependent on wages all its life is still far from being the majority of the German people. It is, therefore, also compelled to seek allies. These can be looked for only among the petty bourgeois, the lumpenproletariat of the cities, the small peasants and the agricultural labourers.

The *petty bourgeois* we have spoken of above. They are extremely unreliable except after a victory has been won, when their shouting in the beer houses knows no bounds. Nevertheless, there are very good elements among them, who join the workers of their own accord.

The *lumpenproletariat*, this scum of depraved elements from all classes, with headquarters in the big cities, is the worst of all the possible allies. This rabble is absolutely venal and absolutely brazen. If the French workers, in every revolution, inscribed on the houses: *Mort aux voleurs!* Death to thieves! and even shot some, they did so not out of reverence for property, but because they rightly considered it necessary above all to keep that gang at bay. Every leader of the workers who uses these scoundrels as

guards or relies on them for support proves himself by this action alone a traitor to the movement.

The *small peasants*—for the bigger peasants belong to the bourgeoisie—differ in kind. They are either *feudal peasants* and still have to perform *corvée* services for their gracious lord. Now that the bourgeoisie has failed in its duty of freeing these people from serfdom, it will not be difficult to convince them that they can expect salvation only from the working class.

Or they are *tenant farmers*. In this case the situation is for the most part the same as in Ireland. Rents are pushed so high that in times of average crops the peasant and his family can barely make ends meet; when the crops are bad he is on the verge of starvation, is unable to pay his rent and is consequently entirely at the mercy of the landowner. The bourgeoisie never does anything for these people, unless it is compelled to. From whom then should they expect salvation if not from the workers?

There remain the peasants who cultivate their *own small plots of land*. In most cases they are so burdened with mortgages that they are as dependent on the usurer as the tenant on the landlord. For them also there remains only a meagre wage, which, moreover, since there are good years and bad years, is highly uncertain. These people can least of all expect anything from the bourgeoisie, because it is precisely the bourgeoisie, the capitalist usurers, who suck the lifeblood out of them. Still, most of these peasants cling to their property, though in reality it does not belong to them but to the usurer. It will have to be brought home to them all the same that they can be freed from the usurer only when a government dependent on the people has transformed all mortgages into debts to the state, and thereby lowered the interest rates. And this can be brought about only by the working class.

Wherever medium-sized and large estates prevail, *farm labourers* form the most numerous class in the countryside. This is the case throughout the North and East of Germany and it is *there* that the industrial workers of the towns find their *most numerous and most natural allies*. In the same way as the capitalist confronts the industrial worker, the landowner or large tenant confronts the farm labourer. The same measures that help the one must also help the other. The industrial workers can free themselves only by transforming the capital of the bourgeois, that is, the raw materials, machines and tools, and the means of subsistence they need to work in production, into the property of society, that is, into their own property, used by them in common. Similarly, the farm labourers can be rescued from their hideous misery only

when, primarily, their chief object of labour, the land itself, is withdrawn from the private ownership of the big peasants and the still bigger feudal lords, transformed into public property and cultivated by cooperative associations of agricultural workers on their common account. And here we come to the famous resolution of the International Working Men's Congress in Basle that it is in the interest of society to transform landed property into common, national property.<sup>139</sup> This resolution was adopted mainly for countries where there is large-scale landed property, and, consequently, big estates are operated, with one master and many labourers on them. This state of affairs is still largely predominant in Germany, and therefore, next to England, the resolution was *most timely precisely for Germany*. The agricultural proletariat, the farm labourers—that is the class from which the bulk of the armies of the princes is recruited. It is the class which, thanks to universal suffrage, now sends into parliament the large number of feudal lords and Junkers; but it is also the class nearest to the industrial workers of the towns, which shares their living conditions and is steeped even more in misery than they. This class is impotent because it is split and scattered, but its latent power is so well known to the government and nobility that they let the schools fall into decay deliberately in order to keep it ignorant. It is the immediate and most urgent task of the German labour movement to breathe life into this class and draw it into the movement. The day the mass of the farm labourers will have learned to understand their own interests, a reactionary—feudal, bureaucratic or bourgeois—government will become impossible in Germany.

Written on about February 11, 1870

First published in the second edition of  
*The Peasant War in Germany*, Leipzig,  
October 1870

Printed according to the text of  
the second edition of the book,  
checked with the preface to the  
third edition (Leipzig, 1875)

Karl Marx

THE ENGLISH GOVERNMENT AND  
THE FENIAN PRISONERS<sup>140</sup>

London, February 21, 1870

I

The silence which is observed in the European press concerning the disgraceful acts committed by this oligarchical bourgeois government is due to a variety of reasons. Firstly, the English Government is *rich* and the press, as you know, is *immaculate*. Moreover, the English Government is the model government, recognised as such by the landlords, by the capitalists on the Continent and even by Garibaldi (see his book<sup>a</sup>): consequently we should not revile this ideal government. Finally, the French Republicans are narrow-minded and selfish enough to reserve all their anger for the Empire. It would be an insult to free speech to inform their fellow countrymen that *in the land of bourgeois freedom* sentences of 20 years hard labour are given for offences which are punished by 6 months in prison *in the land of barracks*. The following details concerning the treatment of Fenian prisoners have been taken from English journals:

*Mulcahy*, sub-editor of the newspaper *The Irish People*,<sup>b</sup> sentenced for taking part in the Fenian conspiracy, was harnessed to a cart loaded with stones with an iron collar round his neck at Dartmoor.

*O'Donovan Rossa*, owner of *The Irish People*, was shut up for 35 days in a pitch-black dungeon with his hands chained behind his back day and night. They were not even unchained to allow him

---

<sup>a</sup> G. Garibaldi, *The Rule of the Monk, or Rome in the Nineteenth Century*, London, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The name of the newspaper is in English in the original, with the French translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

to eat the miserable slops which were left for him on the earthen floor.<sup>a</sup>

*Kickham*, one of the editors of *The Irish People*, although he was unable to use his right arm because of an abscess, was forced to sit with his fellow prisoners on a heap of rubble in the November cold and fog and break up stones and bricks with his left hand. He returned to his cell at night and had nothing to eat but 6 ounces of bread and a pint of hot water.<sup>b</sup>

*O'Leary*, an old man of sixty or seventy kept in prison, was put on bread and water for three weeks because he would not renounce *paganism* (this, apparently, is what a jailer called free thinking) and become either Papist, Protestant, Presbyterian or even Quaker, or take up one of the many religions which the prison governor offered to the heathen Irish.<sup>c</sup>

*Martin H. Carey* is incarcerated in a lunatic asylum at Millbank. The silence and the other bad treatment to which he was subjected have made him lose his reason.<sup>d</sup>

Colonel *Richard Burke* is in no better condition. One of his friends writes that his mind is affected, he has lost his memory and his behaviour, manners and speech are those of a madman.<sup>e</sup>

The political prisoners are dragged from one prison to the next as if they were wild animals. They are forced to keep company with the vilest knaves; they are obliged to clean the pans used by these wretches, to wear the shirts and flannels previously worn by these criminals, many of whom are suffering from the foulest diseases, and to wash in the same water. Before the arrival of the Fenians at Portland all the criminals were allowed to talk with their visitors. A visiting cage was installed for the Fenian prisoners. It consists of three compartments divided by partitions of thick iron bars; the jailer occupies the central compartment and the

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 414-15, 417-19. See also *The Irishman*, No. 49, June 12, 1869, "O'Donovan Rossa. To the Editor of *The Irishman*; The Press on the Treatment of the Political Prisoners: The Treatment of O'Donovan Rossa"; *The Irishman*, No. 30, January 22, 1870, "The Political Prisoners—Misguided Men and Their Desires".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Report of the Commissioners on the Treatment of the Treason-Felony Convicts in the English Convict Prisons*, London, 1867, p. 19. See also this volume, p. 422.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 12, September 18, 1869, "The Irishman in Paris. John O'Mahony and Pagan O'Leary".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 20, November 13, 1869, "Gladstone and His Victims. To the Editor of the *Irishman*".—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 30, January 22, 1870, "The Irish Political Prisoners and Her Majesty's Government"; No. 27, January 1, 1870: "More Prison Horrors. Irish Political Prisoners Being Done to Death in English Prisons".—*Ed.*

prisoner and his friends can only see each other through this double row of bars.

In the docks you can find prisoners who eat all sorts of slugs, and frogs are considered dainties at Chatham. General Thomas Burke said he was not surprised to find a dead mouse floating in the soup. The convicts say that it was a bad day for them when the Fenians were sent to the prisons. (The prison regime has become much more severe.)

---

I should like to add a few words to these extracts.

Last year *Mr. Bruce*, the Home Secretary, a great liberal, great policeman and great mine owner in Wales who cruelly exploits his workers, was questioned on the bad treatment of Fenian prisoners and O'Donovan Rossa in particular.<sup>a</sup> At first he denied everything, but was later compelled to confess.<sup>b</sup> Following this Mr. Moore, an Irish member in the House of Commons, demanded an enquiry into the facts.<sup>c</sup> This was flatly refused by the *radical ministry* of which that demigod Mr. Gladstone (he has been compared to Jesus Christ publicly) is the head, and that old bourgeois demagogue, John Bright, is one of the most influential members.<sup>d</sup>

Recently, when rumours concerning the bad treatment of the Fenians were resumed, several members of Parliament requested Mr. Bruce for permission to visit the prisoners *in order to be able to verify the falseness of these rumours*.<sup>e</sup> Mr. Bruce refused this permission on the grounds that the prison governors were afraid that the prisoners would be too excited by visit of this kind.<sup>f</sup>

Last week the Home Secretary was again submitted to questioning. He was asked whether it was true that O'Donovan Rossa received corporal punishment (i. e., whipping)<sup>g</sup> after his election

---

<sup>a</sup> J. Gray, Enquiry in the House of Commons concerning the treatment of the Irish prisoners, *The Irishman*, No. 3, July 17, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> H. A. Bruce, Speech in the House of Commons on June 4, 1869, *The Irishman*, No. 3, July 17, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> "Mr. G. H. Moore's Motion upon the Treatment by England of Irish Political Prisoners", *The Irishman*, No. 1, July 3, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See this volume, pp. 408, 415.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Ph. Callan, "To the Right Hon. H. A. Bruce, Home Secretary. Reform Club, January 18", *The Irishman*, No. 32, February 5, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> H. A. Bruce, "To P. Callan, Esq., M.P., Home Office, January 19", *The Irishman*, No. 32, February 5, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>g</sup> C. W. White, Speech in the House of Commons on February 18, 1870, *The Times*, No. 26975, February 19, 1870.—*Ed.*

to Parliament as the member for Tipperary<sup>141</sup>; the Minister confirmed that he had not received such treatment since 1868<sup>a</sup> (which is tantamount to admitting that the political prisoner had been given the whip over a period of two to three years).

I am also sending you extracts (which we are going to publish in our next issue) concerning the case of Michael Terbert, a Fenian sentenced as such to forced labour, serving his sentence at Spike Island Convict Prison in the county of Cork, Ireland. You will see that the CORONER<sup>b</sup> himself<sup>c</sup> attributes this man's death to the torture which was inflicted on him. This investigation was held last week.<sup>d</sup>

In the course of two years *more than twenty* Fenian workers have died or gone insane thanks to the philanthropy of these good bourgeois souls, backed by these good landlords.

You are probably aware that the English press professes a chaste distaste for the dreadful general security laws which grace *la belle France*. Well, except for a few short intervals, it has been general security laws that formed the Irish Charter. Since 1793 the English Government has taken advantage of any pretext to suspend the Habeas Corpus Bill (a law guaranteeing the liberty of the individual)<sup>142</sup> regularly and periodically, in fact all laws, except that of brute force. In this way thousands of people have been arrested in Ireland on *suspicion of being suspected of Fenianism* without ever having been tried, brought before a judge or court, or even charged. Not content with depriving them of their liberty, the English Government has had them tortured in the most savage way imaginable. The following is but one example.

One of the prisons where persons suspected of being Fenians were buried alive is *Mountjoy Prison* in Dublin. The prison inspector, Murray, is a despicable brute. He maltreated the prisoners so cruelly that some of them went mad. The prison doctor, an excellent man called M'Donnell (who also played a creditable part in the enquiry into Michael Terbert's death), spent several months writing letters of protest which he addressed in the first instance to Murray himself. As Murray did not reply, he sent accusing letters to higher authorities,<sup>c</sup> but being an expert jailer Murray intercepted these letters.

<sup>a</sup> H. A. Bruce, Speech in the House of Commons on February 18, 1870, *The Times*, No. 26975, February 19, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Marx uses the English term and gives the French equivalent in brackets.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> John Moore.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> "Inquest at Spike Island.—Condemnation of the Prison Treatment", *The Irishman*, No. 34, February 19, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> *The Irishman*, Nos. 7, 12 and 15, August 14, September 18 and October 9, 1869.—*Ed.*

Finally M'Donnell wrote directly to Lord Mayo, then Viceroy of Ireland. This was during the period when the Tories were in power (Derby and Disraeli). What effect did his actions have? The documents relating to the case were published by order of Parliament<sup>a</sup> and ... Dr. M'Donnell was dismissed from his post!!! Whereas Murray retained his.

Then the so-called radical ministry of Gladstone came to power, the tender, unctuous, magnanimous Gladstone who had shed such warm, sincere tears before the eyes of the whole of Europe over the fate of Poerio and other members of the bourgeoisie who were badly treated by King Bomba.<sup>143</sup> What did this idol of the progressive bourgeoisie do? While insulting the Irish by his insolent replies to their demands for an amnesty,<sup>b</sup> he not only confirmed the monster Murray in his post, but endowed the position of the chief jailer with a nice fat sinecure as a token of his particular satisfaction!<sup>c</sup> There's the apostle of bourgeois philanthropy for you!

But something had to be done to pull the wool over the eyes of the public. It was essential to appear to be doing something for Ireland, and a law regulating the land question (LAND BILL)<sup>144</sup> was proclaimed with a great song and dance. All this is nothing but a pose with the ultimate aim of deceiving Europe, winning over the Irish judges and advocates with the prospect of endless disputes between landlords and farmers, conciliating the landlords with the promise of financial aid from the state and deluding the more prosperous farmers with a few mild concessions.

In the long introduction to his grandiloquent and confused speech Gladstone admits that even the "benevolent" laws which liberal England bestowed on Ireland over the last hundred years have always led to the country's further decline.<sup>d</sup> And after this naive confession the same man persists in torturing those who want to put an end to this harmful and stupid legislation.

---

<sup>a</sup> *Report of the Commissioners on the Treatment of the Treason-Felony Convicts in the English Convict Prisons*, London, 1867. See also this volume, pp. 424, 426-28.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, p. 83.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 19, November 6, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Marx refers to Gladstone's speech in the House of Commons on February 15, 1870, *The Times*, No. 26673, February 16, 1870.—*Ed.*



## II

The following is an account taken from an English newspaper of the results of an enquiry into the death of Michael Terbert,<sup>a</sup> a Fenian prisoner who died at Spike Island Prison due to the bad treatment which he had received.

On Thursday last<sup>b</sup> Mr. John Moore, Coroner of the Middleton district, held an inquest at Spike Island Convict Prison,<sup>c</sup> on the body of a convict [...] named Michael Terbert, who had died in hospital.

Peter Hay, governor of the prison, was called first. He deposed—The deceased, Michael Terbert, came to this prison in June, 1866; I can't say how his health was at the time; he had been convicted on the 12th of January, 1866, and his sentence was seven years' penal servitude; he appeared delicate for some time past, as will appear from one of the prison books, which states that he was removed on the recommendation of medical officers, as being unfit for cellular discipline. Witness then went into a detail of the frequent punishments inflicted on the deceased for breach of discipline, many of them for the use "of disrespectful language to the medical officer".<sup>d</sup>

Jeremiah Hubert Kelly deposed—I remember when Michael Terbert came here from Mountjoy Prison; it was then stated that he was unfit for cellular discipline—that means being always confined to a cell<sup>e</sup>; certificate to the effect was signed by Dr. M'Donnel: [...] I found him, however, to be in good health, and I sent him to work. I find by the record<sup>f</sup> that he was in hospital from the 31st January, 1869, until the 6th February, 1869; he suffered then from increased affection of the heart, and from that time he did not work on the public works, but in-doors, at oakum; from the 19th March, 1869, until the 24th March,<sup>g</sup> 1869, he was in hospital, suffering from the same affection of heart; from the 24th April till the 5th May he was also in hospital from spitting of blood; from the 19th May till the 1st June he was in hospital for heart disease; from the 21st June till the 22nd June he was under hospital treatment for the same; he was also in hospital from the 22nd July till the 15th August, for the same—from 9th November till the 13th December for debility, and from 20th December to the 8th February, when he died from acute dropsy; on the 13th November he first appeared to suffer from dropsy, and it was then dissipated; I visit the cells every day, and I must have seen him when under punishment from time to time; it is my duty to remit, by recommendation, that punishment, if I consider the prisoner is not fit to bear it; I think I did so twice in his case.

As a medical man, did you consider that five days on bread and water per day was excessive punishment for him, notwithstanding his state of health in Mountjoy and here?—I did not; the deceased had a good appetite; I don't think that the treatment induced acute dropsy, of which he died [...]

<sup>a</sup> See *The Irishman*, No. 34, February 19, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *L'Internationale* has "On Thursday, February 17".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *L'Internationale* has "Spike-Island Prison".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *L'Internationale* has no quotation marks here.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The words "that means being always confined to a cell" are omitted in *L'Internationale*.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> *L'Internationale* has "I remember".—*Ed.*

<sup>g</sup> *L'Internationale* has "March 26".—*Ed.*

Martin O'Connell, resident apothecary of Spike Island, was next examined—Witness mentioned to Dr. Kelly last July that while the deceased was labouring under heart disease he should not have been punished; [...] he was of opinion that such punishment as the deceased got was prejudicial to his health, considering that he was an invalid for the past twelve months [...] he could not say that invalids were so punished, as he only attended cells in Dr. Kelly's absence; he was certain, considering the state of the deceased man's health, that five days continuously in cells would be injurious to his health; [...] The Coroner then [...] dealt forcibly with the treatment which the prisoner had received [...] alternating between the hospital and the punishment cell.

The jury returned the following verdict: "We find that Michael Terbert died in hospital at Spike Island Convict Prison, on the 8th of February, 1870, of dropsy; he was twenty-five years of age,<sup>a</sup> and unmarried. We have also to express in the strongest terms our total disapproval of the frequent punishment he suffered in cells on bread and water for several days in succession during his imprisonment in Spike Island, where he had been sent in June, 1866, from Mountjoy Prison, for the reason that in Dr. M'Donnell's opinion he was unfit for cellular discipline at Mountjoy; and we express our condemnation of such treatment."

Written on February 21, 1870

First published in the newspaper *L'Internationale*, Nos. 59 and 60, February 27 and March 6, 1870

Printed according to the newspaper

Translated from the French

The account of the enquiry into Terbet's death is reproduced from *The Irishman*

---

<sup>a</sup> *L'Internationale* has "36 years of age".—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[CONCERNING THE CONFLICT  
IN THE LYONS SECTION]<sup>145</sup>

Citizens! The Lyonese section of the International Working Men's Association, in virtue of a resolution passed at the Congress of Basle, 1869, to the effect that the General Council shall act as umpire in cases where differences arise between members of the Association,<sup>a</sup> has appealed to the Council to decide between Albert Richard on one side and Schettel, Cormier, A. Blanc, Chanoz and Vindry on the other side, the latter being members of the old section of Lyons.

The General Council, having examined the documents sent by that section, declares the accusations made to be without the least foundation and confirms the verdict of the two special commissions appointed on that subject: the first at the Congress of Lausanne, 1867, and the second at Geneva, 1869, and maintains Albert Richard in the post of Corresponding Secretary of the International Working Men's Association conformably to the Rules and Regulations.

Considering also that the call made by the old members upon the radical burgesses to give a decision in this case which ought only to have been known to the members of the Association is contrary to the Rules, spirit, and interest of the Association and of a nature of profiting the enemies, the General Council censures energetically the conduct of the old members of the section.

The General Council takes advantage of the position in which it is placed by this misunderstanding to remind all the members of

---

<sup>a</sup> Marx refers to the resolution of the Basle Congress adopted on September 9, 1869 (see *Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association*, London [1869], p. 21).—*Ed.*

the Association that before any publication or any public action it should be apprised of it, as this mode of proceeding is calculated to excite personal animosities which should be carefully avoided at all times, and produces divisions in our ranks, and can only be useful to our adversaries at a time when all the activity, all the strength, and all the energy of our members should be concentrated for the speedy triumph of the principles of the International Working Men's Association.

Adopted by the General Council on  
March 8, 1870

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published in *L'Internationale*, No. 63,  
March 27, 1870, under the signature of  
Eugène Dupont

Karl Marx

THE GENERAL<sup>a</sup> COUNCIL OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION  
TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS  
OF THE RUSSIAN SECTION IN GENEVA<sup>146</sup>

Citizens,

At its meeting of March 22, the General<sup>a</sup> Council declared by unanimous vote that your programme and rules<sup>b</sup> accord with the general rules of the International Working Men's Association. It immediately admitted your section into the International. I am pleased to accept your proposal to take on the honourable duty of being your representative on the General<sup>a</sup> Council.

You say in your programme:

"...that the imperial yoke oppressing Poland is a brake equally hampering the political and social emancipation of both nations—the Russian just as much as the Polish."

You might add that Russia's violent conquest of Poland provides a pernicious support and real reason for the existence of a military regime in Germany, and, as a consequence, on the whole Continent. Therefore, in working on breaking Poland's chains, Russian socialists take on themselves the lofty task of destroying the military regime; that is essential as a precondition for the general emancipation of the European proletariat.

A few months ago I received from St. Petersburg Flerovsky's work *The Condition of the Working Class in Russia*.<sup>147</sup> This is a real eye-opener for Europe. *Russian optimism*, which is spread over the Continent even by the so-called revolutionaries, is mercilessly exposed in this work. It will not retract from its worth if I say that in one or two places it does not fully satisfy criticism from the

<sup>a</sup> "Chief" in the Russian original.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "Pervaya russkaya sektsiya. Programma", "Ustav russkoi sektsii", *Narodnoye Dyelo*, No. 1, April 15, 1870.—*Ed.*

purely theoretical point of view. It is the book of a serious observer, a courageous worker, an unbiased critic, a great artist and, above all, of a person intolerant of oppression in all its forms and of all national anthems, and ardently sharing all the sufferings and all the aspirations of the producing class.

Such works as Flerovsky's and those of your teacher Chernyshevsky do real honour to Russia and prove that your country is also beginning to take part in the movement of our age.

Fraternal greetings,

*Karl Marx*

London, March 24, 1870

Printed in *Narodnoye Dyelo*, No. 1, Geneva, April 15, 1870

Printed according to the newspaper

Translated from the Russian

## Karl Marx

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION<sup>148</sup>

The Russian Bakunin (although I have known him since 1843, I shall here ignore everything not absolutely necessary for the understanding of what follows) met Marx in London<sup>a</sup> shortly after the foundation of the *International*. There the latter took him into the Association, for which Bakunin promised to work to the best of his ability. Bakunin went to Italy and received there from Marx the *Provisional Rules* and *Address to the Working Classes*,<sup>b</sup> answered "very enthusiastically" and did nothing. After some years, during which nothing was heard from him, he turned up again in Switzerland. There he joined, not the *International*, but the *League de la paix et de la liberté*.<sup>149</sup> After the congress of this Peace League (Geneva, 1867) Bakunin got on to its *Executive Committee*, but found opponents there, who not only denied him any "dictatorial" influence, but watched him closely as being "suspect as a *Russian*". Shortly after the Brussels Congress of the *International* (September 1868) the *Peace League* held its congress at Berne. Here Bakunin acted the FIREBRAND and—be it remarked *en passant*—denounced the occidental bourgeoisie in the tone in which Muscovite optimists are accustomed to attack Western civilisation—to palliate their own barbarism. He proposed a number of resolutions, which, *absurd in themselves*, were intended to instil fear into the bourgeois cretins and allow Monsieur Bakunin to *leave* the Peace League and *enter* the *International* with *éclat*. It suffices to note that the programme proposed by Bakunin to the Berne<sup>c</sup> Congress<sup>150</sup> contains

<sup>a</sup> On November 3, 1864.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association*, London, 1864.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The manuscript mistakenly has "Lausanne".—*Ed.*

such absurdities as the “*equality of classes*”, “*abolition of the right of inheritance as the first step of the social revolution*”, etc.—empty babblings,<sup>a</sup> a garland of ostensibly horrifying hollow fancies, in short an insipid improvisation, calculated purely to make a certain short-lived effect. Bakunin’s friends in Paris (where a Russian<sup>b</sup> has a seat on the editorial board of the *Revue Positiviste*) and in London proclaim to the world Bakunin’s resignation from the Peace League as *un événement*<sup>c</sup> and declare his grotesque programme—that *olla podrida*<sup>d</sup> of outworn platitudes—wonderfully awe-inspiring and original.

Bakunin meanwhile had joined the *Branche Romande* of the *International* (in Geneva). It took him years to decide upon this step. But it did not take days for Monsieur Bakunin to decide to transform the *International* and turn it into an instrument of his own.

Behind the back of the London General Council—which was informed only when everything was apparently already *arranged*—he founded the so-called *Alliance des Démocrates Socialistes*.<sup>151</sup> The programme of this society<sup>e</sup> was none other than that proposed by Bakunin at the Berne Peace Congress. The society thereby proclaimed itself from the outset as a propaganda society of the specifically Bakuninist cult, and Bakunin himself, *one of the most ignorant men in the field of social theory*, suddenly appeared here as the *founder of a sect*. The theoretical programme of this Alliance was however pure farce. The serious aspect of the affair lay in its practical organisation. This society was to be *international*, with its Central Committee in *Geneva*, that is, under Bakunin’s personal direction. At the same time it was to be an “*integral*” part of the *International Working Men’s Association*. Its BRANCHES were to be represented at the “next congress” of the *International* (in Basle) and were at the same time to hold their own congress in separate sittings, *side by side with the other*, etc., etc.

The human material which at first stood at Bakunin’s disposal consisted of the majority at that time of the *Comité Fédéral*

---

<sup>a</sup> See *Deuxième Congrès de la Paix et de la Liberté convoqué pour le 22 septembre 1868 à Berne. Programme*, Berne [1868], and “Discours de M. Bakounine” in *Discours prononcés au Congrès de la Paix et de la Liberté à Berne* (1868). Par M. M. Mroczkowski et Bakounine, Geneva, 1869, pp. 5-23.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> G. N. Vyrubov.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> An event.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Hotch-potch.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> *Programme et Règlement de l’Alliance internationale de la Démocratie Socialiste*, Geneva [1868] (see this volume, pp. 207-09).—*Ed.*



*Romand* of the *International* in Geneva. J. Ph. Becker, whose propagandist zeal at times runs away with his head, was pushed forward to the front of the stage. In Italy and Spain Bakunin had a few allies.

The General Council in London was fully informed. However, it let Bakunin proceed undisturbed up to the moment when he found it necessary to send the General Council, through J. Ph. Becker, the Rules (and programme) of the *Alliance des Démocrates Socialistes* for approval. The General Council answered with a thoroughly reasoned resolution—wholly “judicial” and “objective” in tone, but full of irony in its “considerations”—which concluded as follows:

1. The General Council does *not* admit the Alliance as a branch of the *International*.

2. All the paragraphs of the Rules of the Alliance referring to its relations with the *International* are declared *null and void*.

The considerations for this resolution demonstrated clearly and forcefully that the *Alliance* was nothing but an instrument to disorganise the *International*.<sup>a</sup>

The blow was unexpected. Bakunin had already turned the *Égalité*, central organ of the French-speaking members of the *International* in Switzerland, into his *own* organ, and had, in addition, started at *Loche* a little private journal of his own, the *Progrès*. The *Progrès* is playing this role up to the present day under the editorship of a fanatical adherent of Bakunin, a certain *Guillaume*.

After several weeks' reflection the Central Committee of the Alliance finally sent its answer to the General Council, over the signature of Perron, a Genevese. In its eagerness to serve the good cause, the Alliance was ready to *sacrifice its independent organisation*, but on one condition—namely, that the General Council declare its recognition of the *Alliance's* “radical” principles.

The General Council replied: It was not its function to sit in judgment on the theoretic value of the programmes of its various sections. It had only to see that those programmes contained *nothing directly contradictory to the letter and spirit of the Rules*. It must therefore insist upon the absurd phrase about the *égalité des classes* being struck from the programme of the *Alliance* and replaced by the *abolition des classes* (which was done). For the rest, the Alliance could enter the *International* *after dissolving its own independent international organisation*, and supplying the General

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 34-36.—*Ed.*

Council with a list of all its BRANCHES<sup>a</sup> (which, *nota bene*, was not done).

The incident was therewith closed. *Nominally*, the *Alliance* dissolved itself; *actually*, it remained in existence, under the leadership of Bakunin, who at the same time controlled the Genevese *Comité Romand Fédéral* of the *International*.

To its former press organs were added the *Federacion* of Barcelona and, *after* the Basle Congress, the Naples *Eguaglianza*.

Bakunin now attempted to reach his goal—the transformation of the *International* into his personal instrument—by other means. Through our Romance Committee at Geneva he proposed to the General Council the inclusion of the “*inheritance question*” in the agenda of the Basle Congress.<sup>b</sup> The General Council agreed, in order to be able to deal a direct blow to Bakunin. Bakunin’s plan was this: the Basle Congress, in accepting the “principles” (?) put forward by Bakunin at Berne, will show the world that it is not Bakunin who has come over to the *International*, but the *International* that has gone over to Bakunin. Obvious result, the London General Council (of whose hostility to the warming up of the *vieillesse Saint-Simoniste*<sup>c</sup> Bakunin was fully aware) would have to resign and the Basle Congress would *transfer the General Council to Geneva*, that is, the *International* would come under the dictatorship of Bakunin.

Bakunin set a complete *conspiracy* going to secure a majority at the Basle Congress. Even *false* mandates were not lacking, such as Monsieur Guillaume’s mandate for Locle, etc. Bakunin himself begged mandates from Naples and Lyons. Every kind of slander against the General Council was spread abroad. Some were told that *élément bourgeois* dominated the Council, others that it was the seat of *communisme autoritaire*, etc.

The results of the Basle Congress are well known. Bakunin’s proposals were not accepted and the General Council remained in London.

The annoyance which followed this failure—perhaps Bakunin had based all kinds of private speculations on the assumption of success—found expression in the irritable comments of the *Égalité* and *Progrès*. These papers meanwhile were assuming more and more the posture of official oracles. Now one, now another Swiss section of the *International* was excommunicated because, contrary

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 45-46.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See “The *International Working Men’s Association*. Council Meeting. Tuesday, April 13 [1869]”, *The Bee-Hive*, No. 392, April 17, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Saint-Simonian old rubbish.—*Ed.*

to Bakunin's explicit instructions, it had taken part in the political movement, etc. Finally the rage against the General Council, so long restrained, broke out openly. The *Progrès* and *Égalité* derided, attacked, and declared that the General Council was not fulfilling its duties, for example in regard to the quarterly bulletin; that the General Council must give up its direct control over England and have an English Central Committee established alongside it, to deal with English affairs only; that the resolutions of the General Council on the imprisoned Fenians went beyond its functions, since it should not deal with questions of local politics. Moreover, the *Progrès* and *Égalité* took up the cudgels for Schweitzer and categorically demanded that the General Council declare itself officially and *publiquement*<sup>a</sup> on the Liebknecht-Schweitzer question. The newspaper *Le Travail* (in Paris), into which Schweitzer's Paris friends smuggled articles in his favour, was praised on that account by the *Progrès* and *Égalité*, the latter calling upon the *Travail* to make common cause against the General Council.<sup>b</sup>

The time had now come for action to be taken. What follows is an exact copy of the circular sent by the General Council to the Central Committee of the Romance Federation in Geneva. The document is too long for me to translate into German [original in French].<sup>c</sup>

*The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland in Geneva.*

At its extraordinary meeting on January 1, 1870, the General Council resolved:

1) We read in the *Égalité* of December 11, 1869:

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

The General Council does not know of any article, either in the Rules or in the Regulations, which *would oblige it* to enter into correspondence or into polemic with the *Égalité* or to provide "replies" to "questions" of any newspaper whatsoever.

*The Federal Council of Romance Switzerland* alone represents the

<sup>a</sup> Publicly.— Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *L'Égalité*, Nos. 42, 43 and 47, November 6, 13 and December 11, 1869; *Le Progrès*, No. 25, December 4, 1869.— Ed.

<sup>c</sup> See this volume, pp. 84-91.— Ed.

branches of Romance Switzerland at the General Council. When the Federal Council addresses requests or reprimands to us through the only legitimate channel, that is to say through its *secretary*, the General Council will always be ready to reply. But the Romance Federal Council has no right either to *abdicate* its functions in favour of the *Égalité* and the *Progrès*, or to let these newspapers *usurp* its functions. Generally speaking, the General Council's correspondence with the national and local committees cannot be published without greatly prejudicing the Association's general interests.

Consequently, if other organs of the *International* were to follow the example of the *Progrès* and the *Égalité*, the General Council would be faced with the alternative of either discrediting itself publicly by its silence or violating its obligations by replying publicly. The *Égalité* joins the *Progrès* in inviting *Le Travail* to demand an explanation from the General Council. That is almost a League of Public Welfare.<sup>152</sup>

2) Now, assuming that the questions put by the *Égalité* come from the Romance Federal Council, we shall reply to them, but only on condition that such questions shall not in the future be communicated to us in the same way.

### 3) Question of a Bulletin.

In the resolutions of the Geneva<sup>a</sup> Congress, which are inserted in the Regulations, it is laid down that the national committees shall send the General Council *documents* dealing with the proletarian movement<sup>b</sup> and that the General Council shall thereupon publish a bulletin in the *different languages* "as often as its means permit" ("As often as its means permit, the General Council shall publish a report, etc.")<sup>c</sup>.

The General Council's obligation was thus made dependent on *conditions* that have never been fulfilled. Even the *statistical inquiry* prescribed by the Rules, ordered by consecutive General Congresses, and demanded yearly by the General Council, has never been made. As far as the *means* are concerned, the General Council would have long since ceased to exist had it not been for local contributions from England and the personal sacrifices of its members.

<sup>a</sup> The manuscript mistakenly has "Lausanne".—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *Congrès ouvrier de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs tenu à Genève du 3 au 8 septembre 1866*, Geneva, 1866, pp. 13 and 26.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> *Rules of the International Working Men's Association*, London [1867], p. 6. (The quotation in brackets is given in English in the manuscript.)—Ed.

Thus, the Regulations passed at the Geneva<sup>a</sup> Congress have remained a dead letter.

As regards the Basle Congress, it did not discuss the *fulfilment* of an existing regulation. It discussed the possibility of issuing a bulletin in good time and *it did not pass any resolution*.

For the rest, the General Council believes that the original purpose of such a bulletin is at the moment perfectly fulfilled by the different organs of the *International* published in the different languages and exchanged among them. It would be absurd to do by costly bulletins what is being done already without any expense. On the other hand, a bulletin which would print what is not contained in the organs of the *International* would only help our enemies to see behind the scenes.

4) *Question of separating the General Council from the Federal Council for England.*

Long before the foundation of the *Égalité*, this proposition was periodically made inside the General Council by one or two of its English members.<sup>153</sup> It was always rejected almost unanimously.

Although revolutionary initiative will probably come from France, England alone can serve as the *lever* for a serious economic Revolution. It is the only country where there are no more *peasants* and where landed property is concentrated in a few hands. It is the only country where the *capitalist form*, that is to say, combined labour on a large scale under capitalist masters, now embraces virtually the whole of production. It is the only country where *the great majority of the population consists of WAGES-LABOURERS*. It is the only country where the class struggle and the organisation of the working class by the *TRADES UNIONS* have acquired a certain degree of maturity and universality. It is the only country where, because of its domination on the world market, every revolution in economic matters must immediately affect the whole world. If landlordism and capitalism are classical features in England, on the other hand, the *material conditions* for their *destruction* are the most mature here. The General Council now being in the happy position of *having its hand directly on this great lever of the proletarian revolution*, what folly, we might say even what a crime, to let this lever fall into purely English hands!

The English have all the *material* necessary for the social revolution. What they lack is *the spirit of generalisation* and *revolutionary ardour*. It is only the General Council that can provide

<sup>a</sup> The manuscript mistakenly has "Lausanne".—Ed.

them with this, that can thus accelerate the truly revolutionary movement in this country, and consequently *everywhere*. The great results we have already achieved in this respect are attested to by the most intelligent and influential of the newspapers of the ruling classes, as for example, *The Pall Mall Gazette*, *Saturday Review*, *The Spectator* and *The Fortnightly Review*, to say nothing of the so-called radicals in the *COMMONS* and the *LORDS* who, a little while ago, still exerted a great influence on the *leaders* of the English workers. They accuse us publicly of having poisoned and almost extinguished *the English spirit* of the working class and of having pushed it into revolutionary socialism.

The only way to bring about this change is to act like *the General Council of the International Association*. As the General Council we can initiate measures (for example, the founding of the *Land and Labour League*<sup>154</sup>) which later, in the process of their execution, will appear to the public as spontaneous movements of the English working class.

If a *Federal Council* were formed apart from the *General Council*, what would be the immediate results? Placed between the *General Council of the International* and the *General Council of TRADES UNIONS*,<sup>155</sup> the Federal Council would have no authority whatever. On the other hand, the *General Council of the International* would lose *control of the great lever*. If we had preferred the showman's chatter to serious and unostentatious work, we would perhaps have committed the mistake of replying publicly the *Égalité's* question as to why "the General Council permits such a burdensome combination of functions".

England cannot be treated simply as a country along with other countries. It must be treated as the *metropolis of capital*.

5) *Question of the General Council Resolutions on the Irish Amnesty.*<sup>a</sup>

If England is the *BULWARK* of landlordism and European capitalism, the only point where official England can be struck a great blow is *Ireland*.

In the first place, Ireland is the *BULWARK* of English landlordism. If it fell in Ireland, it would fall in England. In Ireland this is a hundred times easier because *the economic struggle there is concentrated exclusively on landed property*, because this struggle is at the same time *national*, and because the people there are more revolutionary and more exasperated than in England. Landlordism in Ireland is maintained solely by *the English army*. The moment the forced Union<sup>156</sup> between the two countries ends, a

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 83.—*Ed.*

social revolution will immediately break out in Ireland, though in outmoded forms. English landlordism would not only lose a great source of its wealth, but also *its greatest moral force*, i. e., *that of representing the domination of England over Ireland*. On the other hand, by maintaining the power of its landlords in Ireland, the English proletariat makes them invulnerable in England itself.

In the second place, the *English bourgeoisie* has not only exploited Irish poverty to keep down the working class in England by *forced immigration* of poor Irishmen, but it has also divided the proletariat into two hostile camps. The revolutionary fire of the Celtic worker does not go well with the solid but slow nature of the Anglo-Saxon worker. On the contrary, in *all the big industrial centres in England* there is profound antagonism between the Irish proletarian and the English proletarian. The average English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers wages and the *STANDARD OF LIFE*. He feels national and religious antipathies for him. He regards him somewhat like the *POOR WHITES* of the Southern States of North America regarded black slaves. This antagonism among the proletarians of England is artificially nourished and kept up by the bourgeoisie. It knows that this scission is the *true secret of maintaining its power*.

Moreover, this antagonism is reproduced on the other side of the Atlantic. The Irish, chased from their native soil by the bulls and the sheep, reassemble in the United States where they constitute a huge, ever-growing section of the population. Their only thought, their only passion, is hatred for England. The English and American governments—that is to say, the classes they represent—play on these feelings in order to perpetuate the *international struggle* which prevents any serious and sincere alliance between the working classes on both sides of the Atlantic, and, consequently, their common emancipation.

Ireland is the only pretext the English Government has for retaining a *big standing army*, which, if need be, as has happened before, can be used against the English workers after having done its military training in Ireland.

Lastly, England today is seeing a repetition of what happened on a monstrous scale in ancient Rome. Any people that oppresses another people forges its own chains.

Thus, the position of the International Association with regard to the Irish question is very clear. Its first concern is to advance the social revolution in England. To this end a great blow must be struck in Ireland.

The General Council's resolutions on the Irish amnesty<sup>a</sup> serve only as an introduction to other resolutions<sup>157</sup> which will affirm that, quite apart from international justice, it is a *precondition to the emancipation of the English working class* to transform the present *forced Union*—i. e., the enslavement of Ireland—into *equal and free confederation* if possible, into *complete separation* if need be.

For the rest, the doctrines of the *Égalité* and the *Progrès* on the CONNEXION, or rather, the NON-CONNEXION, between the social movement and the political movement have never, as far as we know, been recognised by any of our Congresses. *They run counter to our Rules.* The Rules say:

“That the *economical emancipation* of the working classes is [...] the great end *to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means.*”<sup>b</sup>

The words “*as a means*”<sup>c</sup> were *omitted* in the French translation made in 1864 by the Paris Committee.<sup>d</sup> When questioned by the General Council, the Paris Committee excused itself by the difficulties of its political situation.

There are other mutilations of the authentic text of the Rules. Thus, the first clause of the preamble to the Rules reads:

“The struggle for the emancipation of the working classes means ... a struggle ... for *equal rights and duties*, and the *abolition of all class rule.*”<sup>e</sup>

The Paris translation has “equal rights and duties”, that is it reproduced the general phrase which may be found virtually *in all democratic manifestoes* of the last hundred years and which means different things in the mouth of different classes, but *leaves out* the concrete demand: “*the abolition of classes*”.

Further, in the second clause of the preamble to the Rules we read: “That the economical subjection of the *man of labour* to the *monopoliser of the means of labour*, that is, *the sources of life*, etc.”

The Paris translation substitutes the word “*capital*” for “*the means of labour, that is, the sources of life*”, an expression which includes the land as well as the other means of labour.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 3-4 and 83.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Here and below quotations from the Provisional Rules are given in English in the manuscript (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 14).—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Marx uses the English phrase and gives the French equivalent “*comme moyen*” in brackets.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *Congrès ouvrier. Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Règlement Provisoire* [Paris, 1864], p. 1.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> See present edition, Vol. 20, p. 14.—*Ed.*



The original authentic text was restored in the French translation published in Brussels in 1866.<sup>a</sup>

6) *Liebknecht-Schweitzer Question.*

The *Égalité* writes:

“Both these groups belong to the *International*”. That is incorrect. The Eisenachers’ group (which the *Progrès* and the *Égalité* would like to turn into Citizen Liebknecht’s group) belongs to the *International*. *Schweitzer’s group does not belong to it.*

Schweitzer himself explained at length in his newspaper, the *Social-Demokrat*, why the *Lassallean organisation* could not join the *International* without destroying itself.<sup>b</sup> Without realising it, he was speaking the truth: His artificial *sectarian organisation* is opposed to the *real organisation* of the working class.

The *Progrès* and the *Égalité* have summoned the General Council to state publicly its “*opinion*” on the personal differences between Liebknecht and Schweitzer. Since Citizen *J. Ph. Becker* (who is *slandered* as much as Liebknecht in Schweitzer’s paper<sup>c</sup>) is a member of the *Égalité’s editorial board*, it seems most strange that its editors are not better informed about the facts. They should have known that Liebknecht, in the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, publicly invited Schweitzer to accept the *General Council* as *arbiter of their differences*,<sup>d</sup> and that Schweitzer no less publicly refused to acknowledge the authority of the General Council.<sup>e</sup>

The General Council has employed all possible means to put an end to this scandal. It instructed its Secretary for Germany<sup>f</sup> to correspond with Schweitzer; this has been done, but all attempts by the Council have broken down in the face of Schweitzer’s firm resolution to preserve at all cost his autocratic power together with the *sectarian organisation*.

It is up to the General Council to determine the favourable moment when *its public intervention* in this quarrel will be more useful than damaging.<sup>g</sup>

*By order of the General Council etc.”*

<sup>a</sup> *Manifeste de l’Association Internationale des Travailleurs suivi du Règlement provisoire*, Bruxelles, 1866, pp. 15-18.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> A reference to the leading article in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 82, July 16, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 24, February 24, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> W. Liebknecht, “Erklärung. Leipzig, 18. Februar 1869”, *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 8, February 20, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 24, February 24, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> Karl Marx.—*Ed.*

<sup>g</sup> In his “Confidential Communication” Marx omitted Point 7 of the circular.—*Ed.*

The French Committees (although Bakunin had been actively intriguing in Lyons and Marseilles and had won over a few young hotheads), as well as the *Conseil Général Belge*<sup>a</sup> (Brussels), have *fully endorsed* this circular of the General Council.

The copy for Geneva was delayed somewhat (because Jung, Secretary for Switzerland, was very busy). It therefore crossed with an official letter from Perret, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Romance Federation in Geneva, to the General Council.<sup>158</sup>

The crisis had broken out in Geneva before the arrival of our letter. Some members of the editorial board of the *Égalité* had opposed the policy dictated by Bakunin. Bakunin and his followers (including six editors of the *Égalité*) wanted to force the Geneva *Central Committee* to dismiss the unruly members. The Geneva Committee, however, had long grown tired of Bakunin's despotism and saw itself with great displeasure being forced by him into opposition to the other German-Swiss Committees, the General Council, etc. It therefore endorsed the attitude of those members of the *Égalité* editorial board who opposed Bakunin. Thereupon Bakunin's six followers resigned from the editorial board, hoping thereby to put an end to the publication of the paper.<sup>b</sup>

In answer to our letter the Geneva Central Committee declared that the attacks in the *Égalité* had been made without its approval, that it had never endorsed the policy preached therein and that in future the paper would be edited under the strict supervision of the Committee, etc.<sup>159</sup>

Bakunin thereupon retired from Geneva to Ticino. As far as Switzerland is concerned, he now has a say only in the *Progrès* (Locle).

Shortly afterwards Herzen died. Bakunin, who from the time that he decided to set himself up as *director of the European workers' movement* had denied his old friend and patron Herzen, hastened to sing his praises immediately after his death.<sup>c</sup> Why? Herzen, though personally wealthy, allowed the pseudo-socialist, Pan-Slavist party in Russia, which was friendly towards him, to pay him 25,000 francs annually for propaganda. By his paean of praise Bakunin directed this stream of money to *himself* and—*malgré sa haine de l'héritage*<sup>d</sup>—thereby entered financially and morally upon the "*Herzen heritage*" *sine beneficio inventarii*.<sup>e 160</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Belgian General Council.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> See *L'Égalité*, Nos. 2 and 3, January 8 and 15, 1870.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> Marx means Bakunin's tribute to Herzen published in the form of letters in *La Marseillaise*, Nos. 72 and 73, March 2 and 3, 1870, and reprinted in *Le Progrès*, Nos. 10, 11 and 12, March 5, 12 and 19, 1870.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> Despite his hatred of inheritance.—Ed.

<sup>e</sup> Without benefit of inventory.—Ed.

At the same time a COLONY of young Russian REFUGEES settled in Geneva, students whose intentions are really honest and whose sincerity is proved by the adoption of the *fight against Pan-Slavism* as the chief point of their programme.<sup>a</sup>

They publish a paper in Geneva called *La Cause du Peuple*.<sup>b</sup> ABOUT two weeks ago they applied to London, sending in their Programme and Statutes,<sup>c</sup> and requesting permission to form a Russian branch.<sup>161</sup> Permission was given.

In a separate letter to Marx they asked him to represent them provisionally on the General Council. That too was done.<sup>d</sup> At the same time they indicated—and apparently *wished to excuse themselves* to Marx on this account—that in the immediate future they would have to expose Bakunin publicly, since the man spoke in *two entirely different tongues*, one in Russia, another in Europe.<sup>162</sup>

The game of this very dangerous intriguer—at least in the domain of the *International*—will soon be played out.

Written on about March 28, 1870

First published in *Die Neue Zeit*, Vol. 2,  
No. 15, 1902

Printed according to the manu-  
script

Translated from the German and  
the French

---

<sup>a</sup> "Pervaya russkaya sektsiya. Programma", *Narodnoye Dyelo*, No. 1, April 15, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Narodnoye Dyelo*.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> "Ustav russkoi sektsii", *Narodnoye Dyelo*, No. 1, April 15, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See this volume, pp. 110-11.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[TO THE INTERNATIONAL METALWORKERS' SOCIETY]<sup>163</sup>

London, April 18, 1870

Dear Friends,

About a fortnight ago<sup>a</sup> the Executive Committee of the AMALGAMATED ENGINEERS finally invited the General Council of the International Working Men's Association to send delegates to discuss the establishment of direct links with the metalworkers in Germany and the engineers in Paris. They now request you to answer the following questions before they come to a decision about you:

- 1) The number of hours of work per day?
- 2) How many working days a week? Is Sunday a working day?
- 3) The amount of wages?
- 4) Is overtime paid and at what rates?
- 5) The number of members?
- 6) How much is their contribution per week?
- 7) Has the trade union anything to do with funds for sick relief, etc.?
- 8) Which trades are covered by the union?

With fraternal greetings

*Karl Marx*

Written on April 18, 1870

First published in *Die Tagwacht*, No. 16,  
May 5, 1870

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Published in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>a</sup> On April 7.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
ON *THE BEE-HIVE*]<sup>164</sup>

Considering,

1) that the different International sections of the Continent and the United States have been advised by the General Council of the International Working Men's Association to subscribe to the *Bee-Hive* newspaper as the official organ of the General Council and the representative in the English press of the Working-Class movement<sup>a</sup>;

2) that the *Bee-Hive* has not only erased from the official reports of the General Council such resolutions as might displease its patrons, but, by way of suppression, has systematically misrepresented the tenor of consecutive sittings of the General Council;

3) that mainly since its recent change of proprietorship,<sup>165</sup> while still pretending to be the exclusive organ of the working class, the *Bee-Hive* has, in reality, become the organ of a capitalist fraction who want to keep the proletarian movement in their leading strings and use it as a means for the furtherance of their own class and party purposes;

The General Council of the International Working Men's Association, in its sitting of the 26th of April 1870, has unanimously resolved to sever its connection with the *Bee-Hive*, and to publicly announce this resolution to its different sections in England, on the Continent, and in the United States.

Drawn up in early May 1870

Adopted by the General Council  
on May 17, 1870

First published in *Der Volksstaat*,  
No. 38, May 11, 1870

Reproduced from Marx's manu-  
script pasted into the Minute Book  
of the General Council

<sup>a</sup> *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association*, London, 1864, p. 15.—Ed.

## Karl Marx

### [CONCERNING THE PERSECUTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE FRENCH SECTIONS]<sup>166</sup>

#### DECLARATION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

On the occasion of the last pretended complot, the French Government has not only arrested many members of our Paris and Lyons sections, but 'insinuated by its organs that the *International Working Men's Association* is an accomplice of that pretended complot.<sup>a</sup>

According to the tenor of our Statutes, it is certainly the special mission of all our branches in England, on the Continent, and in the United States, to act not only as centres for the organisation of the working class, but also to aid, in their different countries, all political movements tending to the accomplishment of our ultimate end, viz., the *economical emancipation of the working class*. At the same time, these Statutes bind all the sections of our Association to act in open daylight. If our Statutes were not formal on that point, the very nature of an Association which identifies itself with the working classes, would exclude from it every form of secret society. If the working classes, who form the great bulk of all nations, who produce all their wealth, and in the name of whom even the usurping powers always pretend to rule, conspire, they conspire publicly, as the sun conspires against darkness, in the full consciousness that without their pale there exists no legitimate power.

If the other incidents of the complot denounced by the French Government are as false and unfounded as its insinuations against

---

<sup>a</sup> See *Le Moniteur universel*, Nos. 121, 122, 125, 128, May 1, 2, 5, 8, 1870; *La Presse*, May 2, 1870; *Le Constitutionnel*, May 1, 1870; *Le Figaro*, No. 122, May 2, 1870.—Ed.

the *International Working Men's Association*, this last complot will worthily range with its two predecessors of grotesque memory.<sup>167</sup> The noisy and violent measures against our French sections are exclusively intended serving one single purpose—*the manipulation of the plebiscite*.

Adopted by the General Council on  
May 3, 1870

First published as a pamphlet, *Declaration  
of the General Council of the International  
Working Men's Association*, on May 4,  
1870

Reproduced from Marx's manu-  
script pasted into the Minute  
Book of the General Council,  
and checked with the text of the  
pamphlet

who withdrew his assurance of support to, & sympathies with the Association, Cit. Jung announced the receipt of a letter from a young Belgian professor residing at present in Wallis, who desired to become a member of the Association & act as one of its most devoted Champions.

A letter from Cit. Richard of Lyons announced the formation of a new section at Richard, H. Cit. Pörlin was travelling to establish new branches. The letter contained a cheque for G.L. 48. 0. of which 10fr were for the St. Etienne section the rest for Lyons.

Cit. Mars then called the attention of the Committee to the circumstances that many members of the Association had been arrested in France & that the government papers had endeavoured to spread it abroad that the Association was implicated in a pretended plot against the Emperor. To refute these insinuations he proposed the following:

On the occasion of the last pretended Complot, the French government has not only arrested many members of our Paris sections, but sections do incriminate with charges that the International Workingmen's Association is an accomplice of that pretended Complot. According to the terms of our Statutes, it is contrary to the expressed mission of these Complots, in legal, on the Continent, and in the United States, to act not only as centres for the organization of the working class, but also to act, in these different countries, all political movements leading to the accomplishment of our ultimate end, viz. the economical emancipation of the working class. At the same time, these Statutes bind all the sections of our Association to act in the <sup>open and</sup> light of day if our Statutes were not formal on that point, the very nature of an Association which identifies itself with the working classes, would exclude from it, any form of secret society. If the working classes, who form the great bulk of all nations, who produce all their wealth, and in the new republic are the missing power always pushed aside, oppressed, they compare publicly in the sun compare against darkness, in the full consciousness that without these powers there is no real, no rational power. If the other incidents of the Complot denounced by the French government are as false and unfounded as its insinuations against the International Workingmen's Association, the last Complot will wither by being with its two predecessors of yesterday meeting. The rising and violent movements against our French sections are exclusively intended serving one single purpose — the manipulation of the public mind.

Cit. Mars then concluded the proposal, which was adopted unanimously.

Page of the Minute Book with Marx's manuscript  
of "Concerning the Persecution  
of the Members of the French Sections"





## Karl Marx

[DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
ON THE "FRENCH FEDERAL SECTION IN LONDON"]<sup>168</sup>

Considering,

that addresses, resolutions and manifestoes emanating from a *French society in London* which styles itself: "*International Working Men's Association, French Federal Branch*", have recently been published by continental papers and ascribed to the "*International Working Men's Association*"<sup>169</sup>;

that the "*International Working Men's Association*" is at present undergoing severe persecutions on the part of the Austrian and French Governments which eagerly catch at the most flimsy pretexts for justifying such persecutions;

that under these circumstances the General Council would incur a serious responsibility in allowing any society not belonging to the "*International*" to use and act in its name;

the General Council hereby declares that the so-called *London French Federal Branch* has since two years ceased to form part of the "*International*" and to have any connection whatever with the General Council in London or any Branch<sup>a</sup> of that Association on the continent.

London, 10 May 1870

Adopted by the General Council on  
May 10, 1870

First published in *The Penny Bee-Hive*,  
No. 418, May 14, 1870

Reproduced from Marx's manu-  
script pasted into the Minute Book  
of the General Council

<sup>a</sup> The words "in London or any Branch" and "on the continent" were inserted by Eccarius when the resolution was being discussed by the General Council.—*Ed.*

## Karl Marx

[RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
ON THE CONVOCAION OF THE CONGRESS  
IN MAINZ]<sup>170</sup>

Considering,

That by the Basle Congress Paris was appointed as the meeting-place for this year's Congress of the International Working Men's Association;

That the present French regime continuing, the Congress will not be able to meet at Paris;

That nevertheless the preparations for the meeting render an immediate resolution necessary;

That article 3 of the Statutes obliges the Council to change, in case of need, the place of meeting appointed by the Congress<sup>a</sup>;

That the Central Committee of the German Social-Democratic Working Men's Party has invited the General Council to transfer this year's Congress to Germany<sup>171</sup>;

The General Council has in its sitting of the 17th of May unanimously resolved that this year's Congress of the International Working Men's Association be opened on the 5th September next and meet at Mayence.

Adopted by the General Council on  
May 17, 1870

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published in *Der Volksstaat*, No. 42,  
May 25, 1870

---

<sup>a</sup> *Rules of the International Working Men's Association*, London [1867], p. 4.—Ed

## Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

### TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE GERMAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC WORKERS' PARTY<sup>172</sup>

86 Mornington Street,  
Stockport Road, Manchester  
London, June 14, 1870

*Dear Friends,*

Today I received a letter from Stumpf (Mainz), in which he says, among other things:

"Liebknecht authorises me to write to you that because of the Reichstag elections, which are to be held precisely at that time, it might be better to hold the congress here on October 5. Last Monday<sup>a</sup> the congress in Stuttgart<sup>173</sup> also came out in favour of October 5. I hear that Geib is authorised to write to you in this matter."

Liebknecht and the other members of the International ought at least to be familiar with its Rules, which expressly state:

"§ 3. The General Council may, in case of need, change *the place*, but *has no power to postpone the time of meeting.*"<sup>b</sup>

When I spoke in the General Council in favour of your urgent invitation to have the congress moved to Germany, I naturally assumed that you had taken all the circumstances into consideration. According to the Rules there can be no question of postponing the congress.

Another passage in Stumpf's letter is also far from reassuring. In it he says:

"I have just come from the Burgomaster. He wants a solvent citizen to guarantee that *if the Schweitzer people were to start a fighting*, the town would be recompensed for any damage in the Electoral Hall of Marble, which has been promised to us for the congress, etc."

<sup>a</sup> June 6.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Rules of the International Working Men's Association*, London [1867], p. 4. Italics by Marx and Engels.—*Ed.*

You proposed the towns of Mainz, Darmstadt or Mannheim, thus in fact assuming, vis-à-vis the General Council, the responsibility of ensuring that the congress can be held in any of these towns without scandalous scenes which would make the International, and the German working class in particular, the laughing-stock of the whole world. I hope that you have taken all the necessary precautions in this respect.

What is the numerical proportion of Schweitzer supporters in Mainz and district to your own people?

In the event that a scandal cannot be avoided, steps must be taken in advance to ensure that it rebounds on its instigators. The *plan of the Prussian police* to obstruct the international congress in Mainz—which they are unable to prevent from convening by direct means—through their tool, the Schweitzer organisation, or to prevent the peaceful holding of its sessions, must be denounced in the *Volksstaat, Zukunft* and in other German papers open to us. As soon as this had been done in Germany, the General Council would then arrange for similar articles to be published in London, Paris, etc. The International can stand a conflict with Mr. Bismarck, but not alleged *spontaneous* “typical German factional brawls between workers” labelled “struggles of principle”.

I daresay that Stumpf—in collaboration with you—will see to it that the delegates find cheap lodgings.

*Salut et fraternité*

Karl Marx

I take this opportunity of sending the Committee my kindest regards. Ever since the Schweitzerites in Forst informed the Burgomaster *in advance* of their intention to create mayhem and he allowed matters to take their course, the connection between these gentlemen and the police is an *established fact*. Perhaps Stumpf could enquire of the Schweitzerites through the Burgomaster of Mainz whether they have been instructed “to fight”. It is anyway high time these people were exposed in the press everywhere as police agents pure and simple, and next time they try their hand at “fighting” they should be given a taste of their own medicine. This is naturally out of the question at the congress, but in the meantime they can be given a thrashing fit to put them off fighting for good. The manner in which Herr Bismarck is portraying these things in the English press is evident from the enclosed cutting, which is doing the rounds of all the

papers. The *North German Correspondence* is an organ founded by Bismarck with Guelphic money.<sup>174</sup>

With kindest regards

F. Engels

Written on June 14, 1870

First published in *Der Volksstaat*, No. 51,  
June 26, 1872

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Published in English for the first  
time

Karl Marx

GENERAL COUNCIL RESOLUTION  
ON THE FEDERAL COMMITTEE  
OF ROMANCE SWITZERLAND<sup>175</sup>

THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE ROMANCE  
FEDERAL COMMITTEE

Considering,

That although a majority of delegates at the Chaux-de-Fonds Congress elected a new Romance Federal Committee, this majority was only nominal;

That the Romance Federal Committee in Geneva, having always fulfilled its obligations to the General Council and to the International Working Men's Association, and having always acted in conformity with the Association's Rules, the General Council does not have the right to relieve it of its title,

The General Council, at its meeting of June 28, 1870, unanimously resolved that the Romance Federal Committee residing in Geneva shall retain its title, and that the Federal Committee residing in Chaux-de-Fonds shall select another, local title of its own choosing.

In the name and by order of the General Council of the  
International Working Men's Association,

*H. Jung,*  
Secretary for Switzerland

London, June 29, 1870

Adopted at the General Council meeting  
of June 28, 1870

Printed according to the news-  
paper

First published in *Le Mirabeau*, No. 53,  
July 24, 1870

Translated from the French.

Karl Marx

THE LOCK-OUT OF THE BUILDING TRADES  
AT GENEVA<sup>176</sup>

THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION  
TO THE WORKING MEN AND WOMEN  
OF EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES

Fellow-Workers,

The Master Builders of Geneva have, after mature consideration, arrived at the conclusion that "the entire Freedom of Labour"<sup>a</sup> is best calculated to promote the happiness of the labouring poor. In order to secure this blessing to their work-people, they resolved to carry into practice, on June 11th, a trick of English invention, viz., the lock-out of upwards of 3,000 mechanics till then in their employ.

Trade Unionism being of recent growth in Switzerland, the same master builders of Geneva used to indignantly denounce it as an English importation. Two years ago, they taunted their men with a lack of Patriotism for trying to transplant on Swiss soil such an exotic plant as the limitation of the working day with fixed rates of wages per hour. They never doubted but there must be some keen mischief-mongers behind the scene, since their own native workmen, if left to themselves, would naturally like nothing better than drudging from twelve to fourteen hours a day for whatever pay the master might find it in his heart to allow. The deluded men, they publicly asserted, were acting under dictation from London and Paris, much the same as Swiss diplomatists are wont to obey the behests from St. Petersburg, Berlin, and Paris. However, the men were not to be cajoled, taunted, or intimidated into the persuasion that limiting the daily hours of toil to ten, and fixing the rate of wages per hour was something derogatory to the

---

<sup>a</sup> Here and below Marx describes the builders' strike of 1868 according to J. Ph. Becker's book *Die Internationale Arbeiter-Association und die Arbeitseinstellung in Genf im Frühjahr 1868*, Geneva, 1868, pp. 6, 7, 38 and 39.—Ed.



dignity of a Free Citizen, nor could they by any provocation be inveigled into acts of violence affording the masters a plausible pretext for enforcing public repressive measures against the unions.

At last, in May, 1868, M. Camperio, the then Minister of Justice and Police, brought about an agreement that the hours of labour should be nine a day in winter, and eleven a day in summer, wages varying from forty-five to fifty centimes an hour. That agreement was signed in the presence of the Minister by both masters and men. In the spring of 1869 some masters refused to pay more wages for a day's labour of eleven hours, than they had paid during winter for nine hours. The matter was again compromised by making 45 centimes an hour, the uniform rate of wages for artisans in the building trade. Although clearly comprised in this settlement, the plasterers and painters had to toil away on the old conditions because they were not then yet sufficiently organised to enforce the new ones. On the 15th of May last, they claimed to be put on a level with the other trades, and on the flat refusal of the masters, struck work the following week. On the 4th of June, the master builders resolved that if the plasterers and painters did not return to work on the 9th, the whole of the building operatives should be locked out on the 11th. This menace was carried into effect. Not satisfied with having locked out the men, the masters publicly called upon the federal government to forcibly dissolve the union<sup>a</sup> and expel the foreigners from Switzerland.<sup>177</sup> Their benevolent and truly liberal attempts at restoring the freedom of labour, were, however, baffled by a monster meeting, and a protest on the part of the Swiss non-building operatives.<sup>178</sup>

The other Geneva trades have formed a committee to manage the affairs for the men locked-out. Some house owners who had contracted for new buildings with the master builders, considered the contracts broken, and invited the men employed on them to continue the work as if nothing had happened. This proposal was at once accepted. Many single men are leaving Geneva as fast as they can. Still there remain some 2,000 families deprived of their usual means of subsistence.<sup>b</sup> The General Council of the International Working Men's Association, therefore, calls upon all honest working men and women, throughout the civilised world, to assist

---

<sup>a</sup> The French text has: "International Association".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See *L'Égalité*, No. 24, June 18, 1870.—*Ed.*

both by moral and material means the Geneva building trades in their just struggle against capitalist despotism.

By order of the Council,

*B. Lucraft, Chairman*  
*John Weston, Treasurer*  
*George Eccarius, Gen. Sec.*

256, High Holborn, London, W.C.,  
July 5th, 1870

Adopted by the General Council on  
July 5, 1870

Reproduced from the leaflet

First published as a leaflet

## Frederick Engels

### [NOTES FOR THE PREFACE TO A COLLECTION OF IRISH SONGS]<sup>179</sup>

Some of the Irish folk-melodies are of ancient origin, others have emerged in the last 300-400 years, a good number as late as the last century, many of these composed by Carolan, one of the last Irish bards. These bards, or harpists—poets, composers and singers in one person—used to be very numerous: every Irish chieftain kept his own at his castle. Many also travelled around the country as wandering minstrels, persecuted by the English, who quite rightly saw in them the main bearers of the national, anti-English tradition. The old songs about the victories of Finn Mac Cumhal (whom Macpherson stole from the Irish and turned into a Scot under the name of Fingal in his *Ossian*,<sup>a 180</sup> which is entirely based on these Irish songs), about the splendour of the old royal palace of Tara, about the heroic feats of King Brian Borumha, and the later songs about the struggles of the Irish chieftains against the Sassenach (English) were preserved by these bards in the living memory of the nation; and they also celebrated in song the deeds of contemporary Irish chieftains in their struggle for independence. But when the Irish people were utterly crushed in the seventeenth century by Elizabeth, James I, Oliver Cromwell and William of Orange,<sup>b</sup> robbed of their land holdings in favour of English intruders, outlawed and turned into a nation of pariahs, the wandering minstrels were hounded as fiercely as the Catholic priests, and towards the beginning of this century

---

<sup>a</sup> [J. Macpherson,] *Fingal, an Ancient Epic Poem in Six Books, together with Several Other Poems composed by Ossian, the Son of Fingal, translated from the Gaelic Language (in The Works of Ossian, 1765).*—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> William III.—Ed.

they gradually died out. Their names are forgotten, of their verses only fragments remain; the most beautiful legacy which they bequeathed to their enslaved but undefeated people are their melodies.

Poems in the Irish language are all composed in stanzas of four lines. For this reason, most of the melodies, especially the older ones, are based on this four-line rhythm, although the link is often somewhat obscured. This rhythm is often followed by a refrain or a coda on the harp. Many of these old melodies are known only by their Irish names or opening words, even though in most of Ireland Irish is now only understood by old people, or not at all. But the greater part of the melodies, being more recent, already have English names or texts.

The melancholy that prevails in most of these melodies is even today the expression of the national mood. How could it be otherwise among a people whose rulers are always inventing new, more up-to-date methods of oppression? The latest method, introduced forty years ago and carried to extremes for the past twenty years, is the mass eviction of the Irish from house and home, and that—in Ireland—is tantamount to deportation. Since 1841 the population of the country has decreased by two and a half million, and more than three million Irishmen have emigrated. All in the interests and at the behest of the large landowners of English origin. If this goes on for another thirty years, the only Irishmen left will be those in America.

Written on about July 5, 1870

Printed according to the manuscript

First published, in Italian, in the journal  
*Movimento Operaio*, No. 2, Milan, 1955

Karl Marx

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION TO ALL SECTIONS<sup>181</sup>

1) The General Council requests all sections to give their delegates formal instructions concerning the advisability of changing the venue of the General Council for 1870-71.

2) In the event of agreement on the change, the General Council will propose Brussels as the venue for the General Council that year.

Written on July 14, 1870

First published in Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16,  
Moscow, 1960

Printed according to the manu-  
script

Translated from the French

Karl Marx

PROGRAMME FOR THE MAINZ CONGRESS  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL<sup>182</sup>

- 1) On the need to abolish the public debt. Discussion of the right to equitable compensation.
- 2) Relationship between the political action and the social movement of the working class.<sup>183</sup>
- 3) Practical means of converting landed property into social property (*see Note*).
- 4) On the conversion of banks of issue into national banks.
- 5) Conditions of cooperative production on a national scale.
- 6) On the need for the working class to draw up *general statistics of labour*, in conformity with the Geneva Congress resolutions of 1866.<sup>a</sup>
- 7) Reconsideration by the Congress of the question of the means to do away with war.

*Note to Point 3: The Belgian General Council* has proposed this question:

“The practical means of forming *agricultural sections* within the *International* and of establishing solidarity between agricultural proletarians and proletarians of other industries.”

---

<sup>a</sup> See *The International Working Men's Association. Resolutions of the Congress of Geneva, 1866, and the Congress of Brussels, 1868*, London [1869], p. 4.—Ed.

The *General Council of the International Association* believes this question is contained in Point 3.

Written on July 14, 1870

Printed according to the manuscript

First published as a leaflet, *The Fifth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association*, on July 12, 1870

Translated from the French

Frederick Engels

[THE HISTORY OF IRELAND]<sup>184</sup>



Written between May and the first half of  
July 1870

First published in *Marx-Engels Archives*,  
Russian edition, Vol. X, Moscow, 1948

Printed according to the manu-  
script

### NATURAL CONDITIONS

The country whose history is to occupy us is situated in the north-western corner of Europe, an island of 1,530 German or 32,500 English square miles. But between Ireland and the rest of Europe another island lies transversally, three times the size, which we for brevity's sake usually refer to as England; it completely encloses Ireland from the north, east and south-east, only leaving it a clear view in the direction of Spain, Western France and America.

The channel between the two islands, 50-70 English miles wide at the narrowest points in the south, 13 miles wide at one place in the north and 22 miles at another, enabled the Irish Scots in the north to emigrate to the neighbouring island and found the Kingdom of Scotland even before the 5th century. In the south it was too wide for the boats of the Irish and the Britons and even posed a serious obstacle to the Romans' flat-bottomed coasting vessels. But when the Frisians, Angles and Saxons, and after them the Scandinavians, ventured out on to the high seas, out of sight of land, in their keeled vessels, this channel was no longer an obstacle. Ireland became the object of raids by the Scandinavians and easy prey for the English. As soon as the Normans had formed a strong, uniform government in England, the influence of the larger neighbouring island made itself felt—in those days this meant a war of conquest.<sup>185</sup>

Then, in the course of the war, there followed a period when England attained supremacy at sea, thus ruling out the possibility of successful foreign intervention.

Once the whole of the larger island was finally united in a single state, it was then bound to attempt the complete assimilation of Ireland, too.

If this assimilation has succeeded, the whole process belongs to history. History is its judge, but it could never be reversed. If, however, assimilation has *failed* after seven hundred years of struggle; if instead all the intruders who swept in over Ireland in waves, one after the other, were assimilated by *Ireland*; if, even at present, the Irish are no more English, or "West Britons", as they are called, than the Poles are West Russians after a mere century of oppression; if the struggle is still not at an end and there is no prospect of any end at all except through the extermination of the oppressed RACE—if all this is so, then all the geographical excuses in the world will not suffice to prove that England's calling is to conquer Ireland.

---

In order to understand the soil conditions of present-day Ireland, we must go back a long way, right back to the age when the so-called carboniferous system was formed.\*

The centre of Ireland, north and south of the line from Dublin to Galway, forms a wide plain at an average height of 100-300 feet above sea-level. This plain, the ground-plan—as it were—of all Ireland, comprises the massive layer of limestone, which forms the middle stratum of the carboniferous system (CARBONIFEROUS LIMESTONE) and immediately on top of which lie the coal-bearing strata (the COAL-MEASURES<sup>a</sup> proper) in England and elsewhere.

In the south, as in the north, this plain is surrounded by a mountain chain which mainly follows the coastline and almost exclusively consists of older rock formations, which have broken through the limestone: granite, mica-schist, Cambrian, Cambro-Silurian, Upper Silurian, Devonian and the argillaceous schist and sandstone, rich in copper and lead, belonging to the bottom layer of the carboniferous system and containing, in addition, some gold, silver, tin, zinc, iron, cobalt, antimony glance, and manganese.

Only in a few places is the limestone itself high enough to form mountains: in the centre of the plain, in Queen's County,<sup>186</sup> rising to 600 feet, and in the west, on the southern shore of Galway Bay, rising to just over 1,000 feet (Burren Hills).

---

\* Unless otherwise stated, the geological data given here are taken from: J. Beete Jukes, *The Student's Manual of Geology*, New Edition, Edinburgh, 1862. Jukes was the local director of the geological survey of Ireland and is therefore the leading authority on this topic, which he treats in particular detail.

<sup>a</sup> The terms in small caps are given in English in the manuscript after their German equivalents.—Ed.

Recherchungen.

Die bei den Untersuchungen in England... 22,500  
und... 22,500  
...

beim...  
...

...

...

...



In several places in the southern half of the limestone plain there are isolated ranges of 700-1,000 feet [above] sea-level and of considerable extent, formed by the coal-bearing strata. They occur in synclines in the surface of the limestone, protruding from it as plateaus with fairly steep sides.

"The escarpments in these widely separated tracts of coal-measures are so similar, and the beds composing them so precisely alike, that it is impossible to suppose otherwise than that they originally formed continuous sheets of rock, although they are now separated by sixty or eighty miles.... This belief is strongly confirmed by the fact, that there are often, between the two larger areas, several little outlying patches in which the coal-measures are found capping the summits of small hills [...] and that wherever the undulation of the limestone is such as to bring its upper beds down beneath the level of the present surface of the ground, we invariably find some of the lower beds of the coal-measures coming in upon them" (Jukes, p. 286).<sup>a</sup>

Yet other factors, which would lead us into too much detail here and can be found in Jukes, pp. 286-89, leave no doubt that, as Jukes says, the entire central plain of Ireland is a result of denudation, so that, the coal-measures and the upper limestone deposits having been washed away—an average thickness of at least 2,000-3,000 feet, perhaps 5,000-6,000 feet of stone,—it is now principally the bottom layers of limestone that have emerged on the surface. Even on the highest ridge of the Burren Hills, County Clare, which consist of pure limestone and are 1,000 feet high, Jukes found (p. 513) yet another small outcrop of the coal-measures.

In fact, in the south of Ireland there are still some fairly significant tracts possessing coal-measures; but among them only isolated spots contain coal thick enough to make mining worthwhile. Moreover, the coal itself is anthracitic, i.e. it contains little hydrogen and cannot be used for all industrial purposes without additives.

In the north of Ireland there are also several not very extensive coalfields whose coal is bituminous, i.e. ordinary pit-coal rich in hydrogen, and whose stratification does not entirely match that of the coal districts further south. It is, however, quite evident that the coal-measures were washed away here too: large pieces of coal, along with sandstone and blue clay from the same formation, have been found on the surface of a limestone valley to the south-east of one of these coalfields in the direction of Belturbet and Mohill. Large blocks of coal have frequently been found in the course of well-sinking in the drift of this area; and, in some cases, the

---

<sup>a</sup> J. Beete Jukes, *The Student's Manual of Geology*, pp. 285-86.—Ed.

amounts of coal were so considerable that it was thought that deeper excavation would lead to a coal seam (Kane, *Industrial Resources of Ireland*, 2nd edition, Dublin, 1845, p. 265).

It can be seen that Ireland's misfortune is ancient indeed: it commences immediately after the coal-measures were deposited. A country whose coal deposits have been washed away, situated right next to a larger country with plenty of coal, was for a long time condemned by nature, as it were, to play the part of a farming land vis-à-vis the future industrial country. This sentence, pronounced millions of years ago, was not carried out until this century. What is more, we shall see later how the English gave nature a helping hand by immediately and violently trampling underfoot almost any sign of burgeoning industry in Ireland.

More recent Secondary and Tertiary deposits<sup>187</sup> occur almost solely in the north-east; among them of chief interest to us are the Keuper strata in the Belfast area, which contain more or less pure rock-salt to a thickness of up to 200 feet (Jukes, p. 554), and the chalk, which covers the whole of County Antrim, the chalk itself being overlaid with basalt. Generally speaking, the history of Ireland's geological development came to a halt from the end of the Carboniferous Period to the Ice Age.

It is known that after the end of the Tertiary Epoch there was a period when the lowlands of the middle latitudes of Europe were submerged beneath the sea and when such cold temperatures prevailed in Europe that the valleys of the islands of mountain still protruding were covered with glaciers right down to the sea. The icebergs, which detached themselves from these glaciers, carried large and small boulders from the mountains out to sea, until the ice melted and the boulders and other debris transported by the ice sank to the bottom—a process that still occurs daily along the coasts of the polar regions.

During the Ice Age Ireland, too, with the exception of the mountain tops, was submerged beneath the sea. The maximum extent of this submergence may not have been the same everywhere, but one may assume it to have been, on average, about 1,000 feet below the present level; the granite mountains to the south of Dublin must have been submerged by over 1,200 feet.

If Ireland were to sink only 500 feet, the mountain ranges alone would be left, forming two semi-circular groups of islands on either side of a broad sound stretching from Dublin to Galway. Were the land to sink even lower, these islands would shrink in size and in number until, at a drop of 2,000 feet, only the peaks of

the outermost mountains would be left sticking up out of the water.\*

As this submersion slowly took place, the limestone plain and the mountainsides must have been cleared of a great deal of older rock that had overlain them; there then followed the deposition of the "drift" peculiar to the Ice Age over the entire area that was covered by water. The matter produced by the weathering of the mountain islands, and the finely ground particles of rock scraped out of the valleys by the slowly but powerfully moving glaciers—earth, sand, gravel, stones, smoothly polished blocks in the ice itself, sharp-edged ones on its surface—all this was carried out to sea by the icebergs as they detached themselves from the shore, and eventually sank to the bottom. Depending on the circumstances, the layer thus formed consists of clay (deriving from argillaceous schist), sand (from quartz and granite), limestone gravel (from limestone mountains), marl (where finely ground limestone was mixed with clay) or of mixtures of all these components; in every case, however, it contains a quantity of stones, some large, some small, sometimes rounded, sometimes jagged, and some the size of those colossal erratic boulders which occur even more frequently in Ireland than on the North German Plain or between the Alps and the Jura.

When the land was subsequently raised up out of the sea once more, this newly formed surface acquired, more or less, its present-day composition. In Ireland little washing-away seems to have taken place in the process; with few exceptions, the drift covers all the flat land in a layer of varying thickness, extends to the valleys in the mountains and is often found high up on the mountainsides, too. The rocks occurring in it are chiefly limestone; for this reason, the entire layer is commonly termed LIMESTONE GRAVEL<sup>a</sup> here. Numerous large limestone boulders are also scattered over all the lowlying land, one or more in almost every field. Obviously, near the mountains besides the limestone, the local rocks originating there (particularly granite) are also found in large quantities. Granite from the northern shore of Galway Bay occurs in the plain to the south-east, in large quantities as far as the Galton Mountains, and in odd instances as far as Mallow (County Cork).

\* Of Ireland's 32,509 English square miles, 13,243 lie between sea-level and 250 feet; 11,797 are 251-500 feet above sea-level; 5,798 are 501-1,000 feet; 1,589 are 1,001-2,000 feet; 82 square miles are 2,001 feet or more above sea-level.

<sup>a</sup> In the manuscript this term is given in English in brackets after the German equivalent.—*Ed.*



The north of the country is covered with drift to the same height above sea-level as the central plain; between the various more or less parallel chains of mountains traversing it, the south displays a similar deposit, deriving from local rocks of chiefly Silurian formation, and occurring in large quantities particularly in the valley of the Flesk and the Laune near Killarney.

The traces of the glacier on the mountainsides and the valley floors in Ireland are very common and unmistakable, particularly in the south-west. Only in Oberhasli and here and there in Sweden do I recall having seen more distinct traces of ice of every kind than in Killarney (in the Black Valley and the Gap of Dunloe).

The elevation of the land during or after the Ice Age seems to have been so pronounced that Britain was for a while connected by dry land not only with the Continent but with Ireland as well. At least, this seems to be the only explanation for the similarity of the fauna of these countries. Of the extinct large mammals Ireland had the mammoth, the Irish giant stag, the cave-bear, a species of reindeer, and others in common with the Continent. In fact, an elevation of less than 240 feet above the present level would be sufficient to join Ireland and Scotland, and one of less than 360 feet to join Ireland and Wales with wide ridges of land.\* The fact that at some time after the Ice Age Ireland occupied a higher level than at present is proved by the underwater peat bogs with upright treestumps and roots which occur all along the coast, and are identical in every respect with the lowest layers of the adjoining inland peat bogs.

---

Insofar as it is suitable for agriculture, the soil of Ireland is accordingly almost entirely composed of "drift" from the Ice Age; here, thanks to its schist and limestone origin, it is an extremely fertile light loam, unlike the barren sand with which the Scottish, Scandinavian and Finnish granites have covered such a large part of North Germany. The diversity of the rocks which have laid down their deposits on this soil—and continue to do so—provided it with a corresponding diversity of the mineral elements

\* See Map 15a in Stieler's school-atlas,<sup>a</sup> 1868. This map, as well as No. 15d of Ireland in particular, gives a very clear picture of the nature of the terrain.

<sup>a</sup> A. Stieler, *Hand-Atlas über alle Theile der Erde und über das Weltgebäude*, Gotha, 1864.—Ed.

necessary for the vegetation; and if one of these, lime, is often absent from the surface soil, there is nevertheless an abundance of limestone boulders of different sizes everywhere—quite apart from the underlying limestone bed—so that it can easily be added.

When the well-known English agronomist *Arthur Young* travelled in Ireland in the 1770s he did not know what surprised him more, the natural fertility of the soil, or the barbaric treatment meted out to it by the farmers. “A light, dry, soft, sandy loam soil” prevails wherever the land is any good at all. In the “Golden Vale” of Tipperary and elsewhere, too, he found

“the same sandy reddish loam I have already described, incomparable land for tillage”. From there, in the direction of Clonmel, “the whole way, through the same rich vein of red sandy loam I have so often mentioned. I examined it in several fields, and found it to be of an extraordinary fertility, and as fine turnip land as ever I saw”.

#### Further:

“The rich land reaches from Charleville, at the foot of the mountains, to Tipperary,” (the city), “by Kilfennan, a line of twenty-five miles, and across from Ardpatrick to within four miles of Limerick—sixteen miles.”—“The richest land is the Corcasses on the Maag, near Adare, a tract of five miles long, and two broad, down to the Shannon... When they break this land up, they sow first oats, and get twenty barrels an acre” (14 stone or 196 pounds per barrel), “or forty common barrels, and do not reckon that an extra crop; they take ten or twelve in succession [...] till the crops grow poor, and then they sow one of horse beans, which refreshes the land enough to take ten crops of oats more; the beans are very good.... Were such barbarians ever heard of?”

#### Further, near Castle Oliver, County Limerick:

“The finest soil in the country is upon the roots of mountains; it is a rich, mellow, crumbling, putrid, sandy loam, eighteen inches to three feet deep; the colour a reddish brown. It is dry, sound land, and would do for turnips exceedingly well, for carrots, for cabbages; and, in a word, for everything. I think upon the whole it is the richest soil I ever saw, and such as is applicable to every purpose you can wish. It will fat the largest bullock, and at the same time do equally well for sheep, for tillage, for turnips, for wheat, for beans; and, in a word, for every crop [...]. You must examine into the soil before you will believe that a country, which has so beggarly an appearance, can be so rich and fertile.”

#### On the river Blackwater near Mallow

“there are tracts of flat lands, in some places one quarter of a mile broad; the grass everywhere remarkably fine. It is the finest sandy land I have anywhere seen, of a reddish-brown colour; would yield the greatest arable crops in the world, if in tillage. It is five feet deep, and [...] burns into good brick; yet it is a perfect sand. The banks of this river—from its source to the sea—are equally remarkable for beauty of prospect, and fertility of soil.”—“Friable, sandy loams, dry but fertile, are very common, and they form the best soils in the kingdom for tillage and sheep. Tipperary and Roscommon abound particularly in them. The most fertile of all are the bullock pastures of Limerick, and the banks of the Shannon, in Clare, called

the Corcasses.... Sand, which is so common in England, and yet more common through Spain, France, Germany, and Poland—quite from Gibraltar to Petersburg—is nowhere met with in Ireland, except for narrow slips of hillocks upon the sea coast. Nor did I ever meet with or hear of a chalky soil.”\*

Young’s verdict on the soil of Ireland is summarised in the following sentences:

“If I was to name the characteristics of an excellent soil, I should say *that*<sup>a</sup> upon which you may fat an ox, and feed off a crop of turnips. By the way I recollect little or no such land in England, yet it is not uncommon in Ireland” (II, p. 271). “Natural fertility, acre for acre over the two kingdoms, is certainly in favour of Ireland” (II, Part 2, p. 3).—“As far as I can form a general idea of the soil of the two kingdoms, Ireland has much the advantage” (II, Part 2, p. 12).

In 1808-10, Edward *Wakefield*, another Englishman versed in agronomy, travelled around Ireland and presented the results of his observations in a most valuable work.\*\* His comments are better arranged, more lucid and more complete than those in Young’s travel book; on the whole, however, they are both accurate.

On the whole, Wakefield finds no great diversity of soil in Ireland. Sand only occurs on the shore (it is so rare inland that large quantities of sea-sand are transported to the interior in order to improve the peat and loam soil), chalky soil is unknown (the chalk in Antrim, as mentioned above, is covered by a layer of basalt, which after weathering produces an extremely fertile surface soil—chalk constitutes the poorest soil in England),

“and tenacious clays, such as those found in Oxfordshire, in some parts of Essex, and throughout High Suffolk, I could never meet with in Ireland”.<sup>b</sup>

The Irish call any loamy soil *CLAY*<sup>c</sup>; there may be proper clay in Ireland, too, but in any case not on the surface as in some parts of England. There is limestone or calcareous gravel almost everywhere, he says.

“The former is a useful production, and is converted into a source of wealth that will always be employed with advantage.”<sup>d</sup>

Mountains and peat bogs do, of course, reduce the fertile surface considerably. In the north, he says, there is little fertile

\* *A Tour in Ireland* by Arthur Young, 3 vols., London, 177.... The above passages are in Vol. II, pp. 28, 135, 143, 154, 165 and Part 2, p. 4.<sup>188</sup>

\*\* *An Account of Ireland, Statistical and Political*. By Edward Wakefield. London, 1812, 2 vols., in 4°.<sup>189</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Author’s italics.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> E. Wakefield, *An Account of Ireland...*, Vol. I, Ch. III, p. 79.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Engels gives this English word in brackets after the German equivalent.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.*—*Ed.*

land; yet here, too, there are extremely luxuriant valleys in every county, and even in deepest Donegal, at the foot of the wildest mountains, Wakefield unexpectedly came across a very fertile area. The intensive cultivation of flax in the north is in itself sufficient indication of the soil's fertility, since this plant never thrives in poor soil.

"A great portion of the soil of Ireland throws out a luxuriant herbage, springing up from a calcareous subsoil, without any considerable depth. I have seen bullocks of the weight of 180 stone, rapidly fattening on land incapable of receiving the print of a horse's foot, even in the wettest season, and where there were not many inches of soil. This is *one* species of the rich soil of Ireland, and is to be found throughout Roscommon, in some parts of Galway, Clare, and other districts. Some places exhibit the richest loam that I ever saw turned up by a plough; this is the case throughout Meath in particular. Where such soil occurs, its fertility is so conspicuous, that it appears as if nature had determined to counteract the bad effects produced by the clumsy system of its cultivators.—On the banks of the Fergus and Shannon, the land is of a different kind, but equally productive, though the surface presents the appearance of marsh. These districts are called 'the caucasses'" (thus writes Wakefield, differing with Young); "the substratum is a blue silt, deposited by the sea, which seems to partake of the qualities of the upper stratum; for this land can be injured by no depth of ploughing.—In the counties of Limerick and Tipperary there is another kind of rich land, consisting of a dark, friable, dry, sandy loam which, if preserved in a clean state, would throw out corn for several years in succession. It is equally well adapted to grazing and tillage, and I will venture to say, seldom experiences a season too wet, or a summer too dry. The richness of the land, in some of the vales, may be accounted for by the deposition of soil carried thither from the upper grounds by the rain. The subsoil is calcareous, so that the very richest manure is thus spread over the land below, without subjecting the farmer to any labour" (Vol. I, pp. 79, 80).

Where there is a thinnish layer of sticky loam immediately on top of the limestone, the land is no use for arable farming, yielding only miserable crops of corn; but it provides excellent sheep-walks, which go on improving it, producing a thick grass mixed with plenty of white clover and...<sup>a</sup> (Vol. I, p. 80).

Dr. Beaufort\* writes that in the west, particularly in Mayo, there are a great many TURLOUGHES—flat areas of differing sizes which, though not perceptibly fed by any streams or rivers, are covered with water in winter which drains away in summer through underground fissures in the limestone, leaving behind a firm, fertile grazing land.

"Independently of the caucasses," continues Wakefield, "the richest soil in Ireland is to be found in the counties of Tipperary, Limerick, Roscommon, Longford, and Meath. In Longford there is a farm called Granard Kill, which

\* Beaufort, Revd. Dr., *Memoir of a Map of Ireland*, 1792, pp. 75, 76. Quoted in Wakefield, Vol. I, p. 36.

<sup>a</sup> Omission in the manuscript. Wakefield has: "...and wild burnet".—*Ed.*

produced eight crops of potatoes without manure. Some parts of the County of Cork are uncommonly fertile, and upon the whole, Ireland may be considered as affording land of an excellent quality, though I am by no means prepared to go the length of many writers, who assert, that it is decidedly acre for acre richer than England" (Vol. I, [pp. 80-81]).

The last remark, which is aimed at Young, stems from a misunderstanding of the statement by Young quoted above.<sup>a</sup> Young does not say that Ireland's soil is more productive than England's, taking them both in their present state of cultivation, which is naturally much higher in England; Young simply says that the *natural* fertility of the soil in Ireland is greater than in England, and Wakefield does not directly dispute this.

A Scottish agronomist, Mr. Caird, was sent to Ireland in 1849, after the last famine,<sup>b</sup> by Sir<sup>c</sup> Robert Peel to report on means of improving the agriculture there. In his report, published soon afterwards, on the West of Ireland, the worst hit part of the country except for the extreme north-west, he says:

"I was much surprised to find so great an extent of fine fertile land. The interior of the country is very level, and its general character stony and dry; the soil dry and friable. The humidity of the climate causes a very constant vegetation, which has both advantages and disadvantages. It is favourable for grass and green crops,\* but renders it necessary to employ very vigorous and persevering efforts to extirpate weeds. The abundance of lime everywhere, both in the rock itself, and as sand and gravel beneath the surface, are of the greatest value."

Caird also confirms that the whole of County Westmeath consists of the finest pasture land. Of the region north of Lough Corrib (County Mayo) he writes:

"The greater part of this farm" (a farm of 500 acres) "is the finest feeding land for sheep and cattle—dry, friable, undulating land, all on limestone. The fields of rich old grass are superior to anything we have, except in small patches, in any part of Scotland I at present remember. The best of it is *too good for tillage*, but about one half of it might be profitably brought under the plough... The rapidity with which the land on this limestone subsoil recovers itself, and, without any seeds being sown, reverts to good pasture, is very remarkable."\*\*

\* "GREEN CROPS"<sup>d</sup> include all cultivated fodder crops, root vegetables of all kinds and potatoes; everything but corn, grass and garden produce.

\*\* Caird, *The Plantation Scheme, or the West of Ireland as a field for investment*, Edinburgh, 1850. The above passages are on pp. 6, 17-18, 121. In 1850-51, Mr. Caird wrote travel reports for *The Times* on the condition of agriculture in the main counties of England.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 156.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> That of 1846-47.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> At this point in the manuscript the word "Ministry" appears above the word "Sir".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Engels gives these English words in brackets after the German equivalent.—*Ed.*

Finally let us hear what a French authority says\*:

“Of the two divisions of Ireland, that of the north-west, embracing a fourth of the island, and comprehending the province of Connaught, with the adjacent counties of Donegal, Clare and Kerry, resembles Wales, and even, in its worst parts, the Highlands of Scotland. Here again are two millions of unsightly hectares, the frightful aspect of which has given rise to the national proverb, ‘Go to thè devil or Connaught’\*\*. The other, or south-east and much larger division, since it [...] includes the provinces of Leinster, Ulster and Munster, equal to about six millions of hectares, is *at least equal* in natural fertility to England proper. It is not all, however, equally good; the amount of humidity there is still greater than in England. Extensive bogs cover about a tenth of the surface; more than another tenth is occupied with mountains and lakes. In fact, five only out of eight millions of hectares in Ireland are cultivated” (pp. 9, 10).—“Even the English admit that Ireland, in point of soil, is superior to England. [...] Ireland contains eight millions of hectares. Rocks, lakes, and bogs occupy about two millions of these, and two millions more are indifferent land. The remainder—that is to say about half the country—is rich land, with calcareous subsoil. What better could be conceived?” (p. 343).

It is evident that all the authorities are agreed that the soil of Ireland contains all the elements of fertility to an unusual degree, with regard to both its chemical constituents and its physical composition. The extremes—sticky, impenetrable clay, which allows no water through, and loose sand, which does not retain it for an hour—are nowhere to be found. Yet Ireland has another disadvantage. While the mountains are mainly along the coast, the watersheds between the different river basins in the interior of the country are mostly very low-lying. The rivers are not able to drain off all the rainwater into the sea, and this gives rise to extensive peat bogs in the interior, particularly on the watersheds. In the plain alone 1,576,000 acres are covered by peat bogs. These are mostly depressions or hollows in the terrain, largely former shallow lake basins, which have gradually become overgrown with moss and bog plants and filled up with their decayed remains. Like our North German bogs they are no use except for peat-cutting. With the present system of agriculture their edges can only slowly be brought under cultivation. The floor of these former lake basins consists of marl everywhere which derives its limestone content (ranging from 5 to 90%) from the shells of the freshwater mussels in the lake. Thus, each one of these peat bogs contains within itself the material for its own reclamation and cultivation. In addition, most of them are rich in iron stone. Apart

\* Léonce de Lavergne, *Rural Economy of England, Scotland and Ireland*. Translated from the French. Edinburgh, 1855.

\*\* As we shall see, this proverb owes its origin not to the dark mountains of Connaught but to the darkest period in the entire history of Ireland.<sup>190</sup>

from these lowland bogs there are another 1,254,000 acres of mountain bogs, a result of deforestation in a damp climate and one of the peculiar beauties of the British Isles. Wherever flat or gently domed peaks were deforested—which occurred on a mass scale in the 17th and first half of the 18th centuries to keep the ironworks supplied with charcoal—the effects of the rain and mist encouraged the formation of a layer of peat, which later continued down the slopes where conditions were favourable. The entire ridge of mountains which bisects Northern England from north to south as far as Derby is covered by such moors; and where large clusters of mountains are shown on the map of Ireland there are also mountain bogs in abundance. The peat bogs of Ireland are not, however, by any means irrevocably lost to agriculture; rather, in due course we shall see what rich fruits some of them are capable of yielding with the appropriate treatment, not to mention the 2 million hectares (=5 million acres) contemptuously referred to by Lavergne as “indifferent land”.

---

The climate of Ireland is determined by its position. The Gulf Stream and the prevailing south-west winds bring it warmth, making for mild winters and cool summers. In the south-west, summer lasts far into October, which, according to Wakefield (Vol. I, p. 221), is here considered the favourite month for sea-bathing. Frost is rare and does not last long; snow hardly ever lies on the ground for long on the plain. Around the bays of Kerry and Cork, which face south-west and are sheltered from the north, spring weather prevails all winter long; there, as in some other places, myrtle thrives in the open (Wakefield cites an example of a country estate with myrtle trees 16 feet high, the twigs of which were used to make stable brooms, Vol. I, p. 55), and laurel, arbutus and other evergreen plants grow into tall trees. Even in Wakefield's day the farmers in the south left their potatoes out all winter, without any being damaged by frost since 1740. On the other hand, Ireland does bear the brunt of the first heavy downpour from the heavy Atlantic rain clouds. The average rainfall in Ireland is at least 35 inches, considerably more than the average for England, but certainly less than that for Lancashire and Cheshire, and scarcely more than the average for the whole of the West of England. Nevertheless, the Irish climate is decidedly more pleasant than the English. The leaden skies which so often drip away unceasingly for days on end in England, are mainly

replaced by continental April skies there; the fresh sea breezes bring the clouds swiftly out of the blue but drive them away again just as swiftly, unless they promptly fall to earth in a sudden shower. And even rain that continues for days, such as occurs in late autumn, does not have the chronic air of English rain. The weather, like the inhabitants, has a more acute character, it moves in sharper, more sudden contrasts; the sky is like an Irish woman's face, rain and sunshine follow on each other suddenly and unexpectedly, but there is no room for the grey English boredom.

The oldest report on the Irish climate is provided by the Roman *Pomponius Mela* (*De situ orbis*) in the first century A. D. It says:

"Beyond Britain lies Hibernia, almost equal to it in extent but otherwise similar; of a rather long shape, *with skies adverse to the ripening seed; but abounding in grass not only luxuriant but also sweet*, so that a small part of the day suffices for the cattle to eat their fill, and if they are not removed from the pasture they will go on grazing until they burst."

"*Coeli ad maturanda semina iniqui, verum adeo luxuriosa herbis, non laetis modo, sed etiam dulcibus!*" Translated into modern English this passage may be found with others in a work by Mr. *Goldwin Smith*, sometime Professor of History at Oxford and now at Cornell University in America. He tells us that it is difficult to reap a wheat harvest in a large part of Ireland, and continues:

"Its<sup>a</sup> natural way to commercial prosperity seems to be to supply with the produce of its grazing and dairy farms the *population of England.*"\*

From Mela to Goldwin Smith and up to the present day how often the assertion has been made—particularly since 1846<sup>191</sup> by the noisy chorus of Irish landowners—that Ireland has been condemned by its climate not to supply the Irish with bread but to supply the English with meat and butter, and that consequently it is the vocation of the Irish people to be shipped over the ocean in order to make way for cows and sheep in Ireland!

It is clear that to establish the facts with regard to the Irish climate is to solve a political issue of great topicality. To be sure, the climate only concerns us here insofar as it is of importance for agriculture. The observations of natural scientists who have measured the rainfall are, given the present inadequate state of

\* Goldwin Smith, *Irish History and Irish Character*, Oxford and London, 1861 [p. 3].—We know not what to admire more in this work, which sets out to justify English policy in Ireland under a mask of "objectivity", the ignorance of the professor of history or the hypocrisy of the liberal bourgeois. We shall meet with both again.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Engels has "Ireland's".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Cf. this volume, p. 283.—*Ed.*



such observations, only of secondary value for our purposes; it is not so much a matter of *how much* rain falls, but far more *how* and *when* it falls. The judgments of the agronomists are the ones that carry the most weight here.

*Arthur Young* considers Ireland to be decidedly damper than England; hence the astonishing ability of the soil to produce grass. He speaks of cases where turnip and stubble fields, left unploughed, have yielded a plentiful hay harvest the following summer, something which is unknown in England. Further, he mentions that Irish wheat is much lighter than that of drier countries; the fields are full of grass and weeds even with the best management, and harvests are so wet and difficult to gather that the yield suffers greatly thereby (*Young, Tour*, Vol. II, p. 100).

At the same time, however, he draws attention to the fact that the soil of Ireland counteracts the wetness of the climate. The soil is stony everywhere and thus lets the water through more easily.

“Harsh, tenacious, stony, strong LOAMS, difficult to work; are not uncommon in Ireland, but they are quite different from English CLAYS. If as much rain fell upon the clays of England (a soil very rarely met with in Ireland, and never without much stone) as falls upon the rocks of her sister island, those lands could not be cultivated. But the rocks here are clothed with verdure; those of limestone, with only a thin covering of mould, have the softest and most beautiful turf imaginable” (*Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 3, 4*).

The limestone is, as is well known, full of cracks and fissures which allow superfluous water to pass through rapidly.

*Wakefield* devotes a highly detailed chapter to the climate,<sup>a</sup> gathering together all earlier observations up to his own time. *Dr. Boate (Natural History of Ireland, 1645)*<sup>192</sup> describes the winters as mild, 3-4 frosts per year, seldom lasting more than 2-3 days; the Liffey in Dublin scarcely freezing over once in 10-12 years. March is usually dry and fair, but this is followed by a lot of rain; there are rarely 2-3 consecutive days in summer that are completely dry; in late autumn the weather is fine again. Very dry summers are rare; scarcities are never due to drought but mostly caused by the wet. On the plains there is little snow, so that the cattle could stay outside all year round. Occasionally, though, there are snowy years, such as 1635, when people were hard put to find shelter for their cattle (*Wakefield, Vol. I, p. 216 ff.*).

At the beginning of the last century *Dr. Rutty (Natural History of the County of Dublin)*<sup>b</sup> started exact meteorological observations,

<sup>a</sup> E. Wakefield, *An Account of Ireland...*, Vol. I, Chapter VI (“Climate”).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. Rutty, *An Essay towards a Natural History of the County of Dublin*, Dublin, 1772.—*Ed.*

which covered fifty years, from 1716-1765. Over this period the ratio of south and west winds to north and east winds was 73:37 (10,878 south and west against 6,329 north and east). The prevailing winds were westerly and south-westerly, followed by north-westerly and south-easterly; the least frequent being north-easterly and easterly. In summer, autumn and winter westerly and south-westerly winds prevail; easterly winds are most common in the spring and summer, when they are twice as frequent as in autumn and winter; north-easterly winds occur chiefly in the spring, and are also twice as frequent then as in autumn and winter. As a result, temperatures are more even, the winters milder, the summers cooler than in London, though the air is more humid. Even in the summer, salt, sugar, flour, etc., absorb moisture from the air, and the corn has to be kiln-dried, which does not occur in *some parts* of England (Wakefield, Vol. I, pp. 172-81).

At that time, Ruty was only able to compare the Irish climate with that of London, which, like the climate of the whole of Eastern England, is certainly drier. But if he had had access to material on the West and particularly the North-West of England, he would have found that his description of the Irish climate—the distribution of the winds over the year, the wet summers, in which sugar, salt, etc., spoil in unheated rooms—is entirely applicable to this area, except that the latter is colder in winter.

Ruty also kept lists of the meteorological character of the seasons.<sup>a</sup> In the 50 years mentioned there were 16 cold, late or too dry springs; slightly more than in London. Further, 22 hot and dry, 24 wet, 4 changeable summers; somewhat damper than in London, where the number of dry or wet summers was the same; further, 16 fine, 12 wet and 22 changeable autumns, again somewhat wetter and more changeable than in London; and 13 frosty, 14 wet and 23 mild winters, which is considerably wetter and milder than in London.

According to rain measurements made in the Botanical Gardens in Dublin during the ten year period 1802-11, the total monthly precipitation, in inches, was as follows: December, 27.31; July, 24.15; November, 23.49; August, 22.47; September, 22.27; January, 21.67; October, 20.12; May, 19.50; March, 14.69; April, 13.54; February, 12.32; June, 12.07; average per year, 23.36 (Wakefield, Vol. I, p. 191). These ten years were unusually dry; Kane (*Industrial Resources*, p. 73) gives the average for 6 years in

---

<sup>a</sup> J. Ruty, *An Essay...*, Vol. II, p. 471.—*Ed.*

Dublin as 30.87 inches, and Symons (*English Rain Fall*)<sup>a</sup> a figure of 29.79 inches for 1860-62. But how little such measurements mean with the quickly passing, purely local showers of Ireland, unless they cover a long series of years and are undertaken at a large number of stations, is proved among other things by the fact that three stations in Dublin itself recorded for the rainfall in 1862: one 24.63, the second 28.04, and the third 30.18 inches. According to Symons, the average precipitation of twelve stations in all parts of Ireland (varying from 25.45 to 51.44 inches) amounted to just under 39 inches for the years 1860-62.

In his book on the climate of Ireland Dr. Patterson says:

“The frequency of our showers, and not the amount of rainfall itself, has caused the popular notion about the wetness of our climate.... Sometimes, the spring sowing is a little delayed because of wet weather, but our springs are so frequently cold and late that early sowing is not always advisable. If frequent summer and autumn showers make our hay and corn harvests risky, then vigilance and diligence would be just as successful in such exigencies as they are for the English in their ‘CATCHING HARVESTS’<sup>b</sup>, and improved cultivation would ensure that the seed-corn would aid the peasants’ efforts.”\*

In Londonderry the number of rain-free days varied from 113 to 148 over the 10 years 1791-1802, averaging over 126. Belfast showed the same average. In Dublin, the figure varied from 168 to 205, averaging 179 (Patterson, *ibid.*).

According to Wakefield’s report, harvests in Ireland occur as follows: wheat mostly in September, more rarely in August, seldom in October; barley usually somewhat later than wheat, and oats about a week later than barley, thus fairly frequently in October. After lengthy researches, Wakefield comes to the conclusion that the material for a *scientific* description of the Irish climate was far from sufficient, and *nowhere* expresses the opinion that there are any serious obstacles to corn production. Rather, he finds, as we shall see, that the losses suffered during wet harvest-times are due to entirely different factors, and says explicitly:

“The soil of Ireland is so fertile, and *the climate so favourable*, that under a proper system of agriculture, the island will produce not only a *sufficiency of corn* for its own use, but a *superabundance* which may be ready at all times to relieve England when she may stand in need of assistance” (Vol. II, p. 61).

\* Dr. W. Patterson, *An Essay on the Climate of Ireland*, Dublin, 1804, p. 164.

<sup>a</sup> G. J. Symons, *British Rainfall over the British Isles*, London, Stanford, 1862.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Engels gives the English words “catching harvests” in brackets after their German equivalent.—*Ed.*

At that time, 1812, England was, of course, at war with everyone in Europe and America,<sup>193</sup> and the import of corn was rendered much more difficult; the need for corn was paramount. Nowadays America, Romania, Russia and Germany supply enough corn, and it is cheap *meat* that is now in demand. And so the Irish climate is no longer suitable for arable farming.

Corn has been grown in Ireland since ancient times. In the oldest Irish laws, written down long before the arrival of the English, the "sack of wheat" is already a fixed measure of value; in the tributes of subjects to tribal chiefs and other chieftains wheat, barley malt and oatmeal occur almost regularly in particular stipulated quantities.\* After the English invasion the growing of corn decreased during the continuing struggles, though without ever ceasing entirely. From 1660 to 1725 it increased again, then falling off once more until about 1780; from 1780-1846 more corn was again sown, although the main crop was potatoes, and since 1846 both corn and potatoes have been steadily losing ground to cattle grazing. If the climate is not suited to the growing of corn, would it have persisted for more than a thousand years?

Admittedly there are parts of Ireland which are less suitable for growing wheat on account of the more frequent rains always found near the mountains—especially in the south and west. As well as good years, these areas often experience series of wet summers, as in 1860-1862, which inflict great harm on the wheat. But wheat is not Ireland's main cereal crop, and Wakefield even complains that too little of it is grown owing to lack of markets—there was no other market but the nearest mill. Similarly, barley was grown almost solely for the illicit stills (evading taxation). The main cereal in Ireland was and is oats. In 1810, at least ten times as much oats was grown as all the other cereal crops put together; and as the oats harvest is later than that of wheat and barley, it occurs more often in late September and in October, when the weather is generally fine, especially in the south. And anyway oats can tolerate a good deal of rain.

We have already seen above that, with regard to the amount

\* *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Ireland—Senchus Mor*, 2 VOLS., DUBLIN, PRINTED FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONARY OFFICE, AND PUBLISHED BY ALEXANDER THOM (London, Longmans) 1865 and 1869.<sup>194</sup> See Vol. II, pp. 239-51. The value of a sack of wheat was one screpall (denarius) of 20-24 grains of silver. The value of the screpall has been established by Dr. Petrie, in *The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland, anterior to the Anglo-Norman Invasion*, Dublin, 1845, 4<sup>o</sup>, pp. 212-19.

and distribution of rainfall over the seasons, the climate of Ireland corresponds almost exactly to that of north-west England. The rainfall in the mountains of Cumberland, Westmoreland and North Lancashire is far higher than in any Irish station known to me (in Coniston 96.03, in Windermere 75.02 inches, average from 1860 to 1862), and yet hay is made there and oats are grown. In the same years, the rainfall in South Lancashire varied from 25.11 in Liverpool to 59.13 in Bolton, the average of all the observations being approximately 40 inches; in Cheshire it varied from 33.02 to 43.40, the average being about 37 inches. In Ireland, as we have seen, it was not quite 39 inches in the same years. (All figures from Symons.) In both counties, cereals of all kinds, particularly wheat, are grown; Cheshire, it is true, was principally engaged in cattle-breeding and dairy farming until the last outbreak of cattle plague, but since most of the livestock died off, the climate has suddenly proved to be excellent for wheat. If the cattle plague had reached Ireland and caused such terrible devastation there as it did in Cheshire, instead of hearing about Ireland's natural calling as cattle pasture we should now have to listen to the passage from Wakefield where he predicts that Ireland is destined to be England's granary.

Looking at the matter impartially, undeterred by the interested outcry of the Irish landowners and the English bourgeoisie, we find that Ireland has areas which are more suited in their soil and climate to cattle-breeding, others more suited to arable farming, and yet others, the vast majority, which are equally suited to both, as is the case everywhere. Compared with England, Ireland is on the whole better for cattle-breeding; but compared with France, England itself is better for cattle-breeding. Does it follow that the whole of England should be turned into cattle pastures, that the entire farming population—with the exception of a few shepherds—should be sent to the factory towns or to America, in order to make room for cattle that is bound for France to pay for silks and wines? But that is exactly what the Irish landowners, wishing to raise their ground-rents, and the English bourgeoisie, wishing to depress wages, are demanding for Ireland; Goldwin Smith has said it plainly enough. And yet the social revolution entailed by such a transformation from arable land to pasturage would be far more violent in Ireland than in England. In England, where large-scale farming predominates and the farmhands have already been largely supplanted by machinery, it would mean uprooting a million at most; whereas in Ireland, where small-scale farming and even spade-farming predominate, it would mean

uprooting four million people, the extermination of the Irish people.

It is evident that even facts of nature become national issues of contention between England and Ireland. But it is also evident that the public opinion of the ruling class in England—and this alone makes itself heard on the Continent—changes according to fashion and its own interests. Today England needs corn quickly and surely—and Ireland is just made for growing wheat; tomorrow England needs meat—Ireland is no good for anything but cattle pasture. The five million Irishmen are by their mere existence a slap in the face of all the laws of political economy. They must go, let them end up where they will!

## OLD IRELAND

The classical Greek and Roman authors and the fathers of the Church give very little information about Ireland.

However, there exists a native literature that is still comparatively rich despite the loss of many Irish writings in the wars of the 16th and 17th centuries. It consists of poems, grammars, glossaries, annals and other historical writings and law-books. With very few exceptions, however, this entire literature, covering the period at least from the 8th to the 17th centuries, exists *in manuscript* only. As far as the Irish language is concerned, printing has only been in existence for a few years, that is, only since the language began to die out. Thus, only a tiny part of this rich material is accessible.

Of the annals the most important are those by Abbot *Tigernach* (died 1088), those of *Ulster*, and particularly those of the *Four Masters*. The latter were compiled in 1632-36 under the supervision of Michael O'Clery, a Franciscan monk, with the help of three other *Seanchaidhes* (students of antiquity), in the monastery of Donegal from materials which have nearly all been lost now. They were published from the extant original manuscript from Donegal in a critical edition with English translation by O'Donovan in 1856.\* The earlier editions by Dr. Charles O'Connor (the first part of the *Four Masters*, the *Annals of Ulster*, etc.) are unreliable in text and translation.<sup>195</sup>

Most of these annals begin with the mythical prehistory of Ireland, taking as their basis the old folk legends, which were spun out interminably by the bards of the 9th and 10th centuries and

\* *Annala Rioghachta Eireann. Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters.* EDITED, WITH AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION, BY DR. JOHN O'DONOVAN. 2ND EDIT., Dublin, 1856, 7 vols, in 4°.

then put into proper chronological order by monastic chroniclers. Thus, the *Annals of the Four Masters* begin in the year of the world 2242, when Ceasair, a granddaughter of Noah, landed in Ireland 40 days before the flood; other annals trace the forebears of the Scots, the last immigrants to arrive in Ireland, in a direct line back to Japhet and relate them to Moses, the Egyptians and the Phoenicians, just as our mediaeval chroniclers traced the forebears of German tribes back to Troy, Aeneas, and Alexander the Great. The *Four Masters* devote only a couple of pages to these old fables (in which the only valuable element, the genuine old folk legend, cannot be distinguished to this day); the *Annals of Ulster* omit it completely; even Tigernach states with a critical audacity extraordinary for his day that all the monuments of the Scots before King Cimbaoth (supposedly 300 B.C.) are uncertain. But when a new national life was awakened in Ireland at the end of the last century, and with it fresh interest in Irish literature and history, these monastic fables were considered to be the most important parts. With truly Celtic enthusiasm, and specifically Irish naivety, belief in these tales was declared to be an essential ingredient of national patriotism; this did, of course, give the super-clever English scholars—whose own achievements in philological and historical criticism are justifiably famous in the rest of the world—the desired pretext for rejecting everything Irish as sheer nonsense.\*

Since the thirties of the present century, however, a far more critical spirit has come over Ireland, particularly through Petrie and O'Donovan. The above-mentioned studies by Petrie<sup>a</sup> prove that there is complete agreement between the oldest preserved inscriptions from the 6th and 7th centuries and the annals, and

\* One of the most naive products of that time is *The Chronicles of Eri, being the History of the Gaal Sciut Iber, or the Irish People, translated from the original manuscripts in the Phoenician dialect of the Scythian language by O'Connor*, London, 1822, 2 vols. The Phoenician dialect of the Scythian language is, of course, Celtic Irish, and the original manuscript is just any verse chronicle. The publisher is Arthur O'Connor, an exile of 1798,<sup>196</sup> uncle of the subsequent leader of the English Chartists, Feargus O'Connor, an alleged descendant of the old O'Connors, kings of Connaught, and, to a certain extent, pretender to the Irish throne. Before the title there is a portrait of him, a handsome, jovial, Irish face, with a striking resemblance to his nephew Feargus, grasping a crown in his right hand. Underneath it says: "O'CONNOR—CEAR-RIGE, HEAD OF HIS RACE, AND O'CONNOR, CHIEF OF THE PROSTRATE PEOPLE OF HIS NATION: 'Soumis, pas vaincus [Subjected but undefeated].'"

<sup>a</sup> G. Petrie, *The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland, anterior to the Anglo-Norman Invasion*, Dublin, 1845.—Ed.



O'Donovan<sup>a</sup> is of the opinion that these begin to report historical facts as early as the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D. For us it is fairly immaterial whether the credibility of the annals commences a few hundred years earlier or later, for they are, as far as that period is concerned, unfortunately, almost entirely useless for our purpose. They contain short, dry notices of deaths, accessions to the throne, wars, battles, earthquakes, plagues and Scandinavian raids, but little that has any bearing on the social life of the people. If the entire legal literature of Ireland was published, they would assume quite a different significance; many dry notices would acquire new life through explicatory passages in the law-books.

These law-books, which are very numerous, are nearly all awaiting the moment when they will see the light of day. In 1852, on the insistence of Irish students of antiquity, the English Government approved the appointment of a commission for publishing the old laws and institutions of Ireland. But how? The commission consisted of three lords (who are never far away when there is public money to be expended), three lawyers of the highest rank, three Protestant clergymen, Dr. Petrie, and an officer who is Head of the Irish Survey. Of all these gentlemen only Dr. Petrie and two of the clergymen, Dr. Graves (now Protestant Bishop of Limerick) and Dr. Todd, could claim to understand anything of the commission's task; of these, Petrie and Todd have since died. The commission was given the duty of arranging the copying, translation and publication of the old Irish manuscripts of a legal content and were authorised to employ the necessary people for the job. They employed the two best men available: Dr. O'Donovan and Professor O'Curry, who copied a good many manuscripts and made a rough translation; but before anything was ready for publication, both died. Their successors, Dr. Hancock and Professor O'Mahony, then took up the work. So far, the two volumes already mentioned, containing the *Senchus Mor*, have come out. The publishers admit that only two of the members of the commission, Graves and Todd, have taken part in the work, by making some notes in the proofs. The officer, Sir Th. Larcom, put the original maps of the survey of Ireland at the disposal of the publishers for the verification of place names; Dr. Petrie soon died, and the other gentlemen restricted their activities to conscientiously drawing their salaries for 18 years.

This is the way public duties are carried out in England, and

---

<sup>a</sup> J. O'Donovan, *Annala Rioghachta Eireann. Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters, from the earliest period to the year 1616*. Dublin, 1856.—Ed.

even more so in Ireland under English rule. Without jobbery,\* nothing works. No public interests may be satisfied without a tidy sum of money or some fat sinecures for lords or government protégés coming out of it. With the money which this utterly superfluous commission has swallowed up, we in Germany would have printed the complete unprinted historical literature—and even better.

The *Senchus Mor* is to the present day our main source on conditions in old Ireland. It is a collection of ancient legal regulations which, according to the introduction (added later),<sup>a</sup> was compiled at the behest of St. Patrick and on his advice brought into harmony with Christianity, which was rapidly spreading in Ireland. The High King of Ireland, Laeghaire (428-458, according to the *Annals of the Four Masters*); the Vice-Kings Corc of Munster and Daire, probably a prince of Ulster; further, three bishops: St. Patrick, St. Benignus and St. Cairnech; and finally three law scholars, Dubthach, Fergus and Rossa; these are the men who are said to have composed the “commission” that compiled the book, and no doubt they worked harder for the money than the present commission, which only had to publish the work. The *Four Masters* gives the year of composition as 438.

The text itself is obviously based on ancient pagan material. The oldest legal formulae contained in it are all composed in verse, with a fixed metre and what is known as consonance, a kind of alliteration, or rather consonantal assonance, which is peculiar to Irish poetry and often leads into rhyme proper. Since it has been established that the old Irish law-books were translated in the 14th century from the so-called Fenian dialect (*Bérla Feini*), the language of the 5th century, into the Irish current at the time (Introduction [Vol. I], p. XXXVI *et passim*), it is understandable that in *Senchus Mor* as well the metre has been obliterated to a certain extent in many places; but it does emerge often enough, along with occasional rhymes and strongly “consonant” passages, in order to lend the text a certain rhythmic fall. It is generally enough simply to read the translation in order to uncover the

\* JOBBERY is the name given in England to the practice of exploiting government offices to one's own personal advantage, or to that of one's relations and friends; also using public money for indirect bribery to further the ends of a party. The individual act is called a JOB. The English colony in Ireland is the main hotbed of jobbery.

---

<sup>a</sup> *Ancient Laws of Ireland*, Vol. I, London, 1865 (Introduction to *Senchus Mor*).—Ed.

verse formulae. In between, however, there are numerous passages of undoubted prose, particularly in the second half; while the verse formulae are certainly very ancient and have been handed down in the traditional way, these prose insertions seem to originate from the compilers of the book. The *Senchus Mor* is, by the way, quoted several times in the glossary compiled in the 9th or 10th century and ascribed to Cormac, the King and Bishop of Cashel, and was undoubtedly written down long before the English invasion.

All the manuscripts (the oldest seem to date from the beginning of the 14th century or earlier) contain a number of mostly consistent glosses and longer commenting notes on the text. The glosses are wholly in the spirit of the old glossaries, with word-play deputising for etymology and the explanation of words. The notes are of very different value, often badly distorted and many of them incomprehensible, at least without some knowledge of the other law-books. The age of both is uncertain; but the greater part is probably younger than the English invasion. Since, for all that, they only show very few traces of any developments in law beyond the scope of the text, and even then only in the more precise establishment of detail, the larger, purely explicatory part can safely be used, with discretion, as a source for the older period, too.

The *Senchus Mor* contains: (1) the law of distraint, i.e. just about the whole legal procedure; (2) the law on hostages, which were handed over by people of different territories during disputes; (3) the law concerning *Saerrath* and *Daerrath* (see below)<sup>197</sup>; and (4) family law. From this book we derive a good deal of useful information on the social life of the age; but as long as many expressions remain unexplained and the other manuscripts are not published, there is much that is still obscure.

Apart from the literature, the architectural monuments, churches, round towers, fortifications and inscriptions give us an idea of the condition of the people before the English arrived.

Of the foreign sources, we need only mention a few passages on Ireland in the Scandinavian sagas and the life of St. Malachias by St. Bernard,<sup>a</sup> which do not have much to offer; we then come straightway to the first Englishman to have written about Ireland from first-hand knowledge.

Sylvester Gerald Barry, called *Giraldus Cambrensis*, Archdeacon of Brecknock, was a grandson of the amorous Nesta, daughter of

<sup>a</sup> St. Bernard, *De Vita S. Malachiae*.—Ed.

Rhys ap Tewdwr, Prince of South Wales, mistress of Henry I of England and ancestress of almost all the Norman captains who took part in the first conquest of Ireland. He went to Ireland in 1185 with John (later "Lackland") and in the following years wrote first *Topographia Hibernica*, an account of the land and its inhabitants, and then *Hibernia Expugnata*, the highly biased history of the first invasions. We are principally concerned with the first work here. Written in highly pretentious Latin, full of the maddest belief in miracles and all the clerical and national prejudices of the time and the RACE of its vain author, the book is still of great importance, being the first report in any detail by a foreigner.\*

After this the Anglo-Norman sources on Ireland naturally become more abundant; there is, however, still little information to be gained with regard to the social conditions of the part of the island that remained independent, and permitting one to draw conclusions about the old state of affairs. Not until the end of the 16th century, when Ireland was first systematically and completely subjugated, do we receive more detailed reports on the actual living conditions of the Irish people, naturally with a strong English bias. We shall see that, in the course of the 400 years that have elapsed since the first invasion, the condition of the people has changed only slightly, and not for the better. But for this very reason, the more recent writings—Hanmer, Campion, Spencer, Davies, Camden, Moryson,<sup>199</sup> et al.—to whom we shall have frequent recourse, are one of our main sources for a period five hundred years earlier, and an indispensable, badly needed complement to the scanty original sources.

---

The mythical prehistory of Ireland tells of a series of immigrations, taking place one after the other and mostly ending with the subjugation of the island by the new immigrants. The three last are: that of the Firbolgs, that of the Tuatha-de-Dananns, and that of the Milesians or Scots, who are supposed to have come from Spain. Popular Irish writing of history summarily turns the Firbolgs (*fir*=Irish *fear*, Latin *vir*, Gothic *vair*: man) into Belgians, the Tuatha-de-Dananns (*tuatha*=Irish *people*, *region*, Gothic *thiuda*) as necessary into Greek Danai or Germanic Danes. O'Donovan is

\* *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, ed. J. S. Brewer, London, Longmans, 1863.<sup>198</sup>—A (weak) English translation of the historical works including the two works already mentioned (*The Historical Works of Giraldus Cambrensis*) was published in London by Bohn in 1863.

of the opinion that there is some historical basis for at least the above-mentioned immigrations. In the annals there occurs in the year 10 A.D. an insurrection of the Aitheach Tuatha (translated in the 17th century by Lynch, an expert on the old language, as *plebeiorum hominum gens*<sup>d</sup>), in other words, a plebeian revolution, in which the entire aristocracy (Saorchlann) was slain. This points to the Scottish conquerors' dominion over the older inhabitants. From folk-tales about the Tuatha-de-Dananns, O'Donovan concludes that the latter, transformed by later popular belief into elves of the mountain forest, survived into the 2nd or 3rd century A.D. in scattered mountain areas.

It is beyond doubt that the Irish were a mixed people, even before the English settled among them in their masses. As today, in the 12th century the predominant type was already fair-haired. Giraldus (*Top. Hib.*, III, 26) says of two strangers that they had long *yellow* hair, like the Irish. Nevertheless, there are still two completely different types of black-haired people, particularly in the west. One is tall and well-built with handsome features and curly hair, a type one feels one may have encountered before, in the Italian Alps or in Lombardy; this type occurs chiefly in the south-west. The other, thick-set and short in build, with coarse, straight black hair and a flat, almost negroid face, is more often found in Connaught. Huxley attributes this dark-haired element in the originally blond Celtic population to an Iberian (i.e. Basque) admixture,<sup>200</sup> which is no doubt partly true, at least. By the time the Irish make their first definite appearance in history, though, they have become a homogeneous people with a Celtic language, and there is no longer any trace of alien elements apart from the (mostly Anglo-Saxon) slaves acquired through battle or barter.

The pronouncements of the ancient classical writers about this people do not sound very edifying. *Diodor* relates that the Britons who inhabit the island called Iris (or Irin? It is the accusative Ἴριον) eat human beings.<sup>b</sup> *Strabo* goes into more detail:

“Concerning this island” (Ierne) “I have nothing certain to tell, except that its inhabitants are more savage than the Britons, since they are man-eaters as well as heavy eaters” (πολυφάγοι; according to another reading *πηφάγοι*, cabbage-eaters), “and since, further, they count it an honourable thing, when their fathers die, to devour them, and openly to have intercourse, not only with other women, but also with their mothers and sisters.”<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> J. O'Donovan, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 95.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliothecae historicae*, Vol. 5.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *The Geography of Strabo*, with an English translation by Horace Leonard Jones, 8 volumes, London, 1917-32.—*Ed.*

Patriotic Irish historians have waxed not a little indignant over these alleged slanders. It remained for more recent research to show that cannibalism, and particularly the eating of parents, is probably a transitional stage of all peoples. It may come as some consolation to the Irish to learn that the ancestors of the modern Berliners still subscribed to the same practical point of view a good thousand years later:

"...aber Weletabi, die in Germania sizzent, tie wir Wilze heizên, die ne scament sih nicht ze chedenne daz sie iro parentes mit mêren rehte ezen sulîn, danne die wurm!"<sup>a</sup> (Notker, quoted in Jacob Grimm's *Rechtsalterthümer*,<sup>b</sup> p. 488).

And under English rule, we shall see the consumption of human flesh in Ireland make its return more than once. As regards the "phagocrogamia" (to borrow Fourier's phrase<sup>c</sup>) with which the Irish are reproached, such things occurred among all uncivilised peoples, and even more so among the particularly amorous Celts. It is interesting to note that even then the island bore its present native name: Iris, Irin and Jerne are identical with Eire, Erinn, and that Ptolemy already knew the present-day name of the capital, Dublin, Eblana (with the correct accent 'Εβλανα).<sup>d</sup> This is all the more remarkable as the Irish Celts have since times immemorial called it by another name, Athcliath, and Duibhlinn—the black pool—is for them the name of a place on the River Liffey.

Moreover we find in *Pliny's Natural History*, IV, 16, the following passage:

"The Britons travel there" (to Hibernia) "in boats of willow branches, over which animal hides have been sewn together."<sup>e</sup>

And later *Solinus* says of the Irish themselves:

"They sail the sea between Hibernia and Britannia in boats of willow branches which they cover with cowhides" (C. Jul. Solini *Cosmographia*, Ch. 25).

In 1810, Wakefield found that all along the west coast of Ireland "no other boats occurred except ones which consisted of a wooden frame covered over with a horse- or oxhide". These boats

<sup>a</sup> "But the Weletabi who live in Germany and whom we call Wilze are not ashamed to say that they have more right to eat their parents than the worms have."—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, Göttingen, 1828.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Ch. Fourier, *Le nouveau monde industriel et sociétaire, ou invention du procédé d'industrie attrayante et naturelle distribuée en séries passionnées*, Paris, 1829, pp. 399-400.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Claudius Ptolemaeus, *Geographia*, Book II, Chapter 2, Lipsiae, 1845.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, Lugduni Batavorum, 1635.—*Ed.*

were of different shapes according to the area, but they were all distinguished by being uncommonly light, so that an accident rarely occurred. Of course, they were of no use for the high seas, for which reason fishing was only possible in the bays and between the islands. In Malbay, County Clare, Wakefield saw boats like these, 15 feet long, 5 feet wide and 2 feet deep; two cowhides were used for one boat, the hair to the inside, the outside tarred; it was equipped for two oarsmen. A boat like this cost about 30 shillings (Wakefield, Vol. II, p. 97). Instead of plaited willow—a wooden frame! What progress in 1,800 years and after almost 700 years of “civilising” treatment at the hands of the world’s foremost maritime nation!

For the rest, however, some symptoms of progress soon become noticeable. Under King Cormac Ulfadha, who is thought to have ruled in the second half of the 3rd century, his son-in-law, Finn Mac Cumhal, is said to have reorganised the Irish militia, the *Fianna Eirionn*,\* probably after the model of the Roman legion, with a distinction between light troops and troops of the line; all later Irish armies of which we have details distinguish between *kerne*—light—and *galloglas*—heavy—infantry, or troops of the line. The heroic deeds of this Finn were celebrated in many old lays, some of which still exist; these, and perhaps a few Scottish-Gaelic traditions, form the basis of Macpherson’s *Ossian* (Irish Oisín, son of Finn), in which Finn appears as Fingal and the scene has been switched to Scotland.<sup>201</sup> In Irish folk-lore Finn lives on as Finn Mac-Caul, a giant to whom some miraculous feat of strength is attributed in almost every locality of the island.

Christianity must have found its way to Ireland quite early, at least on the east coast. Otherwise, there is no explanation for the fact that even long before St Patrick so many Irishmen played an important part in ecclesiastical history. Pelagius the Heretic is usually considered to have been a Welsh monk from Bangor; but there was also an ancient Irish monastery of Bangor, or rather Banchor, near Carrickfergus. And that he comes from here is proved by Hieronymus, who describes him as “stupid and heavy with Scottish gruel” (“*scotorum pultibus praegravatus*”).<sup>a</sup> It is the first

\* Feini, Fenians, is the name given to the Irish nation throughout the *Senchus Mor*. Feinechus, Fenchus, the law of the Fenians, often stands for *Senchus* or for some other, lost law-book. *Feine*, *grad feine*, is also the designation of the plebs, the lowest free class of people.

<sup>a</sup> S. Eusebius Hieronymus, *Commentariorum in Jeremiam Prophetam libri sex*. Prologus. In: *Patrologiae...* Series latina, 1865.—Ed.

mention of Irish oatmeal porridge (Irish *lute*, Anglo-Irish *stirabout*), which even then, before the introduction of the potato, was the staple food of the Irish people, and which it remained even afterwards, alongside the potato. The main disciples of Pelagius—Coelestius and Albinus—were also Scots, i.e. Irish. From his monastery Coelestius wrote, as Gennadius<sup>a</sup> tells us, three detailed letters to his parents, from which it is evident that alphabetic writing was known in Ireland in the 4th century.

In all the writings of the early Middle Ages the Irish are called Scots, and the country Scotia. We find this term in Claudian, Isidor, Beda, the geographer of Ravenna, Eginhard and even in Alfred the Great: "Hibernia, which we call Scotland" ("Ighbernia the ve Scotland hatadh").<sup>202</sup> What is now Scotland was called Caledonia, a foreign name, or Alba, Albania, its native one; the transference of the name Scotia, Scotland, to the northern tip of the eastern island did not take place until the 11th century. The first great wave of emigration of Irish Scots to Alba is supposed to have occurred in the middle of the 3rd century; Ammianus Marcellinus knows of them there as early as A.D. 360.<sup>b</sup> The emigration took place by the shortest sea-route, from Antrim to the Kintyre peninsula; even Nennius mentions expressly that the Britons, who then occupied the entire Scottish lowlands as far as the Clyde and the Forth, had been attacked by the Scots *from the west* and by the Picts from the north.<sup>c</sup> The seventh of the old Welsh historical *Triads*<sup>203</sup> also relates that the *gwyddyl ffichti* (see below) came from Ireland over the Norse Sea (*Môr Llychlin*) to Alba and settled on the shores of this sea. The fact that the sea between Scotland and the Hebrides is called "Norse" proves, by the way, that this *Triad* is more recent than the Norse conquest of the Hebrides. Around the year 500 larger bands of Scots came over. These gradually formed a kingdom of their own, independent both of Ireland and of the Picts. In the 9th century under Kenneth MacAlpin they finally subjugated the Picts and formed the state to which some 150 years later the name Scotland, Scotia, came to be applied, probably by the Norsemen, for the first time.

In the 5th and 6th centuries Old Welsh sources (Nennius, the *Triads*) mention raids by the *gwyddyl ffichti* or Gaelic Picts on Wales; these are generally interpreted as raids by Irish Scots. *Gwyddyl* is the Welsh form of *gavidheal*, as the Irish call

<sup>a</sup> Gennadius, *Illustrium virorum catalogus*, Basiliae, 1529.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum...*, Lipsiae, 1773.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Nennius, *Historia Britonum*, with an English version by Gunn, London, 1819,

p. 15.—*Ed.*



themselves. As for the origin of the term "Picts", we may leave it to others to investigate that.

In the second quarter of the 5th century Patricius (Irish Patrick, Patraic, as the Celts always pronounce the "c" as "k" in the fashion of the ancient Romans) established the domination of Christianity without any violent upheavals. Traffic with Britain, which had long existed, now became more lively; master-builders and artisans came over and taught the Irish, who had only known *dry* stone building until then, the use of mortar. But from the 7th to the 12th century the latter was used only in church buildings, which is sufficient proof that its introduction is linked with that of Christianity, and further that from now on the clergy, the representative of foreign culture, was completely divorcing itself from the people in its intellectual development. While the social advance of the people was non-existent or extremely slow, the clergy soon developed a literary culture that was extraordinary for the time. It expressed itself chiefly in its zeal to convert the heathens and to found monasteries, as was the custom of the age. Columba converted the British Scots and the Picts; Gallus (the founder of St. Gallen) and Fridolin the Alemanni, Kilian the Franks of the Main, Virgilius the people of Salzburg; all five were Irish. Similarly, the Anglo-Saxons were converted to Christianity mainly by Irish missionaries. What is more, Ireland was considered all over Europe to be a nursery of learning, so much so that Charlemagne summoned an Irish monk, Albinus, to Pavia as teacher, whither he was later followed by another Irishman, Dungal. Of the large number of Irish scholars who were important in their day but are now mostly forgotten, the greatest was the "Father" or, as Erdmann calls him, the "Carolus Magnus" of mediaeval philosophy"—*Johannes Scotus Erigena*.<sup>b</sup> "He was the first with whom from then on true philosophy began," Hegel says of him.<sup>c</sup> Of all the West Europeans of the 9th century he alone understood Greek, and through his translation of the writings attributed to Dionysius, the Areopagite, he harked back to the last offshoot of the old philosophy, the Alexandrian Neoplatonic school.<sup>204</sup> His teaching was very daring for his time: he denied the eternity of damnation, even for the devil, and comes very close to pantheism. For this reason, contemporary orthodoxy did not shrink from slandering him. It was all of two centuries before the

<sup>a</sup> Charlemagne.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> John the Scot.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> G. W. F. Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie*, Vol. 3, Berlin, 1836.—*Ed.*

science founded by Erigena was developed further by Anselm of Canterbury.\*

But before this development of higher culture could influence the people, it was interrupted by the raids of the Norsemen. These raids, which form the staple ingredients of Scandinavian—particularly Danish—patriotism, came too late and emanated from nations too small for them to culminate in conquest, colonisation and the formation of states on any large scale, as had been the case with the earlier incursions of the Germanic tribes. As far as historical development is concerned, the advantages they bequeathed are quite imperceptible compared with the immense and—even for Scandinavia—fruitless disturbances they caused.

At the end of the 8th century, Ireland was far from being inhabited by a single nation. A supreme kingship over the whole island existed only for appearance, and even that was by no means permanent. The provincial kings, whose number and territory were continually changing, were constantly at war with one another, and the smaller local princes also had their private feuds. On the whole, however, certain rules seem to have prevailed in these internal struggles which kept the devastation within definite bounds, so that the country did not suffer too much. But things were about to change. In 795, a few years after the first raid on England by this same predatory people, Norsemen landed on the island of Rathlin, off the coast of Antrim, and burnt everything down. In 798, they landed near Dublin and after that they are mentioned almost every year in the annals as heathens, foreigners, and pirates, never without the addition of *losccadh* (burning down) of one or several places. Their settlements in the Orkneys, Shetlands and Hebrides (Southern Isles, *Sudhreyjar* of the Old Norse sagas) served them as a base for operations against Ireland, as well as against what was to be Scotland, and against England. In the middle of the 9th century they were in possession of Dublin,\*\* which, according to

\* More about Erigena's doctrine and works in Erdmann, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, 2nd edition, Berlin, 1869, Vol. 1, pp. 241-47. Erigena, who was not, however, a clergyman, gives an early example of Irish wit. During a meal with Charles the Bald, King of France (who was sitting opposite him), he was asked by the King how great was the difference between a Scot and a sot, to which Erigena replied, "The width of a table."

\*\* The claim by Snorri in the *Haraldsaga*<sup>205</sup> that the sons of Harald Fairhair—Thorgils and Frodi—were the first Norsemen to take possession of Dublin—that is, at least 50 years later than stated—is in direct contradiction with all the contemporary Irish sources, which for this period are unquestionably authentic. Snorri is obviously confusing Thorgils, son of Harald Fairhair, with the Thorgils mentioned below (=Turgesius).

Giraldus, they first rebuilt as a proper city, just as he attributed to them the construction of Waterford and Limerick. The name Waterford is itself merely the anglicisation—here nonsensical—of the Old Norse *Vedhrafjörðhr*, which means either “Bay of Storms” (*Wetterföhre*) or “Bay of Rams”. The prime necessity of the Norsemen as soon as they had settled in the country was naturally to acquire fortified ports; the population of these towns long remained Scandinavian, but by the 12th century they had long since been assimilated by the Irish in language and customs. The disputes between the Irish princes greatly facilitated the depredations and settlement of the Norsemen, and even their temporary conquest of the whole island. The extent to which the Scandinavians themselves considered Ireland to be one of their regular pillage-lands is indicated by the ostensible death-song of Ragnar Lodbrök in the Snake Tower of King Ella of Northumberland, the *Krâkumâl*, composed about the year 1000.<sup>206</sup> In this song, the old pagan savagery makes one final outburst, as it were. On the pretext of singing the heroic deeds of King Ragnar, the raids of the entire Norse people in their own land as well as all along the coasts from Dünamünde to Flanders, Scotland (here called Skotland, perhaps for the first time) and Ireland are briefly described. Of Ireland it is said:

“We hew’d with our swords, heap’d high the slain,  
Glad was the wolf’s brother of the furious battle’s feast;  
Iron struck brass-shields; Ireland’s ruler, Marsteinn,  
Did not starve the murder-wolf or eagle;  
In Vedhrafjörðhr the raven was given a sacrifice.

We hew’d with our swords, started a game at dawn,  
A merry battle against three kings at Lindiseyri;  
Not many could boast that they fled unhurt from there.  
Falcon fought wolf for flesh, the wolf’s fury devoured many;  
The blood of the Irish flow’d in streams on the beach in the battle.”\*

By the first half of the 9th century a Norse Viking, Thorgils, called Turgesius by the Irish, managed to subjugate Ireland

\* “Hiuggu ver meðh hiörvi, hvern lâthverr of annan;  
gladhr varðh gera bróðhir getu vidh sökna laeti,  
lêt ei örn nê ýlgi, sâ er Írlandi stýrdhi,  
(môt varðh málms ok rítar) Marsteinn konungr fasta;  
varðh î Vedhra firdhi valtafn gefit hrafni.

Hiuggu ver meðh hiörvi, háðhum sudhr at morni  
leik fyrir Lindiseyri vidh lofdhúnga threnna;

completely, but with his death in 844° his kingdom, too, disintegrated and the Norsemen were driven out. The invasions and struggles continued with varying success, until finally, at the beginning of the 11th century, Ireland's national hero, Brian Borumha, originally only king of part of Munster, rose to be ruler of all Ireland and confronted the concentrated force of the invading Norsemen in a decisive battle at Clontarf (not far from Dublin) on April 23 (Good Friday), 1014. As a result, the might of the invaders was broken forever.

In anticipation of the imminent decisive battle, the Norsemen who had settled in Ireland, and on whom Leinster was dependent (the King of Leinster, Maolmordha, had ascended to the throne with their help in 999 and had kept it ever since thanks to them), sent messengers to the Southern Islands, and the Orkneys, to Denmark and Norway to request reinforcements, which duly arrived in large numbers. *Njál's Saga*<sup>207</sup> tells how Jarl Sigurd Laudrisson prepared his departure in the Orkneys, how Thorstein Siduhallsoon, Hrafn the Red and Erlinger of Straumeiy went with him and how he arrived at Dublin (Durflin) on Palm Sunday with all his army:

"Broðhir and all his army came too. Broðhir tried to learn by means of sorcery how the battle would go; the answer he got was this: if the battle were to be fought on Friday, King Brian would win the victory but lose his life, and if the battle were to be fought earlier, all Brian's opponents would lose their lives. Then Broðhir said that they should not join battle before Friday."<sup>d</sup>

fárr átti thví fagna (féll margr í gyn úlfi,  
haukr sleit hold meðh vargi), at hann heill thadhan kaemi;  
Ýra blóðh í oegi aerit féll um skaeru."<sup>a</sup>

Vedhraftiördhr is, as we have said, Waterford; I do not know whether Lindiseyri has been located anywhere. At any rate, it does not mean Leinster, as Johnstone translates it<sup>b</sup>; the eyri (sandy spit of land, Danish *øre*) indicates a quite definite locality. Valtafn can also mean falcon feed, and is mostly so translated here, but as the raven is Odin's holy bird, the word obviously carries both meanings.

<sup>a</sup> In his translation, Engels reproduces the old alliterative verse of the original.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. Johnstone, *Lodbrokar-Quida; or, the Death-Song of Lodbroc*, London, 1782.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> More precisely: 845.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Apart from minor deviations reflecting Engels's rendering of the original text, the English translation here and below follows *Njál's Saga*, translated by Magnus Magnusson and Hermann Palsson, Penguin Books, 1960.—*Ed.*

We have two versions of the battle itself: that of the Irish annals and the Scandinavian one in *Njál's Saga*. According to the latter:

"King Brian had already reached the fortress" (Dublin) "with all his army. On Friday the army" (of the Norsemen) "came marching out of the fortress, and both armies drew up in battle array. Brodhir was on one flank and King Sigtrygg" (King of the Dublin Norsemen, according to the *Annals of Inisfallen*) "on the other. It should be said that King Brian did not wish to fight on Friday; so a wall of shields was formed round him, and his army was drawn up in front of it. Ulf Hraeda was on the flank facing Brodhir, and on the other flank facing Sigtrygg were Ospak and King Brian's sons. In the centre was Kerthialfadh, with the banner aloft before him."

When the battle got underway, Brodhir was chased by Ulf Hraeda into a wood where he found shelter. Jarl Sigurd had a great deal of trouble with Kerthialfadh, who reached the standard and slew the standard-bearer as well as the next man to seize the standard. Then they all refused to bear the standard, and Jarl Sigurd took the standard off its staff and hid it under his clothes. Soon afterwards, he was pierced by a spear, and, at this point, his part of the army seems to have been defeated. Meanwhile, Ospak had attacked the Norsemen in the rear, turning Sigtrygg's flank after a hard struggle.

"And at this all his troops broke into flight. Thorstein Siduhallsson stopped running while the others were fleeing, and tied up his shoe-thong. Kerthialfadh asked him why he was not running like the others. 'Because,' said Thorstein, 'I cannot reach home tonight, for my home is out in Iceland.' Kerthialfadh spared his life."

Now Brodhir saw from his hiding-place that Brian's army was pursuing the fugitives, and that few men were left to man the wall of shields. Then he ran from the woods, broke through the wall of shields and slew the King (Brian, who was 88 years old, was obviously unable to take part in the battle and had stayed in the camp).

"Then Brodhir shouted, 'Let the word go round that Brodhir has felled Brian.'"

But the pursuers returned, surrounded Brodhir and took him alive.

"Ulf Hraeda slit open his belly and led him round an oak tree so that his intestines wound round the trunk; and Brodhir did not die before they had all been pulled out of him. Brodhir's men were all slain."

According to the *Annals of Inisfallen* the Norse army was divided into three sections. The first consisted of the Dublin Norsemen and 1,000 Norwegian volunteers, who were all clad in

long coats of mail; the second, of the Irish auxiliaries from Leinster under King Maolmordha; the third, of reinforcements from the islands and from Scandinavia under Bruadhair, the commander of the fleet which had brought them, and Lodar, the Jarl of the Orkneys. Opposing them, Brian also drew up his army in three sections; the names of the leaders, however, do not agree with those given in *Njâl's Saga*. The report of the battle itself is unimportant; shorter and clearer is that of the *Four Masters*, which follows:

"A.D. 1013" (given instead of 1014 owing to a recurrent error). "The foreigners of all western Europe assembled against Brian and Maelseachlainn" (usually called Malachy, King of Meath under Brian's sovereignty) "and they brought with them ten hundred men in coats of mail. A fierce, furious, violent and bitter battle was fought between them, the like of which had never been seen in those days, at Cluaintarbh" (ox-meadow, now Clontarf) "on the very Friday before Easter. In this battle were slain Brian, 88 years old, Murchadh, his son, 63 years old, Conaing, his nephew, Toirdhealbhach, his grandson..." (There follow a multitude of names.) "The" (enemy) "troops were finally driven back from the Tulcainn to Athcliath" (Dublin) "by Maelseachlainn by dint of heavy fighting, intrepidity and laying about the foreigners and the Leinstermen; and there fell Maelmordha, son of Murchadh, son of Finn, King of Leinster ... and there were also innumerable dead among the men of Leinster. Also slain were Dubhgall, son of Amhlanibh" (usually called Anlaf or Olaf) "and Gillaciarrain, son of Gluniarn, two subordinate commanders (*tanaisi*) of the foreigners, Sichfrith, son of Lodar, Jarl of the Orkneys (*iarla insi h Oirc*), Brodar, leader of the men from Denmark, who was the man who slew Brian. The ten hundred men in coats of mail were cut to pieces, and at least 3,000 of the foreigners were slain there."<sup>a</sup>

*Njâl's Saga* was written down in Iceland about a hundred years after the battle; the Irish annals are based, at least in part, on contemporary reports. The two sources are completely independent of each other; not only do they agree on the main points, but they also complement each other. We only learn from the Irish annals who Brodhir and Sigtrygg were. Sigurd Laudrisson is there called Sichfrith, son of Lodar; Sigfrith is, in fact, the correct Anglo-Saxon form of the Old Norse name Sigurd, and the Scandinavian names in Ireland—on coins as well as in the annals—mainly occur not in the Old Norse but in the Anglo-Saxon form. The names of Brian's subordinate commanders have been modified in *Njâl's Saga* to suit the Scandinavian tongue; one of them, Ulf Hraeda, is even wholly Old Norse, but it would be rash indeed to infer, as some do, from this that Brian, too, had Norsemen in his army. Ospak and also Kerthialfadh seem to be Celtic names; the latter perhaps distorted from the Toirdheal-

<sup>a</sup> *Annales IV Magistrorum*. In: *Rerum Hibernicarum Scriptores*, Vol. III. Buckinghamiae, 1826.—Ed.

bhach mentioned in the *Four Masters*? The dates—the Friday after Palm Sunday in one, the Friday before Easter in the other—agree perfectly, as does the site of the battle; although it is called Kantaraburg in *Njâl's Saga* (otherwise = Canterbury),<sup>208</sup> it is explicitly said to be right by the gates of Dublin. The course of the battle is described most accurately in the *Four Masters*. The Norsemen were driven back from the plain of Clontarf, where they attacked Brian's army, over the Tolka, a small river flowing past the northern side of Dublin, towards the city. The fact that Brodhir killed King Brian is mentioned in both sources; the exact details are given only in the Nordic one.

It is evident that our knowledge of this battle is fairly detailed and authentic, considering the barbarism of the times. There would not be many 11th-century battles about which we have such definite and consistent reports from both parties. This did not deter Professor Goldwin Smith from describing it as a "SHADOWY<sup>a</sup> conflict" (loc. cit.,<sup>b</sup> p. 48). In the esteemed professor's head the most robust facts do, indeed, very often assume a "shadowy" form.

After the defeat at Clontarf the raids of the Norsemen became less frequent and less dangerous. The Dublin Norsemen soon came under the dominion of the neighbouring Irish princes and in a generation or two were assimilated by the native population. As the sole recompense for the havoc they had wreaked, the Scandinavians left the Irish three or four cities and the beginnings of a trading urban population.

---

The further back in history we go, the fainter are the characteristics distinguishing peoples of the same tribe one from the other. On the one hand, this is due to the nature of the sources, which become scantier the older they are, confining themselves to essentials; on the other hand, however, it is due to the development of the peoples themselves. The individual branches of the tribe were the closer to one another, were more alike, the smaller the distance separating them from the original stock. Jacob Grimm<sup>c</sup> quite rightly always treated all reports from the Roman historians describing the campaign of the Cimbri<sup>209</sup> to Adam of Bremen and Saxo Grammaticus, all the literary

<sup>a</sup> Engels gives this English word in brackets after the German equivalent.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Irish History and Irish Character*, Oxford and London, 1861.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> J. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, Göttingen, 1828.—*Ed.*

monuments from *Beowulf* and the *Hildebrandslied* to the *Eddas*<sup>210</sup> and the sagas, all the law-books from the *Leges barbarorum*<sup>211</sup> to the Old Danish and Old Swedish laws and the Germanic precedents, as equally valuable sources for the German national character, German customs and legal procedure. The specific character may only be of local significance, but the character reflected in it is common to the whole tribe; and the older the sources, the more these local differences tend to disappear.

Just as the Scandinavians and the Germans of the 7th and 8th centuries were less different than today, originally the Irish Celts and Gallic Celts must have been more alike than are the Irishmen and Frenchmen of today. We should not, then, be surprised to find a number of traits in Caesar's description of the Gauls<sup>a</sup> which Giraldus twelve centuries later ascribes to the Irish, and which we find in the Irish national character even today, despite the admixture of so much Germanic blood....<sup>212</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> Gaius Julius Caesar, *Commentarii de bello Gallico*.—Ed.





FROM THE PREPARATORY  
MATERIALS



## Karl Marx

[NOTES FOR AN UNDELIVERED SPEECH ON IRELAND]<sup>213</sup>

## I. EXORDIUM. THE EXECUTION

Since our last meeting<sup>a</sup> the object of our discussion, Fenianism, has entered a new phase. It has been baptised in blood by the English Government. The Political Executions at Manchester remind us of the fate of John Brown at Harpers Ferry.<sup>b</sup> They open a new period in the struggle between Ireland and England. The whole Parliament and liberal press responsible. Gladstone.

Reason: to keep up the hypocrisy that this was no political, but a common criminal affair. The effect produced upon Europe quite the contrary. They seem anxious to keep up the Act of the Long Parliament.<sup>214</sup> English [have] a divine right to fight the Irish on their native soil, but every Irish fighting against the British Government in England is to be treated as an outlaw. Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act.<sup>215</sup> State of siege. Facts from *The Chronicle*. Governmental organisation of "Assassination and Violence".<sup>216</sup> Case of Bonaparte.<sup>217</sup>

## II. THE QUESTION

What is Fenianism?<sup>c</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> The meeting of the General Council of the International held on November 19, 1867.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Here the following passage is crossed out in the manuscript: "But the slaveholders have at least treated John Brown as a rebel, not as a common felon."—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See this volume, p. 194.—*Ed.*

## III. THE LAND QUESTION

## DECREASE OF POPULATION

1846				
1841: 8,222,664	}	in 25 Jahren <sup>a</sup>	1801: 5,319,867	
1866: 5,571,971				2,650,693
2,650,693				
1855:	}	in 11 years	1,032,694	
1866:				6,604,665
				5,571,971
			1,032,694	

Population not only decreased, but the number of the deaf-mutes, the blind, the decrepit, the lunatic, and idiotic increased relatively to the numbers of the population.

## INCREASE OF LIVE-STOCK FROM 1855 TO 1866

In the same period from 1855 to 1866 [the] number of the live-stock increased as follows: cattle by 178,532, sheep by 667,675, pigs by 315,918. If we take into account the simultaneous decrease of horses by 20,656, and equalise 8 sheep to 1 horse *total increase of live-stock*: 996,877, about one million.

Thus 1,032,694 Irishmen have been displaced by about one million cattle, pigs, and sheep. What has become of them? The *emigration list* answers.

## EMIGRATION

*From 1st May 1851 to 31 December 1866*: 1,730,189. Character of that emigration.

The process has been brought about and is still functioning upon an always enlarging scale by the *throwing together* or *consolidation of farms* (eviction) and by the simultaneous conversion of tillage into pasture.

*From 1851-1861 [the] total number of farms* decreased by 120,000, while simultaneously the number of farms of 15-30 acres increased by 61,000, that of 30 acres by 109,000 (together 170,000). The decrease was almost exclusively owed to the extinction of farms from less than one to less than 15 acres. Lord Dufferin.<sup>b</sup> The increase means only that amongst the decreased number of farms there is a larger portion of farms of large dimension.

<sup>a</sup> Years.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, p. 428.—*Ed.*

## HOW THE PROCESS WORKS

a) *The People.*

The situation of the *mass of the people* has deteriorated, and their state is verging to a crisis similar to that of 1846.<sup>a</sup> The relative surplus population now as great as before the famine.

Wages have not risen more than 20% since the potato famine. The price of potatoes has risen nearly 200%; the necessary means of life on an average by 100%. *Professor Cliffe Leslie*, in the *London Economist* dated February 9, 1867, says:

"After a loss of  $\frac{2}{5}$  of the population in 21 years, throughout most of the island, the rate of wages is now only 1s. a day; a shilling does not go further than 6d. did 21 years ago. Owing to this rise in his ordinary food the labourer is worse off than he was 10 years ago."

b) *The Land.*1) *Decrease of land under crops.*

*Decrease in cereal crops:*  
1861-1866: 470,917 acres

*Decrease in green crops:*  
1861-1866: 128,061 acres

2) *Decrease per Statute Acre of every crop.* There has been decrease of *yield* in wheat, but greater 1847 to 1865 per cent: the exact decrease: oats 16.3, flax 47.9, turnips 36.1, potatoes 50%. Some years would show a greater decrease, but on the whole it has been *gradual* since 1847.<sup>b</sup>

Since the exodus, the land has been underfed and overworked, partly from the injudicious consolidation of farms, and, partly, because, under the corn-acre system,<sup>218</sup> the farmer in a great measure trusted to his labourers to manure the land for him. Rents and profits may increase, although the profit of the soil decreases. The total produce may diminish, but that part of it, which is converted into surplus produce, falling to landlord and greater farmers, instead of to the labourer. And the price of the surplus produce has risen.<sup>c</sup>

So result: Gradual expulsion of the natives, gradual deterioration and exhaustion of the source of national life, the soil.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 205.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Marx used the data of this paragraph in his "Outline of a Report on the Irish Question..." (see this volume, p. 204).—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Marx used this passage in his "Outline of a Report on the Irish Question..." (see this volume, p. 204).—*Ed.*

## PROCESS OF CONSOLIDATION

This process has only begun; it is going on in rapid strides. The consolidation has first attacked the farms of under one to under 15 acres. It will be far from having reached the English point of consolidation, if all farms under 100 acres have disappeared. Now the state was this in 1864:

The *total area of Ireland, including bogs and waste land*: 20,319,924 acres. *Of those*  $\frac{3}{5} = 12,092,117$  acres, still form farms from *under 1 to under 100 acres*, and are in the hands of 569,844 farmers;  $\frac{2}{5} = 8,227,807$ , form farms from *100 till over 500 acres*, and are in the hands of 31,927 persons. Thus to be cleared off 2,847,220, if we number only the farmers and their families.

This system [is a] natural offspring of the famine of 1846, accelerated by the abolition of corn-laws,<sup>219</sup> and the rise in the price of meat and wool, now systematic.

*Clearing of the Estate of Ireland*, transforming it in an English agricultural district, minus its resident lords and their retainers, separated from England by a broad water ditch.

CHANGE OF CHARACTER  
OF THE ENGLISH RULE IN IRELAND

State only tool of the landlords. *Eviction*, also employed as means of political punishment. (*Lord Abercorn*. England. *Gaels in the Highlands of Scotland*.<sup>220</sup>) Former English policy: displacing the Irish by English (Elizabeth), roundheads<sup>221</sup> (Cromwell). Since Anne 18th-century politico-economic character only in the protectionist measures of England against her own Irish colony; within that colony making *religion* a proprietary title. After the *Union*<sup>222</sup> [the] system of rack-renting and middlemen, but left the Irish, however ground to the dust, holder of their native soil. Present system, quiet business-like extinction, and government only instrument of landlords (and usurers).

---

From this altered state:

1st) *Distinguishing character of Fenianism: Socialist, lower-class movement.*

2) *Not Catholic movement.*

Priests leaders as long as Catholic Emancipation<sup>223</sup> and their leader, Daniel O'Connell, remained leader of the Irish movement.

Ridiculous Popishism of the English. High Catholic priests against Fenianism.

3) *No representative leader in the British Parliament.* Character of O'Connell's physical force movement.<sup>224</sup> Extinction of Irish party in Parliament.

4) *Nationality.* Influence of European movement, and English phraseology.

5) *America, Ireland, England*—three fields of action, leadership of America.

6) *Republican*, because America republic.

I have now given the characteristics of Fenianism.

#### IV. THE ENGLISH PEOPLE

A cause of humanity and right, but above all a specific English question.

a) *Aristocracy and Church and Army.* (*France, Algiers.*<sup>225</sup>)

b) *Irish in England.* Influence on wages, etc. Lowering the character of the English and Irish. *The Irish Character.* Chastity of Irishmen. Attempts at education in Ireland. Diminution of crimes.

##### *Convicted in Ireland*

	<i>Committed for trial:</i>	<i>Convicted:</i>
1852 .....	17,678	10,454
1866 .....	4,326	2,418

The decrease in the numbers of persons committed for trial in England and Wales, since 1855, is partly due to the *Criminal Justice Act of 1855*, authorising Justices to pass sentences for short periods with the consent of the prisoners, instead of committing for trial to the sessions.

Birmingham. Progress of the English people. Infamy of the English press.

c) *The Foreign Policy.* Poland, etc. Castlereagh. Palmerston.<sup>226</sup>

#### V. THE REMEDY

Foolishness of the minor parliamentary propositions.

Error of the Reform League.<sup>227</sup>

*Repeal* as one of the articles of the English Democratic Party.



## Karl Marx

[OUTLINE OF A REPORT ON THE IRISH QUESTION  
DELIVERED TO THE GERMAN WORKERS'  
EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY  
IN LONDON ON DECEMBER 16, 1867]<sup>228</sup>

## I

What distinguishes Fenianism? Actually, it originates from the Irish Americans, Irishmen [living] in America. They are the initiators and LEADERS. But in Ireland itself the movement took root (and is still really rooted) only in the mass of the people, the LOWER ORDERS. That is what *characterises* it. In all earlier Irish movements the people only followed the aristocracy or MIDDLE-CLASS MEN, and always the Catholic churchmen. The Anglo-Irish chiefs and the priests during the rising against Cromwell; even James II, King of England, was at the head in the war against William III; the Protestant Republicans of Ulster (Wolfe Tone, Lord Fitzgerald) in the 1798 revolution,<sup>229</sup> and, finally, in this century the BOURGEOIS O'Connell supported by the Catholic clergy, who also played a leading role in all earlier movements excepting 1798. The Catholic clergy decreed a ban on Fenianism, which it did not lift until it realised that its attitude would deprive it of all influence on the Irish masses.

## II

Here is what baffles the English: they find the present regime mild compared with England's former oppression of Ireland. So why this most determined and irreconcilable form of opposition now? What I want to show—and what even those Englishmen who side with the Irish and concede them the right to secession from England do not see—is that the [oppression] since 1846, though less barbarian in form, has been in effect destructive, leaving no alternative but Ireland's voluntary emancipation by England or life-and-death struggle.

## III

Concerning past history the FACTS are available in any history book. Hence, I shall give only a few, firstly, to clarify the difference between the present epoch and the past and, secondly, to bring out a few points about the character of those who are now called the Irish people.

A) THE ENGLISH IN IRELAND  
BEFORE THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

1172. Henry II. Conquered less than 1/3 of Ireland. NOMINAL CONQUEST. A gift from Pope Adrian IV (Englishman). Some 400 years later another Pope (under Elizabeth) (1576), Gregory XIII, took back the present from the English (Elizabeth).<sup>230</sup> The "ENGLISH PALE".<sup>231</sup> CAPITAL: *Dublin*. Mixing of English COMMON COLONISTS with Irish, and of ANGLO-Norman nobles with Irish chiefs. Otherwise, the war of conquest was conducted (originally) as against RED INDIANS. No English reinforcements sent to Ireland until 1565 (Elizabeth).

B)\* PROTESTANT EPOCH.\* ELIZABETH. JAMES I. CHARLES I.  
CROMWELL. COLONISATION PLAN (16TH AND 17TH CENTURIES)

Elizabeth. The plan was to exterminate the Irish at least up to the RIVER Shannon, to take their LAND and settle English colonists in their place, etc. In battles against Elizabeth the still Catholic Anglo-Irish fought with the NATIVES against the English. The avowed plan of the English. \**Clearing the island of the natives, and stocking it with loyal Englishmen*. They succeeded only to plant a landowning aristocracy. English Protestant "adventurers"<sup>232</sup> (merchants, usurers), who obtained from the English crown the confiscated lands, and "gentlemen undertakers", who were to plant the ceded estates with native English families.

*James I. Ulster*. (Jacobite plantation, 1609-12.) British undertakers, "to stock the confiscated, stolen lands with Irish". \*Not until 1613 are IRISH considered ENGLISH subjects; previously they were looked upon as "OUTLAWS" and "ENEMIES" and the IRISH PARLIAMENT<sup>233</sup> governed only the *Pale*. Persecution of Catholics.

\**Elizabeth* settled *Munster*, *James I*, *Ulster*, but *Leinster* and *Connaught* have not yet been purged. *Charles I* tried to purge *Connaught*.

*Cromwell: First national revolt of Ireland, its 2nd complete conquest, partial re-colonisation (1641-60).*

Irish Revolution of 1641. August 1649 Cromwell landing in Dublin. (Followed by Ireton, Lambert, Fleetwood, Henry Cromwell.) In 1652 the 2nd complete conquest of Ireland completed. Division of spoils: the Government itself, the "adventurers" who had lent £360,000 for the 11 years of war, the officers and soldiers, by the Acts of the English Parliament, 12 August 1652, and 26 September 1653.<sup>234</sup> Smite the Amalekites<sup>235</sup> of the Irish Nation hip and thigh, and replant the re-devastated [land] with new colonies of brand-new Puritan English.\*—Bloodshed, devastation, depopulation of entire counties, removal of their inhabitants to other regions, sale of many Irish into slavery in the West Indies.

By engaging in the conquest of Ireland, Cromwell put paid to the English Republic.

Thence the Irish mistrust of the *English people's party*.

\* C) RESTORATION OF THE STUARTS. WILLIAM III.  
SECOND IRISH REVOLT, AND THE CAPITULATION ON TERMS.<sup>236</sup>  
1660—1692\*\*

The BRITISH were then more numerous in Ireland than at any other time. \*Never higher than 3/11, never lower than 2/11 of the Irish population.

1684. *Charles II* begins to favour the Catholic interest of Ireland, and to enlist a Catholic army.

1685. *James II* gives full rein to the Catholics of Ireland. Catholic army increased and favoured. The Catholics soon began to declare that the Acts of Settlement must be repealed and the proprietors of 1641 re-established. James calls some Irish regiments to England.

1689. William III in England, 12 March 1689: James landed at Kinsale at the head of Irish soldiers. *Limerick capitulates to William III, 1691*. Shameful violation of the treaty, already under William III, still more under Anne.

D) IRELAND DEFRAUDED AND HUMBLED TO THE DUST.  
1692-JULY 4, 1776

α) All notions of "*planting*" the country with English and Scotch yeomen or tenant farmers were discarded.\* Settling German and

<sup>a</sup> In the manuscript there follows "(1701) (Anne)".—Ed.

French Protestants attempted. French Protestants in the towns (woollen manufacturers) flee the English protectionist and mercantile system.

\* 1698. *The Anglo-Irish Parliament* (like obedient colonists) passed, on the command of the mother country, a prohibitory tax on Irish woollen goods export to foreign countries.

1698. In the same year, the English Parliament laid a heavy tax on the import of the home manufactures in England and Wales, and absolutely prohibited their export to other countries. She struck down the manufactures of Ireland, depopulated her cities, and threw the people back upon the land.

The *Williamite* (imported lords) *absentees*.<sup>237</sup> Cry against absentee landlords since 1692.

Likewise legislation of England against Irish cattle.

1698: Molyneux pamphlet for the independence of the Irish Parliament (i.e. the *English Colony in Ireland*) against the English.<sup>a</sup> Thus began the struggle of the *English Colony in Ireland and the English Nation. Simultaneously, struggle between the Anglo-Irish Colony and the Irish Nation.* William III resisted the shameful attempts of the English and Anglo-Irish Parliaments to violate the treaties of Limerick and Galway.

β) *Queen Anne. (1701-13; George until 1776).*

*Penal Code*<sup>238</sup> built up by the Anglo-Irish Parliament with assent of the English Parliament. Most infamous means to make Protestant Proselytes amongst the Irish Catholics by regulations of "Property". A code for the transfer of "Property" from Catholics to Protestants, or to make "Anglicanism" a proprietary title. (Education. Personal disabilities.) (No Catholic able to be a private soldier.) To teach the Catholic religion was a transportable felony, to convert a Protestant to Catholicism an act of treason. To be a Catholic Archbishop—banishment, if returning from banishment—act of high treason; hanged, disembowelled alive, and afterwards quartered. Experiment to coerce the mass of the Irish nation into the Anglican religion. Catholics deprived of vote for members of Parliament.<sup>239</sup>

This *Penal Code* intensified the hold of the Catholic Priesthood upon the Irish people.

*The poor people fell into habits of indolence.*

*During the palmy days of Protestant ascendancy and Catholic degradation, the Protestants did not encroach upon the Catholics in numbers.\**

<sup>a</sup> W. Molyneux, *The Case of Ireland's Being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England Stated*, Dublin, 1698.—Ed.

## E) 1776-1801. TIME OF TRANSITION

α) Before dealing with this transition period, what was the result of English terrorism?

\* *English incomers absorbed into the Irish people and Catholicised.*

*The towns founded by the English Irish.*

*No English colony (except Ulster Scotch) but English landowners.*

*The North American Revolution forms the first turning-point in Irish history.*

β) 1777 the British army surrendered at Saratoga Springs to the American "rebels". *British cabinet forced to make concessions to the Nationalist (English) party in Ireland.*

1778. *Roman Catholic Relief Bill<sup>a</sup> (passed by the Anglo-Irish Parliament).<sup>240</sup> (Catholics were still excluded from acquiring by purchase, or as tenants, any freeholds<sup>241</sup> interest.)*

1779. *Free trade with Great Britain.* Almost all restraints put upon Irish industry swept away.

1782. The Penal Code still further released. The Roman Catholics allowed to acquire *freehold property for life, or in fee simple, and—to open schools.*

1783. *Equal rights of the Anglo-Irish Parliament.<sup>b</sup>*

*Winter 1792-93.* After the French Government had annexed Belgium, and England resolved upon French war, another portion of the Penal Code was released. Irish could become Colonels in Army, *elective franchise for Irish Parliament etc.*

*Rebellion of 1798.<sup>c</sup>* Belfast Republicans (Wolfe Tone, Lord Fitzgerald). Irish peasants not ripe.

*Anglo-Irish House of Commons voted for the Act of Union passed in 1800.<sup>242</sup>* By the Legislature and Customs Union of Britain and Ireland *closed the struggle between the Anglo-Irish and the English.* The colony protested against the illegal Act of Union.\*

## 1801-1846

a) *1801-1831.* At this time (after the end of the war<sup>243</sup>) a movement for emancipation of Catholics under way among Irish and English (1829).

<sup>a</sup> The Bill for Relieving His Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects from Certain Pains and Penalties Imposed on Them by an Act of King William.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> An Act for Removing and Preventing All Doubts Which Have Arisen, or Might Arise, Concerning the Exclusive Rights... (The Renunciation Act, 1783).—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See this volume, p. 194.—*Ed.*

From 1783, \*legislative independence of Ireland, shortly after which duties were imposed on various articles of foreign manufacture, avowedly with the intention of enabling some of her people to employ some of their surplus labour etc. The natural consequence was, that Irish manufactures gradually disappeared as the Act of Union came into effect.

Dublin				
<i>Master woollen manufacturers</i> .....	1800	91	1840	12
<i>Hands employed</i> .....	"	4,918	"	602
<i>Master woolcombers</i> .....	"	30	1834	5
<i>Hands employed</i> .....	"	230	"	66
<i>Carpet manufacturers</i> .....	"	13	1841	1
<i>Hands employed</i> .....	"	720	"	0
<i>Silk-loom weavers at work</i> .....	"	2,500	1840	250
Kilkenny				
<i>Blanket manufacturers</i> .....	1800	56	1822	42
<i>Hands employed</i> .....	"	3,000	"	925
Balbriggan				
<i>Calico-loom at work</i> .....	1799	2,500	1841	226
Wicklow				
<i>Handlooms at work</i> .....	1800	1,000	1841	0
Cork				
<i>Braid weavers</i> .....	1800	1,000	1834	40
<i>Worsted weavers</i> .....	"	2,000	"	90
<i>Hosiery</i> .....	"	300	"	28
<i>Woolcombers</i> .....	"	700	"	110
<i>Cottonweavers</i> .....	"	2,000	"	220

etc. The linen industry (Ulster) did not compensate for this.<sup>a</sup>

"The *cotton manufacture of Dublin*, which employed 14,000 operatives, has been destroyed; the 3,400 silk looms have been destroyed; the serge<sup>b</sup> manufacture, which employed 1,491 operatives, has been destroyed; the flannel manufacture of Rathdrum, the blanket manufacture of Kilkenny, the camlet<sup>c</sup> trade of Bandon, the worsted manufactures of Waterford, the ratteen and frieze manufactures of Carrick-on-Suir have been destroyed. One business alone survives! ... That fortunate business—which the Union Act has not struck down—that favoured, and

<sup>a</sup> This sentence is in German in the manuscript.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Marx gives the German equivalent *Sersche* in brackets.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> Marx gives the German equivalent *Camelot* in brackets.—Ed.

privileged, and patronised business is the Irish coffin-maker's" (*Speech of T. F. Meagher, 1847*)\*

Every time Ireland was about to develop industrially, she was CRUSHED and reconverted into a purely AGRICULTURAL LAND.

After the latest General Census of 1861:

\* *Agricultural Population of Ireland*

(including all cottiers <sup>244</sup> and farm labourers with their families)*	4,286,019
In the 798 TOWNS (of which many were in fact small market towns)	1,512,948
	5,798,967

Therefore (1861) approximately  $\frac{4}{5}$  purely agricultural, and actually perhaps  $\frac{6}{7}$  if market towns are also counted.

Ireland is therefore purely \*agricultural: "Land is life" (*Justice Blackburne*). Land became the great object of pursuit. The people had now before them the choice between the occupation of land, *at any rent, or starvation. System of rack-renting.*

"The lord of the land was thus enabled to dictate his own terms, and therefore it has been that we have heard of the payment of £5, 6, 8, and even as much as £10 per acre. Enormous rents, low wages, farms of an enormous extent, let by rapacious and indolent proprietors to *monopolising landjobbers*, to be relet by intermediate oppressors, for five times their value, among the wretched starvers on potatoes and water."

State of popular starvation.\*

*Corn Laws in England*<sup>245</sup> create a monopoly to A CERTAIN EXTENT for the export of IRISH CORN to England. \*The average export of grain in the *first 3 years* following the passage of the Act of Union about 300,000 qrs,

1820 over 1 million qrs,

1834 yearly average of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  million qrs.

Amount to pay *rent to absentees*, and interest to mortgagees (1834), over 30 million dollars (*about 7 million pounds sterling*). Middlemen accumulated fortunes that they *would* not invest in the improvement of land, and *could* not, under the system which prostrated manufactures, invest in machinery etc. All their accumulations were sent therefore to England for investment. An official document published by the British Government shows that the transfers of British securities from England to Ireland, i.e., the investment of Irish capital in England, in the 13 years following the adoption of free trade in 1821, amounted to as many millions of pounds sterling, and thus was Ireland forced to contribute

cheap labour and cheap capital to building up "the great works of Britain".\*

Many pigs and export of same.

1831-1841. Accretion of Ireland's population from 7,767,401 to 8,175,238

In 10 YEARS ..... 407,837

In the same period there *emigrated* (somewhat more than 40,000 per YEAR) ..... 450,873

The total being ..... 858,710

\* O'Connell. Repeal Movement, Lichfield-House Contract with Whigs.<sup>246</sup> Partial famines. *Insurrection Acts, Arms Acts, Coercion Acts*.<sup>a</sup>

#### IV

#### THE PERIOD OF THE LAST 20 YEARS (FROM 1846).

##### \* CLEARING OF THE ESTATE OF IRELAND \*

Earlier, REPEATED CASES OF PARTIAL FAMINE. NOW GENERAL.

This new period was ushered in by the potato blight (1846-47), starvation and the consequent exodus.

Over one million die, in part directly from hunger, in part from DISEASES, etc. (caused by hunger). In 9 years, 1847-55, 1,656,044 left the country.

The revolution of the old agricultural system was, originally, but a natural result of the barren fields. People fled. \*(Families clubbed together to send away the youngest and most enterprising.)\* Hence, of course, the pooling of small leaseholds and substitution of pasturage for crop farming.

However, soon circumstances arose whereby this became a conscious and deliberate system.

*Firstly, the chief factor:* Repeal of the Corn Laws was one of the direct consequences of the Irish disaster. As a result, Irish corn lost its monopoly on the English market in the ordinary years. Corn prices dropped. Rents could no longer be paid. In the meantime, the price of meat, wool and other animal products has been rising steadily in the last 20 years. Tremendous growth of the wool industry in England. Pig-raising was partly connected with

<sup>a</sup> In an earlier passage in his manuscript, after the words "if market towns are also counted" (this section, pp. 199-200), Marx outlines this paragraph thus: "(b) 1831-1847. O'Connell", after which the following words are crossed out: "REPEAL MOVEMENT. Lichfield-House Contract with Whigs. (Useless buildings etc.) Not to be forgotten that during the entire period successive INSURRECTION ACTS, ARMS ACTS, COERCION ACTS".—Ed.



the old system. Now, chiefly sheep and horned cattle.\*[Ireland] deprived of the English market now, as by the Act of Union of her own.\*

Contributing circumstances that made this systematic:

*Secondly*: Reorganisation of agriculture in England. Caricature of same in Ireland.

*Thirdly*: The despairing flight of starving Irish to England filled basements, hovels, WORKHOUSES in Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow with \*men, women, children in a state almost of starvation\*.

Act of Parliament passed (1847-48) that Irish \*landlords had to support their own paupers\*. (The English Pauper Law is extended to Ireland.<sup>a</sup>) Hence, the Irish (especially English) landlords, mostly deep in debt, try \*to get rid of the people and clear their estates\*.

*Fourthly*: \*Encumbered Estates Act (1853?)<sup>b</sup>:

"The landlord was ruined, for he could collect no rents, and he was at the same time liable for the payment of enormous taxes for the maintenance of his poor neighbours. His land was encumbered with mortgages and settlements, created when food was high, and he could pay no interest; and now a law was passed, by aid of which property could be summarily disposed of at a public sale, and the proceeds distributed among those who had legal claims upon it."\*

ABSENTEE PROPRIETORS (English capitalists, INSURANCE SOCIETIES etc.) thereby multiplied, equally former MIDDLEMEN etc., who wanted to run their farms on modern economic lines.

*Eviction* of farmers partly by friendly agreement terminating tenure. But much more *EVICTON* on a large scale (forcibly by CROWBAR BRIGADE, beginning with the destruction of roofs), forcible EJECTION. (Also used as political retribution.) This has continued since 1847 to this day. (*Abercorn*, Viceroy of Ireland.) African razzias \*(razzias of the little African kings). (People driven from the land. The starving population of the towns largely increased.)

"The tenantry are turned out of the cottages by scores at a time.... Land agents direct the operation. The work is done by a large force of police and soldiery. Under the protection of the latter, the 'crowbar brigade' advances to the devoted township, takes possession of the houses.... The sun that rose on a village sets on a desert." (*Galway Paper, 1852.*) (*Abercorn.*)\*

Let us now see how this system affected the land in *Ireland*, where conditions are quite different from those in England.

<sup>a</sup> An Act to Amend an Act of the Tenth Year of Her Present Majesty, for Amending the Laws Relating to the Removal of the Poor.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> An Act for Continuing and Amending the Act for Facilitating the Sale and Transfer of Encumbered Estates in Ireland.—*Ed.*

## DECREASE OF CULTIVATED LAND. 1861-1866

	* <i>Decrease in cereal crops</i>	<i>Decrease in green crops*</i>
1861-65	428,041 acres	107,984 acres
1866	42,876 acres	20,077 acres
Total .....	470,917	128,061

DECREASE OF \*YIELD PER STATUTE ACRE OF EVERY CROP<sup>a</sup>

1847-1865 per cent: the exact decrease: *oats* 16.3, *flax* 47.9, *turnips* 36.1, *potatoes* 50. Some years would show a greater decrease, but on the whole it has been gradual since 1847.

*Estimated Average Produce per Statute Acre*

	<i>Wheat</i> cwt	<i>Potatoes</i> tons	<i>Flax</i> stones (14 lbs.)
1851	12.5	5.1	38.6
1866	11.3	2.9	24.9*

Though Ireland exported considerable quantities of wheat in the past, it is now said to be good only for cultivating OATS<sup>b</sup> (the yield of which per acre also continuously decreases).

In fact: 1866 Ireland shipped out only 13,250 qrs of wheat against 48,589 qrs shipped in (that is, almost fourfold). Meanwhile, it shipped out approximately one million qrs of oats (for £1,201,737).

\* Since the exodus, the land has been underfed and overworked, partly from the injudicious consolidation of farms, and partly because, under the corn-acre system,<sup>247</sup> the farmer in a great measure trusted to his labourers to manure the land for him. Rents and profits (where the farmer is no peasant farmer) may increase, although the produce of the soil decreases. The total produce may diminish, and still greater part of it be converted into surplus produce, falling to the landlord and (great) farmer. And the price of the surplus produce has risen.\*

Hence, *sterilisation* (gradual) of the land, as in *Sicily by the ancient Romans* (ditto in *Egypt*).

We shall speak of the *livestock*, but first about the *population*.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 191.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> This English word is given in the manuscript in brackets after the German equivalent *Hafer*.—Ed.

## DECREASE OF THE POPULATION

1801: 5,319,867; 1841: 8,222,664; 1851: 6,515,794; 1861: 5,764,543. If the trend continues, there will be 5,300,000 in 1871, that is, less than in 1801. I shall now show, however, that the population will be lower still in 1871, even though the emigration rate remains constant.

## EMIGRATION

Emigration ACCOUNTS naturally for part of the decrease. In 1845-66 there emigrated 1,990,244, or approximately 2,000,000 IRISH. (Unheard of.) (About  $\frac{2}{5}$  of the TOTAL emigration from the UNITED KINGDOM in 1845-66 which was 4,657,588.) In 1831-41 emigration approximately equalled half the accretion of population during the decade, and after 1847 it was considerably higher than the accretion.

However, emigration alone \*does not account for the decrease of the population since 1847\*.

DECREASE OF THE NATURAL ANNUAL ACCRETION  
OF THE POPULATION

The accretion (annual) in 1831-41 was 1.1 per cent, or ABOUT  $1\frac{1}{10}$  per cent a year. If the population had increased in the same proportion in 1841-51, it would have been 9,074,514 in 1851. In fact, however, it was only 6,515,794. Consequently, the deficit was 2,558,720. Out of this figure, emigration accounted for 1,274,213. That leaves 1,284,507 unaccounted for. Over a million, but not the whole deficit of 1,284,507, died in the FAMINE. Hence, evidently, natural population growth decreased in 1841-51.

This is borne out by the decade of 1851-61. NO FAMINE. The population decreased from 6,515,794 to 5,764,543. Absolute decrease: 751,251. Yet emigration in this period was over 1,210,000. Hence there was an accretion of NEARLY 460,000 during the ten years. Because  $751,251 + 460,000 =$  the number of emigrants  $= 1,211,251$ . Emigration claimed almost triple the accretion. The rate of accretion was 0.7 per cent per year, hence considerably lower than the 1.1 per cent of 1831-41.

The explanation is very simple. \*The increase of a population by births must principally depend on the proportion which those between 20 and 35 bear to the rest of the community. Now the

proportion of persons between the ages of 20 and 35 in the population of the United Kingdom is about 1:3.98 or 25.06 per cent, while their proportion in the emigration even of the present day is about 1:1.89 or 52.76 per cent.\* And probably still greater in Ireland.

#### PHYSICAL DETERIORATION OF THE POPULATION

\* In 1806, with a total population of 5,574,107, there was an excess of males over females by 50,469, whilst in 1867, with a total population of 5,557,196, there is an excess of the females over males.\* At the same time *not only a relative*, but an *absolute increase* in the number \*of deaf-mutes,<sup>a</sup> blind, insane, idiotic, and decrepit inhabitants. Contrasting 1851 with 1861, whilst the population had decreased enormously, the number of deaf-mutes had increased by 473, on their former total of 5,180; the lame and decrepit by 225, on their former total of 4,375; the blind by 1,092, on their former total of 5,767; the lunatic and idiotic, by the immense number of 4,118, on their former total of 9,980; mounting up, in 1861, notwithstanding the decrease in the population, to 14,098.

#### WAGES

Wages have not risen more than 20% since the potato famine. The price of potatoes has risen nearly 200%, and the rise \* for essential foodstuffs has been 100% \* on an average.

Professor Cliffe Leslie, in the *Economist of February 9, 1867*, says:

“After a loss of two-fifths of the population in 21 years, throughout most of the island, the rate of wages is now only 1s. a day; a shilling does not go further than 6d. did 21 years ago. Owing to this rise in the ordinary food the labourer is worse off than he was ten years ago.”

Partial famines, especially in Munster and Connaught.\*

Bankruptcy of SHOPKEEPERS PERMANENT. Market towns, etc., fall into decay.

#### THE RESULTS OF THIS PROCESS

In 1855-66, 1,032,694 Irishmen replaced by 996,859 head of LIVESTOCK (cattle, sheep and pigs). That, in fact, was the accretion of

<sup>a</sup> After this English word Marx gives its German equivalent in brackets.—Ed.

LIVESTOCK during that period, with the DECREASE OF HORSES (20,656) compensated by four sheep [to one horse], which are therefore subtracted from the accretion.

\*CONSOLIDATION OF FARMS\*

From 1851 to 1861 the TOTAL DECREASE OF FARMS was 120,000. (Though the number of 15-30 ACRE FARMS and FARMS of 30 ACRES and over increased.) Thus, the decrease affected particularly farms of one to under 15 acres.

In 1861 about  $\frac{3}{5}$  of the area (Ireland's total area: 20,319,924 acres) or 12 million acres was held by 569,844 tenants who worked plots of one up to less than 100 acres, and about  $\frac{2}{5}$  (8 million acres) by tenants with over 100 and 500 acres and over (31,927 tenants).

The process of consolidation in full gear. Ulster. (Cultivation of flax; Scottish Protestant tenants.)

*The Times* etc. officially congratulates Abercorn as Viceroy on this system. He, too, is one of these DEVASTATORS. Lord Dufferin: over-population etc.<sup>a</sup>

In sum, it is a question of life and death.

Meagher, Hennessy, *Irishman*.

DECREASE OF CRIME IN IRELAND

	<i>Committed for trial</i>	<i>Convicted</i>
1852	17,678	10,454
1866	4,326	2,418

V

UNITED STATES AND FENIANISM

Written on about December 16, 1867

Printed according to the manuscript

First published in: Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16,  
Moscow, 1960

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 428, 435. — *Ed.*

Karl Marx

[REMARKS ON THE PROGRAMME AND RULES  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE  
OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY]<sup>248</sup>

[PROGRAMME AND RULES  
OF THE ALLIANCE]<sup>a</sup>

[MARX'S REMARKS]

The socialist minority of the League of Peace and Freedom, having separated itself from the League as a result of the majority vote at the Berne Congress, the majority being formally opposed to the fundamental principle of all workers' associations—that of *economic and social equalisation of classes and individuals*—has thereby adhered to the principles proclaimed by the *workers' congresses* held in Geneva, Lausanne and Brussels. Several members of this minority, belonging to various nations, have suggested that we should form a new *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, merged entirely in the great *International Working Men's Association*, but having a special mission to study political and philosophical questions on the basis of the grand principle of the universal and genuine equality of all human beings on earth.

Convinced, for our part, of the usefulness of such an **enterprise that would provide** sincere socialist **democrats**<sup>b</sup> of Europe and America with the means of being understood and of affirming their ideas, without any pressure from the false socialism which bourgeois democracy finds necessary to apply these days, we consider it our duty, together with our friends, to take

equality of classes!

merged in and established  
against!

So, the socialist democrats  
are not understood through  
the International

<sup>a</sup> *Programme et Règlement de l'Alliance internationale de la Démocratie Socialiste*, Geneva [1868].—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The words in bold type were underlined by Marx.—*Ed.*

the initiative in forming this new organisation.

Therefore, we have constituted ourselves as the **central section** of the *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, and we publish today its *Programme* and *Rules*.

PROGRAMME  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
ALLIANCE OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY

1) The *Alliance* declares itself atheist; it wants abolition of cults, substitution of science for faith, and human justice for divine justice.

2) It wants above all political, economic and social equalisation of classes and individuals of **both sexes**, commencing with **abolition of the right of inheritance**, so that in future enjoyment be equal to each person's production, and so that, in conformity with the decision taken at the last workers' congress in Brussels, the land, instruments of labour, like all other capital, on becoming the collective property of the entire society, may be used only by the workers, that is, by agricultural and industrial associations.

3) It wants for all children of both sexes, from birth, equal conditions of development, that is, maintenance, education and training at all levels of science, industry and the arts, being convinced that this equality, at first only economic and social, will gradually lead to greater natural equality of individuals, eliminating all kinds of artificial inequalities, historical products of a social organisation as false as it is iniquitous.

4) Being the foe of all despotism, not recognising any political form other than republican, and rejecting completely any reactionary alliance, it also rejects any political action which does not have as its **immediate and direct** aim the triumph of the workers' cause against Capital.

5) It recognises that all the political and authoritarian states that exist at present and are more and more reducing their activities to simple administrative functions of public service in their respective countries, will have to dissolve into a universal union of free associations, both agricultural and industrial ones.

What modesty! They constitute themselves as the central authority, clever lads!

As if one could declare—by decree—the abolition of faith!

Hermaphrodite man! Just like the **Russian commune!**  
The old Saint Simon panacea!

Empty phrase!

If they are **reducing** themselves they will **not have to** dissolve, but will disappear spontaneously.

6) Since the social question can only have a final and real solution on the basis of international or universal solidarity of the workers of all countries, the *Alliance* rejects any policy based on so-called patriotism and on rivalry between nations.

7) It wants the universal association of all local associations on the basis of Liberty.

#### RULES

1) *The International Alliance of Socialist Democracy* constitutes a **branch of the International Working Men's Association** and accepts all its general rules.

2) The *Founder Members of the Alliance* are organising provisionally a *Central Bureau* at Geneva.

3) Founder Members belonging to the same country constitute the *national bureau* of their country.

4) The national bureaux shall establish in all regions **local groups of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, which, through their respective national bureaux, shall ask the Central Bureau of the Alliance to admit them** into the *International Working Men's Association*.

5) All local groups shall form their bureaux according to the customary procedure accepted by the local sections of the *International Working Men's Association*.

6) All members of the *Alliance* shall pay a monthly contribution of *ten centimes*, half of which shall be retained for their own needs by each national group, and the other half shall go to the Central Bureau for its general requirements.

In countries where this sum is judged to be too high, the national bureaux, in accord with the Central Bureau, shall have the power to reduce it.

7) At the annual Working Men's Congress *the delegation of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, as a branch of the *International Working Men's Association*, shall hold public meetings in a separate building.

#### MEMBERS OF THE GENEVA INITIATORY GROUP

J. Philipp Becker.—M. Bakunin.—Th. Rémy.—Antoine Lindegger.—Louis Nideg-

There is rivalry and rivalry,  
my dear Russian!

The International Association does not admit any  
"international branches".  
New Central Council!

The Rules of the International do not recognise this  
"mediatory power".

New taxes absorbing our  
own contributions!

They want to compromise  
us under our own patronage!

Asinus Asinorum! And  
Madame Bakunin!



ger.—Valérien Mroczkowsky.—Jean Zagorsky.—Phil. Zöller.—A. Ardin.—Ch. Perron.—J. Gay.—J. Friess.—Fr. Rochat.—Nikolai Zhukovskiy.—M. Elpidin.—Zampérini.—E. Becker.—Louis Weiss.—Perret.—Marauda.—Edouard Crosset.—A. Blanchard.—A. Matis.—Ch. Raymond.—Mme. Alexeyeva.<sup>a</sup>—Mme. Bakunin.—Mme. Suzette Croset.—Mme. Rosalie Sanguinède.—Mme. Désirée Gay.—Mme. Jenny Guinet.—Antoine Dunaud.—J. Maulet.—Guerry.—Jacques Courtois.—John Potot.—André Bel.—Fr. Bofféty.—Ch. Guyot.—Ch. Postleb.—Ch. Détraz.—J. Croset.—J. Sanguinède.—C. Jaclard.—L. Coulin.—Fr. Gay.—Blaise Rossety.—Jos. Marilly.—C. Brechtel.—L. Monachon.—Fr. Mermillod.—Donat-père.—L. J. Cheneval.—J. Bédeau.—L. H. Fornachon.—Pinière.—Ch. Grange.—Jacques Laplace.—S. Pellaton.—W. Rau.—Gottlob Walter.—Adolphe Haerberling.—Perrié.—Adolphe Catalan.—Marc Hérédier.—Louis Allement.—A. Pellerin-Druart.—Louis de Coppet.—Louis Dupraz.—Guillmeaux.—Joseph Baquet.—Fr. Pisteur.—Ch. Ruchet.—Placide Margarittaz.—Paul Garbani.—Etienne Borret.—J. J. Scopinini.—F. Crochet.—Jean Jost.—Léopold Wucher.—C. Filliétaz.—L. Fulliquet.—Ami Gandillon.—V. Alexeyev.<sup>b</sup>—François Chevalier.

Jules Johannard  
Eugène Dupont<sup>c</sup>

The Founder Members of the *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, having decided to start a paper under the name *La Révolution*, to be the press organ of this new Association, the *provisional Central Bureau* will begin publication as soon as 300 shares, of 10 francs each and payable in four instalments quarterly, from January 1, 1869, have been subscribed. Accordingly, the *provisional Central Bureau* is appealing to all *national bureaux of the Alliance* and inviting them to begin subscriptions in their own countries. As these subscriptions are considered voluntary gifts which give no right to receipt of the paper, the *national bureaux* are also requested to compile a list of subscribers.

The paper will appear once a week.

and they have the cheek to announce in Switzerland that I shall contribute articles to "**La Révolution**,"<sup>249</sup> without informing me!

<sup>a</sup> Barteneva.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Bartenev.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The names Johannard and Dupont are written in Jung's hand.—*Ed.*

*Subscription cost:*

one year      6 fr.  
six months    3 fr. 50

On behalf of the *provisional Central Bureau*:

Secretary, *Jean Zagorsky*  
rue Montbrillant, 8.

N. B. The *national bureaux* are requested to send the *Central Bureau* the money received for the shares and subscriptions before January 1.

Remarks made by Karl Marx on December 15, 1868

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1964

Printed according to the French leaflet containing Marx's remarks

Translated from the French

Karl Marx

[IRELAND FROM THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION  
TO THE UNION OF 1801

EXTRACTS AND NOTES]<sup>250</sup>

I. FROM 1778 TO 1782. INDEPENDENCE

A) IRISH PARLIAMENT BEFORE 1782

*Importance of the question for English working class, and working-class movement generally.*

Until 1800 Ireland, although conquered, remained separate and federate kingdom. Title of King up to peace of Amiens<sup>251</sup> "George III, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith etc."

The English usurpations in regard to the Parliament at Dublin principally calculated with view to *mercantile monopoly* on the one hand, and, on the other, to have the *appellate jurisdiction* in regard to the *titles of landed estates* in the last instance to be decided at London, only in English courts.

*Poynings' Law*<sup>252</sup>

A Statute of Henry VII, framed by his Attorney-General, Sir Edward Poynings, restrained the Irish Parliament *from originating any law whatever*, either in the Lords or Commons. Before any statute could be finally discussed, it was *previously submitted to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and his Privy Council*,<sup>253</sup> for their consideration, who might *at their pleasure reject it, or transmit it to England*. The British Attorney-General and Privy Council were invested with a power either to *suppress it altogether, or model it at their own will*, and then return it to Ireland, *with permission to the Irish Parliament to pass it into law*. Already Molyneux etc. protested against this (17th century). Later, in the 18th century, Swift and Dr. Lucas.<sup>254</sup>

*Statute 6, George I*<sup>255</sup>

(It declared in fact the *legislative supremacy of the British Parliament over Ireland*.)





Poyning's law reduced the Irish House of Commons to a *mere instrument of the Privy Council of both nations*, and, consequently, of the *British Cabinet*.

George I, *Statute*, to neutralise the Irish legislation altogether, and to establish an *appellant jurisdiction to the British Lords*, whereby every decree and judgment of the Irish superior courts, which would tend to affect or disturb the *questionable or bad titles of the British adventurers or absentees*<sup>256</sup> to Irish estates or Irish property, might be reversed or rendered abortive in Great Britain by a *vote of the Scotch and English nobility*.

(*This was re-enacted by the Union!*)

Many British Peers and Commoners, through whose influence this Statute of George I had been enacted, had themselves been deeply interested in effecting that measure, to secure their own grants of Irish estates. Under the 1st clause of this law England assumed a *despotic power* "and declared her inherent right to bind Ireland by every *Statute* in which she should be *expressly* designated".

It was the success of that vicious precedent which had encouraged *George III* and his *British Parliament* to attempt to legislate for America. Cost them the North-American colonies.<sup>257</sup>

### *General Character of Irish Parliament in the 18th Century Until the Upheaving*

Protestant Parliament. Only Protestants electors. In fact the Parliament of the Conquerors. A mere instrument, a mere serf in relation to the British Government. Compensated themselves by despotism against the Catholic mass of the Irish people. *Penal Code* against Catholics<sup>258</sup> rigorously enforced. Only from time to time some efforts of that Parliament to resist the *English commercial legislature* ruining Irish industry and commerce, then principally carried on by the Protestant, Scotch-English part of the population.

As to the *internal composition* of this Parliament etc. more will be said by and by.

A new state of things opened with the *American War of Independence* and the disasters it brought upon England.

B)<sup>a</sup> FIRST EFFECTS OF AMERICAN WAR  
OF INDEPENDENCE ON IRELAND PRIOR  
TO LEGISLATIVE INDEPENDENCE

A) RELAXATION OF PENAL CODE AGAINST CATHOLICS

*American (United States) Declaration of Independence* proclaimed by Congress, 4 July 1776.<sup>b</sup>

April 1777: Congress proclaims the *Constitution (American) of American Republic*.<sup>c</sup>

*War between England and America.*

6 February 1778: *Treaties with France*, by which independence of American Republic [was] recognised and France promised to support the Americans, until they had got rid of the English.<sup>259</sup>

Great fermentation produced by the American events in Ireland. Many Irish, mainly Presbyterians from Ulster, emigrate to America, enrol under the *United States banners* and fight against England on the other side of the Atlantic. *The Catholics*, who for a long time had in vain supplicated for a relaxation of the Penal Code, moved again in 1776, in louder tones.

1778: *Irish Parliament relaxed the severity of the Penal Code*, its worst features obliterated, Catholics were allowed to *take leases of land*.

Curran said afterwards (1792, in *debate on Catholic Emancipation*):

“What was the consequence even of a *partial union* with your countrymen? The united efforts of the two bodies restored that constitution which had been lost by their separation.[...] Your Catholic brethren shared the danger of the conflict, but you had not justice or gratitude to let them share the fruits of the victory. You suffered them to relapse into their former insignificance and depression. And, let me ask you, has it not fared with you according to your deserts? Let me ask you if the Parliament of Ireland can boast of being now less at the feet of the British Minister, than at that period it was of the British Parliament?”

“But *you affect to think your property in danger, by admitting them into the state*.[...] *Thirteen years ago* you expressed the same fears, yet you made the experiment; you *opened the door to landed property*, and the fact has shown the fear to be without foundation.”<sup>260</sup> Then *Protestant Ascendancy*.<sup>261</sup> *Tithes and property of the Protestant Church in Ireland*.

---

<sup>a</sup> In the manuscript this section is marked II, though the preceding section is marked “A” and the following “C”.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> “Declaration of Independence in Congress, July 4, 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America”.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> “Articles of Confederation, and Perpetual Union”.—*Ed.*

*Main opposition* to every innovation and useful measure on the part of *absentees*. Always steady adherents of the Minister for the time being. Their proxies in the Lords, and their influence in the Commons, were transferred to the Minister on a card or in a letter, and on every division in both Houses they formed a phalanx.

B) THE VOLUNTEER ORGANISATION.  
THE FREE-TRADE MOVEMENT.  
FIRST CONCESSIONS OF ENGLAND

On 4 July 1776 the Americans had proclaimed their *Declaration of Independence*. In the same year the Irish Catholics, as seen, demanded (they had before supplicated for) relaxation of the Penal Code, redress.

In April 1777 Constitution of American Republic proclaimed. In 1778 first redress of the Catholic grievances etc. This enabled the Irish Protestants, till now considered by the English as their *gaolers* and *bailiffs*, to move.

To understand the movement from 1779-1782 (*Legislative Independence*), it becomes necessary briefly to allude to the state in which England found herself.

June 1778 commenced war between England and France.<sup>262</sup> In 1780 France sent not only, as she had done till then, money subsidies and men-of-war to America, but also an auxiliary army. (6,000 men under the Marquis of Rochambeau.) The French army landed on 10 July 1780 in Rhode Island, surrendered to him by the English. September 1780 English colonel *Ferguson* defeated in the West of North Carolina. 19 October 1781, *Cornwallis* (General) included by Washington in *York Town* (Virginia) had to *capitulate*. (5-6,000 men, many English men-of-war etc. were captured.)

27 July 1778 sea-battle between French and English at *Quessant*. Undecided.

Summer 1779: King of Spain<sup>a</sup> accedes as ally to United States and France. His navy united with the French one. The hostile fleets assailed the *English coast in June*, and only the dissension amongst the French and Spanish Admirals saved *Plymouth* (August 1779) from the destruction of its wharfs and arsenals.

In 1780 England was not defeated on the sea, but lost much in money and *mercantile ships*.

<sup>a</sup> Charles III.—Ed



26 February 1780 Russia invites all neutral maritime powers to *Armed Neutrality*.<sup>263</sup> England pounces upon Holland. 5 August 1782 naval battle between English and Dutch, at *Doggersbank*, in the North Sea. *Undecided*.

On 30 November 1782 at Paris *Preliminary Peace Treaty between United States and England*.

\* \* \*

1779. Great part of English army and navy consisted of Irishmen. In 1779 *Ireland was left ungarrisoned*, an invasion of Ireland by France threatened, English coast (*Plymouth*) menaced by united French and Spanish navy. Under these circumstances the *Volunteers*—the armed Protestantism of Ireland<sup>264</sup>—arose, partly for defence from the foreigner, partly for self-vindication. In less time than could have been supposed, from the commencement of these armed associations, the whole surface of the island was covered with a self-raised host of patriot soldiers.

\* \* \*

At this place, it will be interesting to anticipate the *whole of the history* of this Volunteer force, because, in fact, it is the history of Ireland to the moment when, since 1795, on the one hand, the *general popular, national and constitutional movement*, represented by them, stripped off its *merely national* character and merged into a *truly revolutionary movement*, and, on the other hand, the British Government changed secret intrigue for brutal force intended to bring about, and succeeding in bringing about, the Union of 1800, i. e. the annihilation of Ireland as a nation, and its transformation into an out of the way country district of England.

There are 4 periods of the Volunteer movement.

*I Period. From 1779 to 1783:* In its first formation the Volunteers, the armed Protestantism of Ireland, embrace all vital elements of all classes, noblemen, gentlemen, merchants, farmers, labourers. Their first object, emancipation from the *commercial and industrial fetters* which the mere mercantile jealousy of England had thrown around them. Then *National Independence*. Then *Reform of Parliament* and *Catholic Emancipation* as one of the conditions of National Resurrection! Their official organisation and the disasters of England give them new strength, but lay also

the germ of their ruin, subordinating them to a weak, bigot, aristocratic Whig, the *Earl of Charlemont*. The first victories (commercial ones) of the Irish Commons they justly claim as their own victory. The votes of thanks by the Irish Commons exalt them. Catholic bodies enroll in them. The apogee of their power in 1783, when their delegates assembled in *Dublin Rotunda*, as *Convention* for Parliamentary Reform. The treason of their chief and the disavowal of them by the Irish *House of Commons* breaks their force and pushes them into the background.

*II Period. From 1783 to 1791 (October).*

Still important as pressure from without upon Irish Parliament, especially House of Commons, and as armed and popular support of the *national and reforming Opposition (minority)* of the House of Commons. The aristocratic element and reactionary part of the middle-class withdrew, the popular element prevailing.

The French Revolution (1789) finds both *Catholic Committee*

(principally composed of Catholic noblemen)

and *Whig Club*<sup>265</sup>

(Reformers)

feeble and dispirited.<sup>266</sup>

There was a steady decline of the Volunteer organisation, and of the strength of the Liberal Party until 1790.

A different race of men from Whig Club orators or Catholic Lords now began to act on the public.

In *Dublin*, *John Keogh*, a strong, rough-souled, sagacious merchant, and men of his stamp, sent the Catholic nobles flying in slavish dread.

And in *Belfast*, Neilson, Russell, McCracken etc., headed a Protestant Party, which advocated Reform, but began soon to think of Republicanism. The government rendered fearful by the *Regency dispute*,<sup>267</sup> and desperate by the French Revolution, began to push corruption and the principles of the Union<sup>a</sup> harder than ever.

*Theobald Wolfe Tone*, the son of a man, half coachmaker and half farmer, a poor and briefless barrister, with a wife and a pack of children, resolved to *redress the wrongs of the Catholics*, restore *representation in the Commons*, and with these, or failing in them, to make his country *an independent republic*. Now he wrote a pamphlet *in favour of the Catholic emancipation*, called: "*An Argument on Behalf of the Catholics of Ireland, by a Northern Whig*," and received every mark of gratitude from his new clients.

*In October, 1791, in Belfast* he founded the *first United Irish Society*.

From this moment, the movement of the Volunteers merges into that of the *United Irishmen*. The Catholic question became that of

<sup>a</sup> Probably a slip of the pen; in his "Memoir of John Ph. Curran" prefixed to *The Speeches of ... Curran*, Thomas Davis writes (p. XX): "to push corruption and the principles of disunion".—*Ed.*

the Irish people. The question was no longer to remove disabilities from the Catholic *upper and middle classes*, but to *emancipate the Irish peasant*, for the vast part Catholic. The question became *social* as to its matter, assumed *French political principles* as to its form, remained *national*.

*III Period. From 1791 (October) to 1795 (after recall of Lord Fitzwilliam).*

The movement of the Volunteers merged into that of the *United Irishmen*.

Public until 1794, when forced by the government measures to become *secret*. The United Irishmen increased in numbers, the Catholics in confidence, and the *Volunteer Corps* began to restore their array, and improve their discipline.

Acme of their action:

*15 February 1793: A Volunteer Convention at Dungannon* passed resolutions in favour of Emancipation and Reform, and named a permanent Committee. The *Relief Bill of April 1793* was carried by this pressure.<sup>268</sup>

But now, the *Catholic higher classes secede from the movement*; pitched against the *ci-devant*<sup>a</sup> Volunteers (merging into the Secret Societies of the United Irishmen) the *aristocratic and stupidly, bigottedly middle-class yeomen*.

Coercive laws against *military societies, drilling, and the whole machinery of the Volunteers* passed on *11 March 1793*, and the *Alien Act, the Militia, Foreign Correspondence, Gunpowder and Convention Acts*,<sup>269</sup> in fact, a full *code of coercion* passed by the same Parliament, that had passed the Catholic Relief Bill.

The *United Irishmen* became a secret organisation. Recall of Fitzwilliam only left the decision to force.

*IV Period. Volunteer movement merged into the revolutionary movement since 1795.*

\* \* \*

We now return to the development of the *Volunteer Movement, 1779-83*, and the Acts of Irish Parliament under this high popular pressure. The *Armed Associations, first provincial and local*, strongest in the North (Ulster) and Dublin (Leinster). Only Protestants. First *against Invasion*. Protestant farmers rallied under this cry first. Catholics prohibited by statute from bearing arms in Ireland. However, they zealously assisted in forwarding those very associa-

<sup>a</sup> Former.—Ed.

tions into which they themselves had no admission. Their calmness and their patriotism gained them many friends, and a relaxation of intolerance appeared rapidly to be gaining ground, but it was not until the Volunteers had assumed a deliberative capacity, that the necessity of uniting the whole population of the country in the cause of independency became distinctly obvious.

The first object of the Irish Volunteers—after the defence against invasion—was to free themselves mercantilely and industrially, an interest then almost wholly in the hands of the Protestants, although by its very nature a national interest.

It was observed, that this British assumption of authority to legislate for Ireland, whatever colouring it might have received by the dissimulation or ingenuity of its supporters, had, in fact, for its real object the restraint of her commerce and the suppression of her manufactures, so far as they might interfere with the interests of England; because the management of the merely local concerns of Ireland, by her own Parliament, was altogether immaterial to Great Britain, unless where a commercial rivalry might be the probable consequence of successful industry and legislative encouragement.

Peers [showed] no public spirit; the measures of the Commons might be suppressed by an act of the Privy Council; hence determined co-operation of the whole people necessary.

The moment (the distress of England and the armed force of the Volunteers) was favourable.

England, notwithstanding [the fact that] she had in some instances suspended, and in others prohibited, the exportation of Irish manufactures, inundated the Irish markets with every species of her own; a combination of the great capitalists of England to destroy Irish manufacture by inundation of the Irish market.

Hence the Irish resolved to adopt a non-importation and non-consumption agreement throughout the whole kingdom, by excluding not only the importation, but the consumption of any British manufacture in Ireland. No sooner was this measure publicly proposed, than it was universally adopted; it flew quicker than the wind throughout the whole nation. Meanwhile the Volunteer organisation spread; at length almost every independent Protestant enrolled as a patriot soldier. Self-formed, self-governed, no commissions from the Crown, no connexion whatever with the Government, [they] appointed their own officers etc. Yet subordination complete. Their arms at first provided by themselves; but the extraordinary increase of their numbers rendered them at length unable to procure a sufficient supply by purchase; they required arms from the Government; Government did not think it

safe to refuse their demand; and, with an averted eye, *handed out to the Volunteers 20,000 stands of arms from the Castle of Dublin.*<sup>270</sup> Many men who had served in the United States against the Americans became their drill sergeants. At the head of the corps noblemen etc. Important in this movement *the familiar association of all ranks.*

Under these circumstances:

*Sessions of the Irish Parliament 1779-80.* After frivolous speech of the Lord Lieutenant (Harcourt?)<sup>a</sup> in the House of Lords, and usual adulatory address moved in the Commons by *Sir Robert Deane,*<sup>b</sup> *Grattan* moved the following *amendment*:

“That we beseech Your Majesty to believe, that it is with the utmost reluctance we are constrained to approach you on the present occasion; but the *constant drain to supply absentees*, and the *unfortunate prohibition of our trade*, have caused such calamity, that the natural support of our country has decayed, and our *manufacturers* are dying for want: famine stalks hand in hand with hopeless wretchedness; and the only means left to support the expiring trade of this miserable part of Your Majesty’s dominions, is to *open a free export trade*, and let your Irish subjects enjoy their natural birthright.”<sup>c</sup>

Mr. *Hussey Burgh*, the Prime Sergeant (above the Attorney-General) moved the following amendment:

“That it is not *by temporary expedients*, that this nation is now to be saved from impending ruin.”<sup>271</sup>

Unanimously carried.

Volunteers attributed rightly this unexpected success to their movement. It greatly increased both the numbers and confidence in Volunteer associations.

Although even in *both Houses of the British Parliament* attention [was] called to the Irish distress and the dangerous state of that country, *Lord North* treated the whole [matter] with his usual superciliousness and frivolity. Nothing was done.

The *non-importation and non-consumption movement* became now general in Ireland. At length, a general meeting was convened by the *High Sheriff of the city of Dublin*, and resolutions then entered into by the whole metropolis, which finally confirmed and consummated that judicious measure, and at length convinced

<sup>a</sup> George Nugent-Temple Grenville, the Marquis of Buckingham, was the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland at the time. See his speech at the opening of the session of the Irish Parliament on October 12, 1779, in H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, pp. 20-22.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Deane’s address to George III on October 12, 1779, see H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, p. 22.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See J. Mitchel, *The History of Ireland...*, Vol. I, p. 126.—*Ed.*

Great Britain, that Ireland would no longer submit to insult and domination. These resolutions were enforced with vigour and strictness. The Volunteers of Dublin resolved to consolidate, chose *William, Duke of Leinster*, for their Chief. This was the first measure of the Volunteers to form a regular army composed of every rank of society. Secret efforts of the Government to seduce the soldier from his officers, or to detach the most popular officers from the command of the soldiers—all in vain!

The appointment of the Duke of Leinster to the command of the Dublin Volunteers, was quickly followed by that of other district generals; and the organisation of 4 provincial armies was regularly proceeded on. The Ulster army appointed the *Earl of Charlemont* its commander-in-chief, the other armies proceeded rapidly in their organisation. Provincial reviews were adopted; and everything assumed the appearance of systematic movement. Soon General Commander-in-Chief [was appointed].

Affairs now approached fast towards a crisis; the freedom of commerce being the subject most familiar to the ideas of the people, was the first object of their solicitude. "A *free trade*" became the *watchword* of the *Volunteers*, and the cry of the Nation; the *Dublin Volunteer Artillery* appeared on parade, commanded by *James Napper Tandy*, with labels on the mouths of their cannon: "*Free Trade or Speedy Revolution.*" Lord North got now frightened. America already lost. On *24th November 1781* speech from the throne wherein he [the King] called the immediate attention of his *British Parliament* to the situation of Ireland. Now in hot haste these blockheads acceded to the Irish claims. The *British Parliament* met on *25 November*, and the first Bills of concessions received the royal assent on *21 December 1781*. Now these dunderheads passed Bills, distinctly repealing all the Acts which their predecessors had declared absolutely *essential* to secure the *prosperity* of England from the *dangerous industry* of the Irish.

Messages sent over to Ireland, much fuss made of the liberality and justice of Great Britain. Meanwhile *North* tried to pass over the year 1782, by continuing to open the Committee on Irish affairs from time to time, now and then passing a resolution in favour of that country, and thus endeavouring to wear out the session.

Ireland at length perceived the duplicity of proceedings which, while they purported to extend benefits to Ireland?!, asserted the paramount authority of Great Britain, and converted its acts of *concession* into declaratory statutes of its own supremacy. *14 Irish Counties* at once avowed to establish, at the risk of their lives and

fortunes, *the independence of the Irish Legislature*. The cry of "Free Trade" now accompanied with that of "*Free Parliament*".

*George III* forced, from the throne (in his speech), to pass unqualified eulogiums on the *Volunteer army*, as expression of the *loyalty and fidelity of the people*.

The *Army in Ireland* had been under *the regulations of a British Statute*, and the *hereditary revenue of the Crown*, with the aid of a *perpetual mutiny bill*,<sup>272</sup> enabled the British Government to command at all times a *standing army in Ireland*, without the authority or the control of its Parliament. Volunteers became aware of this. *Resolutions were entered into by almost every military corps, and every corporate body, that they would no longer obey any laws, save those enacted by the King, Lords and Commons of Ireland.*

The salaries of the *Judges of Ireland* were then barely sufficient to keep them above want, and *they held their offices only during the will of the British Minister, who might remove them at his pleasure*: all Irish justice, therefore, was at his control. In all questions between the Crown and the people, the purity of the judge was consequently suspected.

*The Irish Parliament*, at this period, met *but once in 2 years*, and in the *British Attorney-General* was vested the superintendence of their proceedings and in the *British Privy Council* the alteration and rejection of their Statutes.

**9 October 1781.** *Irish House of Commons.* *Irish Parliament* opened, speech of the Viceroy<sup>a</sup> etc., after address to His Majesty passed, *Mr. O'Neill* (House of Commons) moved a *resolution of thanks* to "*all the Volunteers of Ireland, for their exertions and continuance*". Unanimously voted, and directed to be circulated throughout all Ireland, and to be communicated by the Sheriffs of the counties to the corps within their bailiwicks.<sup>b</sup>

This resolution brought down the British Government to the feet of the Volunteers, and raised the Volunteers above the supremacy of Britain, by a direct Parliamentary approbation of self-armed, self-governed, and self-disciplined associations.

These Volunteers by *this time exceeded in number the whole regular military force of the British Empire.*

*Portugal Affair:* By the resolutions of the British Legislature, Ireland had been admitted to export her *linen and woollen manufactures to Portugal*, agreeable to the provisions of the *Treaty of Methuen*,<sup>273</sup> from which *liberty she had been previously and explicitly prohibited by express statutes*. Irish manufacturers tried immediately to *improve this*. Portuguese Ministry (*under orders of the British Ministers*) peremptorily

<sup>a</sup> Frederick Howard, Earl of Carlisle.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, pp. 82-85; J. Mitchel, *The History of Ireland...*, Vol. I, p. 135.—Ed.

refused, seized the Irish merchandise (this in 1782). Petition of the Dublin merchants to Irish House of Commons. In opposition to a motion of Fitzgibbon Sir *Lucius O'Brien* moved an amendment, calling upon the King, as *King of Ireland*, to assert the *rights of that kingdom* "by *hostility with Portugal*", [and] concluding with: "We doubt not that Nation (Ireland) has *vigour* and *resources* sufficient to maintain all her rights, and *astonish all her enemies*."

House [did] not [have] the courage to pass it.

Now [the] cry in the country, that *their connection with England was only federative*. This engrossed now almost the exclusive consideration of the armed associations of Ireland.

*Want of protection for personal liberty in Ireland: No Habeas Corpus Act.*<sup>274</sup>

*Repeal of the English Statute of 6, George I* asked by the armed Volunteers and corporate bodies<sup>a</sup> etc. *Catholic bodies now also entered the Volunteer army*, officered by Protestants. Regular and public deliberative meetings of the armed Volunteers. The *armed associations of Ulster first appointed delegates* to declare the sentiments of their province, in a general assembly. **Convention at Dungannon, 15 February 1782**. Agreed upon the celebrated *Declaration of Rights and Grievances*.

They were delegates from 25,000 Ulster soldiers, backed by the voice of about 1 million inhabitants of that country.

*Declaration of the Volunteers  
at the Dungannon Convention.  
15 February 1782*<sup>275</sup>

"Whereas it has been asserted that Volunteers, as such, cannot with propriety debate or give their opinions on political subjects, or the conduct of Parliament, or public men, resolved unanimously: That a citizen, by learning the use of arms, does not abandon any of his *civil rights*. That a claim of any body of men, other than the *King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland*, to make laws to bind *this Kingdom*, is *unconstitutional, illegal, and a grievance*;

"that the *power exercised by the Privy Council* of both Kingdoms, under the pretence of the *law of Poynings*,<sup>b</sup> is *unconstitutional* and a *grievance*;

"that the *independence of judges* is equally essential to the impartial administration of *justice in Ireland*, as in England; and that the refusal or delay of this right to Ireland, makes a distinction where there should be no distinction; may excite jealousy where perfect union should prevail; and is in itself *unconstitutional and a grievance*; that it is our *decided and unalterable* determination to seek a redress of these grievances ... redress, *speedy and effectual*; that as men, and as Irishmen, as Christians, and as Protestants, we *rejoice in the relaxation of the penal laws against our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects*; and that we conceive the measure to be fraught with the *happiest consequences* to the union and prosperity of the inhabitants of Ireland."

4 members from each county of the province of Ulster were appointed to *act as a committee* for the Volunteer Corps, to call general meetings of the province. That

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 212.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 212, 215.—*Ed.*



the said committee appoint 9 of their members to be a committee in Dublin, in order to communicate with all other Volunteer Associations in the other provinces, that may think proper to come to similar resolutions; and to deliberate with them on the most constitutional means of carrying them into effect.

*Earl of Bristol*, Englishman by birth, British Peer and Protestant Bishop of Derry<sup>a</sup> (uncle of *George Robert Fitzgerald*), openly declares for the Volunteers (ditto for full *Catholic Emancipation*).

*In every Volunteer Corps of Ireland the **Dungannon** resolutions are accepted.*

About this time about 90,000 Volunteers are ready.

As soon as the *Dungannon* Volunteers had received the concurrence of the armed associations, the *Irish House of Commons* assumed new aspect. The proceedings of the people without now told on their representatives within. The whole House appeared forming into parties.

Their Sessions were *biennial*, and consequently their grants to Government *were for 2 years at once*; and till more money was required, their legislative [power] was inactive. They *now determined on granting supplies to the Crown for 6 months only*, as a hint that they would grant no more till their grievances were redressed: this had its effect.

The proceedings of the Volunteers and municipal bodies became every day more serious and decisive, tone in House of Commons more menacing.

*Impracticable to proceed with Lord North any longer*. About April 1782 *Marquis of Rockingham's Cabinet* (*James Fox* etc.). *Duke of Portland*, nominated *Lord Lieutenant of Ireland*, arrived at *Dublin 14 April 1782*, had to meet the *Irish Parliament on the 16th April*.

#### C) DECLARATIONS OF IRISH LEGISLATIVE INDEPENDENCE<sup>276</sup>

*Message of George III to **British** Parliament, 18 April 1782.*<sup>277</sup>  
Stating:

"that mistrusts and jealousies had arisen in Ireland, and that it was highly necessary to take the same into immediate consideration, in order to [effect] a *final adjustment*."

*British House of Commons* in reply: express

"their entire and cheerful concurrence in His Majesty's views of a *final adjustment*".

The same words "*final adjustment*" were repeated, by the Irish Ministry, when a *Union* was proposed to the Irish Parliament in 1800.

<sup>a</sup> Frederick Hervey.—*Ed.*

Duke of Portland wanted to procrastinate. Grattan communicated to him, that this [was] impossible without provoking anarchy. *House of Commons, 16 April 1782*: Grattan on the point of proposing *Independence motion*, when Mr. **Hely Hutchinson** (Secretary of State in Ireland) rose and said, the Lord Lieutenant had ordered him to deliver a message from the King, importing that "His Majesty, being concerned to find that discontents and jealousies were prevailing amongst his loyal subjects of Ireland, upon matters of great weight and importance, recommended the House to take the same into their most serious consideration, in order to effect such a *final adjustment* as might give satisfaction to both kingdoms".

*Hutchinson* accompanied this message, and his statement of his own views on the subject, with a determination to support a declaration of "*Irish rights*" and constitutional "*independence*". *Hutchinson* declared at the same time, that he had simply to deliver the message; he was therefore silent to all details and pledged the Government to none. *Ponsonby* proposed a short address.

*Grattan* spoke: "America has shed much English blood, and America is to be free: Ireland has shed her own blood for England, and is Ireland to remain in fetters?" etc. Proposes *Amendment* to *Ponsonby's* "short address", etc. "to assure His Majesty that his subjects of Ireland are a *free people*, that the Crown of Ireland is an *imperial* crown, inseparably connected with the Crown of Great Britain ... but that the Kingdom of Ireland is a *distinct kingdom*, with a Parliament of her own the sole legislature thereof, that there is no body of men competent to make laws to bind the nation but the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland, nor any Parliament which hath any authority or power of any sort whatever in this country, save only the Parliament of Ireland; to assure His Majesty that we humbly conceive that in this right the very *essence of our liberty exists*, a right which we, on the part of all the people of Ireland, do claim as their birth-right, and which we cannot yield but with our lives."

*Brownlow* seconded. *George Ponsonby* stated "that he most willingly consented [on behalf of Portland] to the proposed amendment, and would answer that the noble lord who presided in the Government of Ireland, wished to do everything in his power etc." and "he (Portland) would use his utmost influence in obtaining the *rights* of Ireland, an object on which he had **fixed his heart**".

(1799. Portland openly avowed in 1799 that he had **never** considered this concession of England in 1782 as **final**.)

*Unanimously Grattan's Motion was passed.*

Shortly before and shortly after this scene very decided resolutions on the part of the Volunteer Corps. It was the unanimous *firmness* of the *people*, and not the abstract virtue of their delegates, which achieved this revolution.

*Fitzgibbon* had declared [himself] a patriot; and Mr. *John Scott*, then Attorney-General, afterwards *Lord Clonmel*, even declared: "If the Parliament of Great Britain were determined to lord it over Ireland, he was resolved not to be their villain in executing their tyranny. That if matters should proceed to the extremity to which he feared they were verging, he should not be an insignificant subscriber to the fund for defending their common rights ... he had determined to throw his life and fortune into the scale."

(This true man of the Pitt-Castlereagh school!)

Immediately on this turn, *Portland* sent off 2 despatches to England, one to the Cabinet as a public document, the other, *private and confidential*, to Fox. Explained the reasons for the necessity of acceding.... Stated in conclusion that "he would omit no opportunity of *cultivating* his connexion with the Earl of Charlemont, who appeared entirely disposed to place confidence in his Administration, and to give a *proper tone* to the *armed bodies* over whom he had the most considerable influence".

*Parliament* was meanwhile *prorogued for 3 weeks*, to wait for the King's Reply to their Declaration of Independence. Meanwhile *reviews and discipline* were continued with unremitting vigour by the *Volunteer army*, now about 124,000, of whom upwards of 100,000 effectives. Besides nearly  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the whole English army then Irish, ditto very many *sailors* Irish.

(Portland's conduct in 1782 a *premeditated tissue of dissimulation!*)

27 May 1782 Irish House of Commons met, pursuant to adjournment.

*Portland* in his quasi throne speech: "King and British Parliament ... are united in a desire to *gratify every wish* expressed in your late Address to the Throne.... By the papers which, in obedience to His Majesty's commands, I have directed to be laid before you, you will receive the most convincing testimony of the cordial reception which your representations have met with from the Legislative of Great Britain, but His Majesty whose first and most anxious wish is to exercise his Royal Prerogative in such a manner as may be most conducive to the welfare of his faithful subjects, has further given it me in command to assure you of his gracious disposition to give his Royal assent to acts to *prevent the suppression of Bills in the Privy Council of this Kingdom*, and the *alteration of them anywhere*, and to *limit the duration of the Act for the better Regulation and Accommodation of His Majesty's forces in this Kingdom, to the term of 2 years*. The benevolent intentions of His Majesty ... unaccompanied by any stipulation or condition whatever. The *good faith, the generosity*, and the honour of *this* (the English) nation, afford them the surest pledge of a corresponding disposition, on your part etc."<sup>a</sup>

*Grattan* the fool rose at once:

"That as Great Britain had *given up every claim to authority over Ireland*, he had *not the least idea* that she should be also bound to make *any declaration that she had formerly usurped that power*. I move you to assure His Majesty of our unfeigned affection to His Royal Person and Government ... magnanimity of His Majesty, and the wisdom of the *Parliament of Great Britain*, that we conceive the *resolution for an unqualified, unconditional repeal of the 6, George I, to be a measure of consummate wisdom and justice*"

and similar talk, and in particular

"that no constitutional question between the two nations will any longer exist".

Sir *Samuel Broadstreet* on the other hand declared: "The Irish Parliament actually sat at that moment under an English statute." Ditto *Flood, David Walsh*:

"I repeat it, that until England declares unequivocally, *by an Act of her own Legislature*, that she had no right, in any instance, to make laws to bind Ireland, the *usurped power of English Legislation* never can be considered by us as relinquished ... we have the *power* to assert our rights as men, and accomplish our independence as a nation."

<sup>a</sup> For Portland's speech in Parliament on May 27, 1782, see H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, p. 131.—Ed

*Grattan's address was triumphantly carried (only 2 votes against. The secretary Fitzpatrick had accelerated the vote by artifice).*

*Beauchamp Bagenal* proposed to appoint committee "to consider and report what sum the Irish Parliament should grant, to build a suitable mansion and purchase an estate for their deliverer" (i.e. *Grattan*).

*The British Cabinet now frightened.* Their intolerance degenerated into fear. They had already signed the capitulation, and thought it impossible to carry it too soon into execution. America already lost.

Bills to enact the concessions demanded by Ireland were, therefore, prepared with an expedition nearly bordering on precipitancy. The *6th of George I*, declaratory of, and establishing the supremacy of England, and the eternal dependence of Ireland on the Parliament and Cabinet of Great Britain, was *now hastily repealed, without debate, or any qualification by the British Legislature.* This repeal obtained the royal assent, and a copy was instantly transmitted to the Irish Viceroy, and communicated by circulars to the Volunteer commanders.

*Chap. III: An Act, to repeal an Act made in the 6th year of the reign of his late Majesty King George I, entitled, An Act for the better securing the dependency of the Kingdom of Ireland upon the Crown of Great Britain.*

"Whereas, an Act was passed etc., may it please your excellent Majesty, that it may be enacted, and be it enacted, by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that from and after the passing of this Act, *the above-mentioned Act, and the several matters and things therein contained, shall be, and is, and are hereby repealed.*"

*Irish House of Commons, 30 May 1782.* Bagenal resumed the subject of reward to Grattan; proposed £100,000. *Mr. Thomas Conolly* declared that "the *Duke of Portland* felt with the Irish people ... he (the Lord Lieutenant) begged to offer, as a part of the intended grant to Mr. Grattan, the *Viceregal Palace in the Phoenix Park*"

—the King's best Palace in Ireland.

The Viceroy of Ireland proposing, on behalf of the King of England, to Grattan to reward his services for having emancipated his country from the domination of Great Britain, was an incident as extraordinary as had ever occurred in any Government, and, emanating from that of England, told, in a single sentence, the whole history of her horrors, her jealousies, her shallow artifice and humbled arrogance. Was, of course, rejected by the Irish House of Commons. Grattan got £50,000 from that House.

## II. FROM 1782 (AFTER THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE) TO 1795

*General remark on this period:* When Lord Westmoreland was removed from Ireland, in 1795, Ireland was in a *most unexampled and progressive state of prosperity*. Curran suggested even an intention to impeach Westmoreland for having permitted a *part of 12,000 troops* (which, according to stipulation, should always remain in Ireland) to be drafted out of that kingdom for foreign service.

### A) FROM 1782 TO 1783. (THE FIASCO OF THE REFORM BILL AND THE GREAT DEFEAT OF THE VOLUNTEERS)

*Irish House of Commons: Bills to ameliorate*, by partial concession, the *depressed state of the Catholics*, and some reward for their zeal and patriotism, *were introduced*, and *had arrived to their last stages in the House of Commons, without any effective opposition*. Opposed by bigotry in their latter stages, the Castle powers stirring on. *Those Bills relaxing the severity of the Penal Code passed however through both Houses*. The concessions [though] very limited, still afforded great satisfaction to the Catholics, as the first growth of a tolerating principle. *Grattan still believed in the Whigs*. But at length *Fox himself*, wearied by a protracted course of slow deception, at once confirmed the opinions of the Irish people, and openly proclaimed to Ireland the inadequacy of all the measures that had heretofore been adopted. He took occasion in the *British Parliament*, on the repeal of the 6th George I being there alluded to, to state

*"that the repeal of that statute could not stand alone, but must be accompanied by a final adjustment, and by a solid basis of permanent connexion", that "some plans of that nature would be laid before the Irish Parliament by the Irish Ministers, and a treaty entered upon, which treaty, when proceeded on, might be adopted by both Parliaments, and finally become an irrevocable arrangement between the two countries".<sup>a</sup>*

By that speech, the Irish delusion of a final adjustment was in a moment dissipated, the Viceroy's duplicity became indisputably proved.

Still *Flood* was feebly supported in Irish House of Commons, but [was supported] by the *Volunteers*.

*19 July 1782* Flood moved for leave to bring in a Bill "to affirm the sole exclusive right of the Irish Parliament, to make laws affecting that country, in all concerns external and internal whatsoever".<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, pp. 148-51.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 145-46.—Ed.

Even the introduction of this Bill was negated without division. Grattan!

On the other hand [Parliament] *passed* [the] foolish motion of Grattan:

"that leave was refused to bring in Mr. Flood's bill, because the sole and exclusive right to legislate for Ireland in all cases whatsoever, internally and externally, had been asserted by the Parliament of Ireland, and had been fully, finally and irrevocably acknowledged by the British Parliament"<sup>a</sup>

(which was *not* true). (Fox himself had declared the contrary!) (*Because of his scepticism Flood had been dismissed from his office of Vice-Treasurer.*)

27 July 1782 the Parliament was prorogued. In the proroguing speech *Portland* stated amongst other things:

"Your claims were directed by the *same* spirit that gave rise and stability to the *liberty of Great Britain*, and could not fail of success, as soon as the councils of that Kingdom were influenced by the avowed friends of the Constitution.

"Convince the people in your several districts, as you are yourselves convinced, that every cause of past jealousies and discontents is *finally removed*; that both countries have *pledged their good faith* to each other, and their best security will be an *inviolable* adherence to *that compact*; that the implicit reliance which Great Britain has reposed on the honour, generosity, and candour of Ireland, engages your national character to a return of sentiments equally liberal and enlarged. Convince them that the two kingdoms are *now one*, indissolubly connected in *unity of constitution*, and *unity of interests*."<sup>b</sup>

*Marquis of Rockingham* died (1782). *Fox and Lord North Coalition*.

*Portland superseded by Earl Temple* (who later became *Marquis of Buckingham*) (his *Chief Secretary* his brother Mr., afterwards *Lord, Grenville*) (15 September 1782-3 June 1783). Temple made small reforms. Though he obtained no credit from the *body of the people*, he made considerable progress amongst the aristocracy of the patriots (*Charlemont, Grattan* etc.).

The *armed Volunteers* had now assumed a deliberative capacity: Paraded as soldiers and debated as citizens. More than 150,000 Volunteers now appeared upon the regimental muster-rolls. *Strong accession to them of Catholics*. They resolved no longer to obey, or suffer to be obeyed, any statute or law *theretofore* enacted in England, and to oppose their execution with their lives and fortunes. The magistrates refused to act under them, the judges were greatly embarrassed, no legal causes could be proceeded on, under the authority of British Statutes, though naming Ireland, no counsel would plead them, no juries would find for them, the

<sup>a</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 166.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 170-72.—*Ed.*

operation of many important laws, theretofore in force, was necessarily suspended.

*Parliament divided between Flood and Grattan*, the latter (Whig spelt) always in the majority. This division of nation the British Administration wanted to foster. Baffled by the *injudicious conduct of some Members of the British Parliament*.

In the *House of Commons* (British) *Sir George Young* (Sinecure placeman in Ireland, although not Irish, viz. *Vice-treasurer of Ireland*) opposed the *Bill of Concession to Ireland*, and Repeal of 6, George I. Protested against the *Power of King and Parliament to pass such bills*. (He could not act against the will of the Ministers.)

*Lord Mansfield*, notwithstanding the repeal of 6, George I, proceeded to entertain, in the Court of King's Bench,<sup>278</sup> at Westminster, an appeal from the King's Bench of Ireland, observing that "he knew of no law *depriving* the British Court of its vested jurisdiction". The interest of money 5% in England, 6% in Ireland. Mansfield had placed very large sums of Irish mortgages to gain the additional 1%. Felt that they were not likely to gain any additional facilities by the appellant jurisdiction being taken from the British courts and transferred to Ireland herself: hence his reluctance to part with it.

*Lord Abingdon*, in the *House of Lords*, totally denied the authority of King and Parliament of England to emancipate Ireland; he moved for leave to bring in a Declaratory Bill to re-assert the right of England to legislate externally in the concerns of Ireland.

The Volunteers beat to arms throughout the whole kingdom; above 120,000 paraded. All confidence in Great Britain dissipated. Flood gained much ground amongst the people. Now *new panic of the British Ministry*. Without waiting for further and peremptory remonstrances from Ireland, they passed the following Statute:

*Anno vicessimo tertio (1783)*  
*Georgii III. Regis<sup>a</sup>*

Ch. XXVIII. An Act for removing and preventing all doubts which have arisen, or might arise, concerning *the exclusive rights of the Parliament and Courts of Ireland, in matters of legislation and judicature; and for preventing any writ of error or appeal from any of His Majesty's Courts in that Kingdom from being received, heard, and adjudged, in any of His Majesty's Courts in the Kingdom of Great Britain*. Whereas ... doubts have arisen whether the provisions of the said (their last) Act are sufficient to secure to the people of Ireland the rights claimed by them, *to be bound only by laws enacted by His Majesty and the Parliament of that Kingdom, in all cases whatever* etc. etc. ... be it declared and enacted ... that the said right claimed by the *people of Ireland*, to be bound only by laws enacted by His Majesty and the Parliament of *that Kingdom*, in all cases whatever, and to have all actions and suits at law or in equity, which may be instituted in that Kingdom, decided in His Majesty's Courts therein finally, and

<sup>a</sup> The twenty-third regnal year (1783) of King George III (J. Mitchel, *The History of Ireland...*, Vol. I, p. 153).—Ed

without appeal thence, shall be, and it is thereby declared to be *established and ascertained for ever*, and shall, at no time hereafter, be questioned or questionable.

And be it further enacted ... that no writ of error or appeal shall be received or adjudged, or any other proceeding be heard by or in any of His Majesty's Courts in this Kingdom, in any action or suit at law or in equity, instituted in any of His Majesty's Courts in the Kingdom of Ireland, etc. etc.

This measure brought into the British House of Commons by Mr. Townshend, passed through both Houses, and received the Royal assent without debate and with very little observation. In England held out a mere consequential *declaratory* part of a general constitutional arrangement entered into between the two nations. This measure came too late to satisfy the Irish people as to the purity of their *own Parliament*. It convinced them of either its inefficiency or corruption, or the *Renunciation Act of the British Parliament would have been quite unnecessary*. They had to secure their liberties. The Renunciation Act of Ireland had discredited the Irish Parliament with the Irish people.

Mr. Flood had become most prominent among the Irish patriots. Grattan his enemy. The discussion on the English Renunciation Act led to the conclusion of the necessity to reform *their own Parliament*, because, without its comprehensive Reform, there was no security against the instability of events and the duplicity of England.

Rotten borough system.<sup>279</sup> Many members of the Irish *House of Commons* nominated by individuals (borough-mongers) and *Peers*, who in this way voted by proxy in the House of Commons. The King constitutionally nominated *Peers*, and the *Peers* created *Commoners*. The representation of the people in the Commons was *purchased for money*, and the exercise of that representation was sold for office. These purchases made by servants of the executive Government, in trust, for the uses and purposes of its ministers to carry measures. The *Volunteers* had the facts sifted. One *Peer* nominated 9 *Commoners* etc. Many individuals openly *sold their patronage for money, to the best bidder*, others returned members at the nomination of the Viceroy or his Secretary; and it appeared that the number of representatives elected freely by the *people did not compose 1/4 of the Irish Commons*. The *Volunteers* at length determined to *demand a reform of Parliament*. Delegates from several *Volunteer* regiments again assembled at Dungannon, to consider the expediency and means of an immediate reform of Parliament. Flood [had] great influence now. 300 delegates, men of great influence, many of them members of the House of Lords and the Commons chosen by different corps.



10 November 1783 was proclaimed for the first sitting of the Grand National Convention of Ireland at Dublin. [The delegates] arrived there escorted by small detachments of Volunteers from their respective counties. Rotunda chosen as their place of meeting (vis-à-vis the magnificent dome of the Commons' House of Parliament). Bishop of Derry and Earl of Charlemont rivals for the presidency. The British Ministers knew that if a reform of Parliament were effected in Ireland, it could not be long withheld from England. Then the commercial jealousy of England. Charlemont, their fool. By intrigue he (supported by Grattan) [was] elected before the Earl of Bristol, Bishop of Derry, arrived. Collision in the Convention between Flood and the Bishop on one side, Charlemont and his friends on the other.

After much deliberation, a plan of reform, framed by Mr. Flood and approved by the Convention, was directed to be presented by him to Parliament forthwith, and the sittings of the Convention were made permanent till Parliament had decided the question. Mr. Flood obeyed his instructions, and moved for leave to bring in a Bill of reform of the Parliament. The Government knew that the triumph of the Parliament implied not only the destruction of the Convention, but of the Volunteers.

The Government refused leave to bring in Flood's Bill,<sup>a</sup> because it had originated from *their* (the Volunteers) deliberations. (Yelverton now Attorney-General.) (Furious speech of Fitzgibbon.)<sup>b</sup> Unprecedentedly violent debate. Bill was rejected by 158 to 49; 158 of the majority were placemen and the very persons on whom the reform was intended to operate. Ditto 158 placemen who carried the Union Bill in 1800, which, if the Reform had succeeded, never could have been passed. An address to the King (moved by Conolly), offending against the Volunteers, carried.<sup>c</sup> Earl Charlemont, suppressing this news, told the Volunteers, he had received a note from the House of Commons, which left no hopes of a speedy decision, the Convention ought to adjourn till Monday,<sup>d</sup> then to decide upon interior measures, if the Bill should be rejected. He had secretly decided that they should meet no more. On the Monday morning he repaired to the Rotunda before the usual hour of sitting; only his own immediate partisans present. He adjourned the Convention *sine die*. When the residue of the

<sup>a</sup> "A Bill for the More Equal Representation of the People in Parliament, November 29, 1783." See H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, p. 191.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, pp. 191-94.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. 38.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> December 1. 1783.—Ed.

delegates came, the door closed, the Convention dissolved. The Bishop became now the popular man. Charlemont went down. He, a bigot, hated the Catholics, Bishop was quite the opposite. Exclusion on the one side, and toleration on the other became the theme of partisans. The dispute ran high. *The people began to separate*. This effected all the mischief the Government expected.

A *Northern Corps*, calling itself "*Bill of Rights Battalion*", says in Address to the Bishop among other things:

"The gloomy clouds of superstition and *bigotry*, those *engines of disunion*, being fled from the realm, the interests of Ireland can no longer suffer by a diversity of *religious persuasions*. All are united in the pursuit of one great object—the extermination of corruption from our Constitution; nor can your Lordship and your virtuous coadjutors, in promoting civil and *religious liberty*, be destitute of the aid of *all professions*."

Bishop answered in the same strain (dated *14 January 1784*): in conclusion he said:

"The hour is now come ... when Ireland must necessarily avail herself of her whole internal force to ward off foreign encroachments, or once more acquiesce under those encroachments, the better to exercise anew the tyranny of a *part* of the community over the dearest and inalienable rights of *others*. For one million of *divided* Protestants can never, in the scale of Human Government, be a counterpoise against 3 millions of united *Catholics*. But, gentlemen of the Bill of Rights Battalion, I appeal to yourselves, and summon you to consistency—*Tyranny is not Government, and Allegiance is only due to Protection*."

The Government resolved (too impotent to act) to watch the progress of events. Many of the best patriots thought the Bishop's language too strong. The idea of coercing the Parliament very rapidly lost ground. No military language to Parliament etc.

The people were severed, but the Government remained compact; the Parliament was corrupted, the Volunteers were paralysed, and the high spirit of the Nation exhibited a rapid declension.

Weak ly foolish Charlemont, after the dissolution of the Convention, recommended a *Reform Bill* to be presented to Parliament, as emanating solely from *civil* bodies, unconnected with military character. Of course, the placemen, who had scouted the military Bill, because it was military, now rejected the civil Bill, because it was popular. Meetings of the Volunteers were suspended, their reviews continued, to amuse the languid vanity of their *deluded general*.

The *temperate* (bourgeois parliamentary) system now gained ground. The Volunteers of Ireland survived these blows for some years. The Whig orators (Grattan etc.) lost ground and influence.

*December 1783. Pitt Minister. Duke of Rutland Viceroy (!)*

B) FROM THE END OF 1783 TO 1791  
(FOUNDATION OF UNITED IRISHMEN)

*Pitt in England.*

*Duke of Rutland (Lord Lieutenant) died October, 1787.*

*Marquis of Buckingham (formerly Earl of Temple) second time Viceroy (16 December 1787-5 January 1790).*

*John Fane, Earl of Westmoreland [Lord Lieutenant] (Hobart, afterwards Earl of Buckinghamshire, Chief Secretary) from 5 January 1790 onwards (until 1795).*

In *Irish House of Commons* repeated attempts at *Reform* (Flood, Grattan, Curran etc.) failed.

*Place Bill, Pension Bill, Responsibility Bill, Inquiry into the Sale of Peerages* and into the *Police of Dublin* the most material measures pressed by the Opposition during *Westmoreland's* Office, hence after the *Revolution of 1789* in France.

{ The *Place, Pension and Responsibility Bills* proposed by Mr. Grattan, *acceded to by the Viceroy*, passed into laws. *Place Bill*—a bill to vacate the seats of members *accepting offices under Government*, omitting the term of *bona fide* offices, thereby leaving the Minister a power of packing the Parliament; this Bill one of the instruments of Castlereagh for carrying the Union. }

[Up] to 1790 all these things as also *Emancipation, Reform, Tithe questions* failed.

There was a steady decline of the Volunteer organisation, and of the strength of the Liberal party to 1790. We have Tone's word that when the French Revolution broke out, both *Catholic Committee* and *Whig Club*<sup>280</sup>—the *Emancipation* and *Reform* parties—were feeble and dispirited.<sup>a</sup>

*Irish House of Commons. February 14, 1785. Militia against Volunteers. Gardiner* { on behalf of the Minister, and, as Curran told him, "in hope of being rewarded, by being raised to a higher rank", became actually *Lord Mountjoy* by the Union } moved a grant of £20,000 for clothing the Militia. This motion was levelled at the Volunteers, and therefore violently debated. One of the reasons of its *being carried*—the fool-rogue<sup>b</sup> *Grattan* went with the Government. *Fitzgibbon*, the *Attorney-General*, said amongst other things *against Curran*, who opposed the Bill and defended the Volunteers: "he (Curran) poured forth a studied panegyric of the Volunteers.... I shall even entrust the defence of the country to **gentlemen**, with the *King's commission* in their pockets, rather than to his (Curran's) friends, the **beggars** in the streets."

*Orde's Propositions<sup>c</sup> and Regency Bills* the things most important during this period as **international** questions between Ireland and

<sup>a</sup> See Davis' "Memoir" in J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. XIX.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> "The fool-rogue" was inserted by Marx.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> Marx means Orde's propositions regarding the trade between Ireland and Great Britain made on February 11, 1785. See H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, pp. 214-17.—Ed.

*England*; before speaking of them, we shall, however, allude still to a few other objects treated in Parliament during the period 1783-1791.

**Renewed efforts for reform** made in 1784. In consequence of a requisition, Henry Reilly, Sheriff of the County of Dublin, summoned his bailiwick to the court-house of Kilmainham for the 25 October 1784, to elect members to a national congress. For this Mr. Reilly was attacked by the King's Bench, on a crown motion, and on the 24 February 1785 Mr. Brownlow moved a *vote of censure on the judges of that court*, for the attachment. Speech of Curran. Motion rejected by 143 to 71.<sup>a</sup>

Shows still a great independent minority.

PENSIONS, DISFRANCHISEMENT OF EXCISE OFFICERS,  
GOVERNMENT CORRUPTION

The endeavour to *regain by corruption* what was surrendered to *force*, began in 1782, and *increased greatly after the defeat of Orde's Propositions*.<sup>281</sup>

### *Pensions*

*Pensions, 13 March 1786. Irish House of Commons. Bill of Forbes to limit the amount of pensions.* Defeated, i.e., *adjournment ad Calendas Graecas*<sup>b</sup> carried. As Curran said [the] object of the Bill [was] to "*restrain the Crown from doing wrong by a physical necessity*". "The Pension List, like charity, covers a multitude of sins ... coming home to the members of this House ... the *Crown is laying a foundation for the independence of Parliament ... they*" (the members of this House) "*will have this security for their independence, that while any man in the kingdom has a shilling, they will not want one*" (Curran).

12 March 1787. (Forbes renewed his Bill for *limiting Pensions. Curran supported him. Orde, Secretary. Also failed.*)

"The King's authority" (here) "delegated first to a Viceroy, and next it falls to a Secretary, who can have no interest in the good of the people, no interest in future fame etc.... *What responsibility can be found or hoped for in an English Secretary? ... A succession of men*" (these Secretaries), "sometimes with heads, sometimes with hearts, oftener with neither" (Curran). "Where will you look for Orde's responsibility as a Minister? You will remember his *Commercial Propositions*" (Curran).

"A right honourable member opposes the principle of the Bill, as being in *restraint of the Royal Bounty*.... A gross and general application of the people's money to the encouragement of every human vice, is a crying grievance.... The pension list, at the best of times, was a scandal to this country; but the present abuses of it have gone beyond all bounds" (Curran).

"That unhappy list has been degraded by a new species of prostitution that was unknown before: the *granting of honours and titles, to lay the foundation for the grant of a pension*; the suffering any man to steal a dignity, for the purpose that a barren

<sup>a</sup> See Davis' commentary in J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. 42.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Until the Greek calends.—Ed.

beggar steals a child. It was reducing the *honours of the State* from *badges of dignity* to *badges of mendicancy*" (Curran). The Bill would "*restrain a Secretary from that shameful profusion of the public treasure.... It is a law necessary as a counterpoise of the Riot Act, [...] a penal law adopted from Great Britain, giving a new force to the executive magistrate. It is a Bill to preserve the independence of Parliament*" (Curran).

11 February 1790. *Irish House of Commons* (*government corruption* and *patriot opposition* proceeded, the public daily being more convinced that nothing but a reform of the Commons could save the Constitution of 1782 from the foul policy of the Ministers). *Forbes moved an address describing and censuring several recent pensions. Curran supported it. Motion rejected by 136 to 92.*

## Government Corruption

*House of Commons. 21 April 1789. Disfranchisement of Excise Officers' Bill. Bill rejected by 148 to 93.*

Curran's prophecy in his speech on that occasion was fulfilled. The English executive inflicted incompetent men and corrupt measures on Ireland, then *took advantage of her own crime* and our misfortunes to provincialise us, and *now uses these very events as arguments against our independence*. Curran said inter alia:

"The opposition to this measure [...] comes from the *avowed servants of the crown and of every administration ... the men sent to grind us are, in general, the refuse of Great Britain.... Cart-loads of excise officers—revenue troops—collected from every corner of the nation, and taking possession of boroughs on the eve of an election*" (Curran).

*House of Commons. 25 April 1789. Dublin Police.*

Sir *H. Cavendish* moved two resolutions to the effect that the *Dublin Police System* was attended with waste, and *useless patronage*. *Ministers opposed the Resolutions. Rejected by 132 to 78.*

Curran in support said among other things:

"Advantage had been taken of some disturbances in 1784, to enslave the capital by a police. A watch of old men, at 4d. per night, was naturally ineffectual."

*House of Commons. 4 February 1790. Stamp Officers' Salaries.* {Curran proposes to regulate, cut them down etc. *Rejected by 141 to 81.*} (This was one means of *government corruption*.) *Westmoreland* Viceroy, *Hobart* his Secretary.

Curran says inter alia: the *Earl of Temple* (afterwards *Marquis of Buckingham*) incensed because of his failure in the *Regency Bill* increased the *Revenue Board*, the *Ordinance*, £13,000 addition to the *infamous Pension List*; (Under Lord *Harcourt* compact [was] made that the *Board of Accounts* and the *management of the stamps* {stamp duties had been granted in *Harcourt's* times} should be executed by one board.) *Buckingham* separated them *in order to make places for members of Parliament*. "Two country members prying into stamps!" "In proportion as you rose by union, your tyrant became appalled: but when he divided, he sunk you, and you became debased." "I rise in an assembly of 300 persons, 100 of whom have places or pensions.... I am showing the danger that arises to our honour and our liberty, if we submit to have corruption let loose among us ... the people now are fairly told that it is lawful to rob them of their property, and divide the plunder among the honest gentlemen who sell them to the administration."

In his bold speech Curran alludes to the *French Revolution*.

*House of Commons. February 12, 1791. Government Corruption.* {New attempt of Curran to prove the impurities of Government.} Curran's principal theme: "Raising

men to the peerage for money, which was disposed of to purchase the liberties of the people." "Miserable men introduced" (by these means) "into this House, like beasts of burden, to drudge for their employers." On the other hand "those introduced into the House of Lords, to frame laws, and dispose of the property of the Kingdom, under the direction of that corruption by which they have been raised".

"I have proof<sup>a</sup> ... that a contract has been entered into by the present ministers to raise to the peerage certain persons, on condition of their purchasing a certain number of seats in this House."

Curran states: "During the whole of last session" (1790) "we have, in the name of the people of Ireland, demanded from them the Constitution of Great Britain, and it has been uniformly denied. We would have passed a law to restrain the shameful profusion of a pension-list—it was refused by a majority. We would have passed a law to exclude persons, who must ever be the chattels of the government, from sitting in this House—it was refused by a majority. A bill to make some person, resident among you, and therefore amenable to public justice, responsible for the acts of your governors—has been refused to Ireland by a majority of gentlemen calling themselves her representatives [...] This uniform denial ... proof to them" (the people) "that the imputation of corrupt practices is founded in fact."

The vain attempt—in 1790-91—of the Parliamentary Minority against government corruption proves on the one hand its increase, on the other the influence of French Revolution of 1789. It also shows why, at last, foundation of United Irishmen [took place] in 1791, since all Parliamentary action proved futile, and the Majority of Parliament mere tool in the hands of the Government.

\* \* \*

ATTEMPTS OF GOVERNMENT AGAINST IRISH INDEPENDENCE REPELLED  
ON OCCASION OF ORDE'S COMMERCIAL PROPOSITIONS  
AND THE REGENCY BILL.

a) Orde's Commercial Propositions.  
(Duke of Rutland, Lord Lieutenant)<sup>282</sup>

In May, 1784, Griffith proposed in Irish House of Commons inquiry in the commercial intercourse between Britain and Ireland. He desired to show that Irish trade should be protected from English competition etc.

Government took this proposal out of his hand.

On 7 February 1785, Mr. Orde, the Chief Secretary, announced, and on 11 February moved the 11 propositions on trade, commonly called the Irish<sup>a</sup> propositions (in fact, of English origin).

There were 4 principles established in these propositions:

1) Taxes on all goods, foreign and domestic, passing between the 2 countries, should be equal

{placing England and Ireland on the same footing, to the ruin of the latter.}

<sup>a</sup> This word is underlined by Curran.—Ed

2) *Taxes on foreign goods should always be higher than on the same articles produced in either island* (this sacrificed the realities of French, Spanish, and American trade then increasing, to the profits of English competition).

3) *That the regulations should be unalterable* (thus abdicating legislation).

4) *That the surplus of the hereditary revenue* (hearth tax, and certain customs, and excises, over £656,000 a year) *should be paid over to the English Treasury*, for the support of the *Imperial* (English) *navy*.

Yet this plan was proffered as a boon, a reciprocity plan; Orde (in contrast to Flood) hurried the Commons on to seize upon it, because otherwise the *jealousy of the English monopolists* might be awakened. The thing was a favour—to be paid for by £140,000 of new taxes, asked and voted in return for it.

On the 22nd of February 1785 Pitt moved the Resolution in *British House of Commons* which declared that Ireland should be allowed the advantages (i.e. competition) of British Commerce as soon as she had “irrevocably” granted to England an “aid” (i.e. tribute) for general defence. North and the Tories, Fox and the Whigs—

as a party manoeuvre—

*saw in English jealousy to Ireland* a sure resource against the “heaven born Minister”. Fox obtained adjournments, and all England “spoke out”, from Lancashire to London, from Gloucester to York. Pitt sounded a parley. He submitted to some of their terms; *retained all that was adverse to the Irish Constitution*, suffered the loss of all that could by any ingenuity be serviceable to Irish trade. *Returned the Act thus approved of by him in the form of 20 English propositions.*

The 11 propositions had been increased in England to 20, each addition a fresh injury. *Half the globe*, namely, all between Magellan and Good Hope, was (articles 3 and 9) *interdicted to Ireland’s ships: interdicts were also laid on certain goods*. The *whole customs legislation of Ireland* was taken away by clauses which forced her (art. 4) to *enact (register) all navigation laws passed or to be passed by England*; (art. 5 and 8) to *impose all the colonial duties that England did*; (art. 6 and 7) to *adopt the same system in custom-houses that England did*; and finally (art. 17 and 18) to *recognise all patents and copyrights granted to England*.

*Irish House of Commons. 30 June 1785: Orde moves the adjournment of the House till Tuesday fortnight.* Curran opposes this. Adjournment is carried. Curran says:

“When we had the 11 propositions before us, we were charmed with them. Why?—because we did not understand them. Yes, the endearing word *reciprocity* rang at every corner of the streets.”

23 July 1785. Orde moves new adjournment; Curran opposes; adjournment carried.

11 August 1785. Curran asks Orde what has become of the 11 propositions “as of them only that Parliament could treat”. They were “proposed as a system of final and permanent commercial adjustment between the 2 kingdoms”. “As a compensation for the expected advantages of this system, we were called upon

{and they did so!}

to impose £140,000 a year on this exhausted country.” “We submitted.” “We have oppressed the people with a load of taxes, as a compensation for a commercial adjustment: we have not got that adjustment.”

Curran plainly threatened that the people would take revenge against the persons who, in a thin House, would accept the 20 propositions after the adjournment. He threatened that such a

demand for surrender of the Constitution would be answered not merely "by words". All this is taken from Curran's speech of 23 July.<sup>a</sup>

12 August 1785. *Orde* moved his *Bill* (the 20 propositions). Opposed by *Grattan*, *Flood*, *Curran*. *Leave to bring in the Bill* carried by 127 to 108 (=19 votes: this showed that the *Bill* would be rejected).

*Curran*: "The commercial part of it" (the *Bill*) "is out of the question: for this *Bill* portends a surrender of the Constitution and the liberties of Ireland.... I fear the British Minister is mistaken in the temper of Ireland, and judges of it by former times. Formerly the business here was carried on by purchase of majorities ... things have changed. The people are enlightened and strong, they will not bear a surrender of their rights, which would be the consequence, if they submitted to this *Bill*. It contains a covenant to enact such laws as England should think proper: they would annihilate the Parliament of Ireland. The people here must go to the bar of the English House of Commons for relief; and for a circuitous trade to England, we are accepting a circuitous constitution.... A power to bind externally, would involve a power to bind internally. This law gives the power to Great Britain, of judging what would be a breach of the compact, of construing it; in fact, of taxing us as she pleased; while it gives her new strength to enforce our obedience. In such an event we must either sink into utter slavery, or the people must wade to a re-assumption of their rights through blood, or be obliged to take refuge in a Union, which would be the annihilation of Ireland, and what, I suspect, the Minister is driving at<sup>b</sup>.... Civil war or a Union at best."

15 August 1785: *Orde*, on presenting the *Bill*, abandoned it for the session, and for ever. Thereupon *Flood* moved: "Resolved—That we hold ourselves bound not to enter into any engagement to give up the sole and exclusive right of the Parliament of Ireland to legislate for Ireland in all cases whatsoever, as well externally as commercially and internally." *Curran* supported him. *Flood* withdrew his motion, the House adjourned, and *Orde's Propositions* merged in a secret design for the Union.

### b) Regency Bill (1789)<sup>283</sup>

*George III* mad for some time, concealed, in the end of 1788 could no longer be hid. In the ministers' draft of the address in answer to the Lord Lieutenant (*Buckingham*) (he had again become Viceroy in December 1787), they praised themselves.

*Irish House of Commons*. February 6, 1789. *Grattan* moved amendment, substituting a general expression of loyalty. *Curran* spoke in support. "Every man sees the change of public administration that is approaching."

(People thought that *Fox* would become Minister under the Prince of Wales.<sup>a</sup>)

"It has been delayed and opposed by a party in another kingdom. Upon what principle of wisdom or justice can Ireland enlist herself in that opposition etc?"

*Grattan's amendment* was carried without a division although he called *Buckingham* "a jobber in a mask"

<sup>a</sup> This sentence is in German in the manuscript.—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> The words "or be obliged to ... is driving at" are italicised by *Curran*.—*Ed*.



(*Fitzherbert Buckingham's Chief Secretary*),

so prostrated was the Castle at the prospect of the *Prince's Regency, with Fox as Premier.*

*February 11, 1789:* Ministers tried to postpone the discussion on the Regency. Their *avowed motive* to have from England the *Resolutions* of the British Parliament, appointing the *Prince Regent of Great Britain with limited powers.* These resolutions passed on *23 January*, accepted by Prince on *31st January*, but had not reached the Irish Government. *The postponement was refused by the House.* Conolly then *moved an address to be presented to Prince, as Prince Regent of Ireland with full kingly powers. Motion passed without a division.*

*February 12, 1789.* Conolly moved the address. *February 17* concurrence of Lords brought up and agreed to. On *19 February* presented to *Buckingham.* He *refused to transmit it.* *February 20, 1789* agreed to transmit it *by deputation.* Vote of censure against Buckingham.

*February 27, 1789.* Deputation (Conolly, O'Neil, etc.) deliver a letter to the Commons with answer of Prince Regent, thanking "warmly" the Irish Parliament.

*March 20, 1789.* Still more fervent letter of the Prince Regent, announcing his father's recovery, read in the Irish House of Commons.

*Pitt, to maintain his power, had defended and carried in England, the right of election of the Regent, hence the right to restrain his power.*

The Irish in this case maintained the common Constitution against the oligarchic and ministerial encroachments of Pitt.

\* \* \*

There are for this *lapse of time* two things still to be considered,  
1) the *Tithe Riots* etc., showing the state of the Catholic Irish peasantry at that time, and

2) *The Dublin Lord Mayor election, showing the influence of the French Revolution upon the (into the bargain Protestant) Irish middle-class.*

### 1) *Tithe Riots etc.* *English Riot Act Introduced in Ireland*<sup>284</sup>

*Irish House of Commons. January 19, 1787. Outrages in the South. Disturbances in the South caused by the misery of the people, Tithes, Rents, absenteeism,*<sup>285</sup> *bad tenures, harsh treatment etc.*

*Towards the close of the 18 century (since end of 1791) political parties united themselves with the peasants (the republicans of the North).*

*1786:* In the Lord Lieutenant's Opening Speech, he referred to the "frequent outrages" ("Right Boys" of Kilkenny, who were bound amongst each other by

*oath*<sup>286</sup>). Yet the *only Bill on disturbances* brought in by Government was a *Dublin Police Bill*, against which the City petitioned.

1787 Viceroy's speech referred much more positively to the *Southern outrages*, and the debates on the *Address* in reply to it [were] violent. During this debate the *government party* (Fitzgibbon for instance) treated the disturbances as *against the clergy, accused the landlords of grinding the people, and abetting the disturbances, and asked for fresh powers.*

*House of Commons. 19 January 1787.* Fitzgibbon, in [his] speech (1787) said the disturbances commenced in *Kerry*, the people assembled in a mass-house, there took an *oath to obey the laws of Captain Right*. Soon spread through the province of Munster. Their objects the *tithes*, then to *regulate the price of lands, to raise the price of labour, and to oppose the collection of hearth-money and other taxes.* "I am very well acquainted with the province of Munster, and I know that it is impossible for human wretchedness to exceed that of the *miserable peasantry in that province. I know that the unhappy tenantry are ground to powder by relentless landlords*<sup>a</sup>—far from being able to give the clergy their just dues, they *have not food or raiment for themselves, the landlords grasp the whole; and ... not satisfied with the present extortion, some landlords have been so base as to instigate the insurgents to rob the clergy of their tithes, not in order to alleviate the distresses of the tenantry, but that they might add the clergy's share to the cruel rack-rents already paid.... The poor people of Munster live in a more abject state of poverty than human nature can be supposed able to bear*—their miseries are intolerable, but they do not originate with the clergy; nor can the legislature stand by and see them take the redress into their own hands. *Nothing can be done for their benefit while the country remains in a state of anarchy.*"

Longfield, a County Cork Gentleman, stated that the disturbances were exaggerated, though the distress was not. He accused the government of looking for a year at the disturbances, for a political purpose.

Curran moved an amendment to the address (withdrawn without a division). *Said inter alia:*

"Cease to utter idle complaints of inevitable effects, when you yourselves have been the causes ... the patience of the people has been totally exhausted; their grievances (have long) been the empty song of this House, but no productive effect has ever followed. The *non-residence of the landholders, the tyranny of intermediate landlords. You denied the existence of the grievance, and refused redress....* No wonder that the peasantry should be ripe for rebellion and revolt.... Not a single man of property or consequence connected with the rebels....

"You were called on solemnly ... for a *proper reformation in the representation of the people: did you grant it? No; and how does it at present stand? Why, Sir, seats in this House are bought and sold. They are set up to public sale; they have become an absolute article of commerce—a traffic of the constitution....* Saleable rotten boroughs. As they have bought the people for a sum of money, it is natural they should sell them.... The peasantry have formed hopes of relief.... *People, when oppressed, [...] though oppressed by law, will make reprisals; and these are the real causes of the disturbances. System of vile jobbing extends to commissions of the peace (24 commissions of the peace sent down to the County of Clare in one post) and to the sheriffs. You may talk of commerce expanding ... but what, in God's name, have they to do with the wretched peasantry?"*

*House of Commons. 19 February 1787. "Right Boy Bill".* One clause of the Government, [which was] abandoned, was *directing magistrates to demolish mass-houses*

<sup>a</sup> The passage "to exceed that of ... relentless landlords" is italicised by Davis.—Ed

at which combinations shall be found, or unlawful oaths administered. Curran resisted the Bill altogether:

Curran: "The people are too much raised by a consciousness of their strength and consequence to be proper objects of so sanguinary a code as that now proposed...." He alludes to pamphlet of Dr. Woodward, Bishop of Cloyne, in defence of tithes "tending manifestly to revive the dissensions from which we had so recently emerged, and to plunge us into the barbarism from which we were emerging, or, perhaps to imbrue us in the bloodshed of a religious war".... (The Bill was committed by 192 to 31.)

20 February 1787. Discussion of the same Bill, by which a Riot Act passed. O'Neill moved to limit it to Cork, Kerry, Limerick, and Tipperary. (Limiting motion rejected by 176 to 43.) In the Bill Todesstrafe—capital punishment—for tendering an oath etc.

"I fear," said Curran, "that, as the coercion is so great, and as no means are taken for the relief of the poor, rebellion will go in the dark ... until the whole Kingdom set in a flame."

13 March 1787. Tithes. Grattan having moved a resolution that if tranquillity were restored, at the opening of the next session, the House would consider the Tithe Question. **Motion lost, without a division.** Curran supported Grattan's Motion.

Curran: "A law of pains and penalties severe beyond all example of any former period.... The offence was local and partial ... the causes of such offence were universal.... The object and miserable state of the peasantry of Ireland. The Secretary" (Englishman!) "declares he is a stranger to their distresses, and will not hold out any hope that they should be ever considered by the Parliament!" ... "The honourable gentlemen could not let the Riot Act pass without accompanying it with an express disavowal of all intention to alleviate, or even at any period, however distant, to listen to their complaints." "Who are to execute it" (that law)? "That very body of men in the class above the peasants, who have been represented as adverse to the rights of the clergy, and are said to have connived at these offences." ... "But whatever may be the idea of an English Secretary, this House must be too wise to say that inveterate evils can receive any sanction from any length of time."

## 2) Election of Lord Mayor of Dublin (1790)<sup>287</sup>

Disputed election for the Mayoralty of Dublin, connected with the attempt of the English Government to govern or provincialise Ireland by corruption. Hence the burgesses of Dublin pledged themselves in their guilds not to return any one as Lord Mayor or Member of Parliament for the city, who held a place or pension from the Government. Alderman James was a Police Commissioner. Under the old Corporation laws the Lord Mayor and Aldermen sat and voted in one chamber, the Sheriff and Common Councilmen in a second. 16 April 1790 the former chose Alderman James as mayor elect for the ensuing year, the Common Council rejected him. Seven other names afterwards sent down were similarly rejected. Then the Common Council elected Alderman Howison; Napper Tandy led the popular party. The Aldermen repeated their election of James. This dispute came before the Privy Council, where Curran pleaded for the Common Council. Privy Council decided for a new election. Aldermen re-elect James and Councilmen Howison. This whole process, with interference of the Privy Council, repeated several times.

On 10 July 1790 Curran pleads for the Common Council before the Privy Council, presided by Fitzgibbon (became Lord Chancellor, and Lord Clare, in June 1789.)

He flagellated that fellow masterly.

Privy Council decided for *James*, he resigned, on 5th August 1790 *Howison* chosen by the *Aldermen*, approved by the *Common Council* and *Privy Council*. Thus this struggle ended in utter defeat of the Government.

On 16 July, in the *Common Council*, *Napper Tandy* carried 17 Resolutions censuring the *Privy Council*, *Aldermen*, and summoned meeting of freemen and freeholders<sup>288</sup> at the Exchange. This meeting held on 20 July, *Hamilton Rowan* in the chair, adjourned to 3d August, after appointing a committee to prepare a state of facts.

3d August that *State of Facts* read, and *James's resignation* was announced.

*Sir E. Newenham* denounced *Fitzgibbon*, who on 24 July had in *House of Peers* made audacious speech, where he read a *Resolution of the Whig Club*<sup>289</sup> and attacked them, until *Lords Charlemont* and *Moir* avowed the *Resolution*. (*Whig Club founded in Dublin, summer 1789.*)

*Whig Club*, [which] met on 2d August, drew up a *Report against Fitzgibbon*.

*Fitzgibbon* had become so unpopular, that the guild of merchants, who had, in the previous winter, voted him an address in a gold box, for services to their trading interests, expunged the resolutions on 13 July, 1790, as "disgraceful".

From the above-quoted "*State of Facts*", August 3, 1790. (*Aggregate meeting of the citizens of Dublin, held at the Royal Exchange.*) Among other things it said:

"That we do acknowledge, that for the last 10 or 11 years the citizens of Dublin did take an active part for the liberty of their country etc. etc.;

"that we do acknowledge [that] the freedom of the City of Dublin [was] refused to His Excellency etc. the Earl of Westmoreland etc.;

"that we do not deny that many among us did, on a former occasion, favour the scheme of *Protective Duties* etc.;

"that we do acknowledge to have expressed our approbation of the conduct of the minority of the late Parliament in the last session ... that those measures had no other view, meaning or object, save corruption only: ... that the nation was told by a very high authority (*Fitzgibbon*) ... that in order to defeat an opposition in Parliament, this nation had been, in the Administration of the Marquis of Townshend, bought in by the Government, and sold by the Members of Parliament for half a million, and that if opposition continued to the present Administration, this nation must be bought and sold again etc. etc."

---

The Judges, dependent on the Crown, the Army independent of Parliament, the Legislature at the feet of the British Attorney-General, and the people bound by the laws of Scotch and English Delegates. {The two last points apply to the period before 1782.}

C) FROM OCTOBER 1791 TO COMMENCEMENT OF APRIL 1795  
(LORD FITZWILLIAM'S RECALL  
AND REPLACEMENT BY LORD CAMDEN)

{From October 1791 to 4 January 1795. (*Arrival of Fitzwilliam.*)  
*Continuation of Lord Westmoreland's Government.* (His Secretary  
Major Hobart.)}

*French events during this time: 1793.* Duke of York, 8 September thrashed by Houchard, has to abandon the siege of Dunkirk, Dutch and English thrown back into Flanders.<sup>a</sup> The allies were repulsed on the *Upper Rhine*, towards the end of December they had to abandon the whole territory as far as Worms. The Republicans were victorious in the *South and West* of France as well. In *October 1793* they subdued the rebellious Lyons and in *December 1793* the English-held *Toulon*, drove the Spanish over the Pyrenees and attacked them on their own territory.

1794. 18 May, Moreau and Souham won a total victory over the Duke of York at Tourcoing.

26 June 2nd battle of Fleurus (Jourdan). Belgium quickly conquered. The leaders of the English and Dutch troops were compelled to think only of the defence of the Netherlands.

October and November the Dutch lost all their frontier fortresses.

October Jourdan compelled the Austrians to abandon the entire left bank of the Rhine up to Mainz, 26 October he entered Coblenz. On the entire left bank of the Rhine, only Mainz and Luxembourg remained in the hands of the allies.

27 December Pichegru in Holland.

1795. 20 January 1795 Pichegru's entry into Amsterdam. *Batavian Republic*.

September Düsseldorf in Jourdan's hands, Mannheim in Pichegru's. The Austrians had to withdraw across the Main. *Clairfait* defeated the French army at Mainz on 29 October. Pichegru and Jourdan had to retreat. *An armistice towards the end of the year.* Moreau was given the command of the Rhine army.

At the beginning of 1795 a peace treaty with the leaders of the Vendée. (The Peace of La Mabilois.) Pitt landed an émigré army at Quiberon on 27 June 1795 etc. On 20 July it was crushed by Hoche etc.<sup>290</sup>

{ February and March 1796 Stofflêt, Charette etc. were court-martialled and executed by firing-squad. July 1796 he [Hoche] reported to the Directory that the civil war in the West had been brought to an end. }

1796, 1797. Bonaparte in Italy.

---

<sup>a</sup> The next passage, up to and including the words "1796, 1797. Bonaparte in Italy", is in German in the manuscript.—Ed.

*First United Irishmen Society* founded by *Theobald Wolfe Tone* in *October 1791*.<sup>291</sup>

Their avowed (and by the mass of the *Societies* alone wished for) objects were *Union between Catholics and Protestants*, perfect *Emancipation for the Catholics* (*Belfast* had proposed this already in 1783) and *Popular Representation for the men of both creeds*. (*Tone* and others of the leading men for *independent Republic*. Without the cruelty of Government they would have been *overruled* by the Whigs, and outvoted in the *Societies*.)

*The Belfast Society met publicly, as did all the United Irish Societies until 1794*. The Catholics, on their part, were rapidly advancing in political spirit and information.

*Keogh* and the leading (not aristocratic and Whiggish) Catholics were *United*.

The Confederation extended to *Dublin*, received the support of the leading citizens, and of *many of the Volunteer Corps*. Its chief organ was *The Northern Star*: the first number of this paper, printed 4 *January 1792* (manager *Samuel Neilson*), occupied itself chiefly with French politics. *The Evening Star* appeared in *Dublin* soon after, but *The Press* did not commence until 28 *September 1797*.

Returning now to *Westmoreland's Administration*, we remark that *Catholic Emancipation* and *Parliamentary Reform* were the two cries!

*Irish House of Commons. 18 February 1792. Catholic Emancipation.*

These proceedings began by the presentation of a petition from the *Protestants of County of Antrim* for the Bill.

Some small thing was proposed by *Grattan*. (Rejected.)

*Curran*. "At *Cork*, the present Viceroy was pleased to reject a most moderate and modest petition from the Catholics of that city. The next step was to create a division amongst the Catholics themselves: the next was to hold them up as a body formidable to the English Government, and to their Protestant fellow-subjects.... It is not a question merely of the sufferings or their relief—it is a *question of your own preservation* ... a partial liberty cannot long subsist ... alienation of 3 millions of our people, subserviency and corruption in a fourth ... *the inevitable consequence would be an Union with Great Britain*. And if any one desires to know what that would be, I will tell him. *It would be the emigration of every man of consequence from Ireland; it would be the participation of British taxes, without British trade; it would be the extinction of the Irish name as a people etc.*"

The petition for the Catholics *rejected with indignation*, by 208 to 23. This rejection inflamed the Catholics.

DOINGS OF CATHOLICS, UNITED IRISHMEN  
AND ADMINISTRATION UNTIL CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL  
OF 1793<sup>292</sup>

In *March, 1792*, the *Catholic Committee*,<sup>293</sup> or rather *Convention* (for it was a body of delegates) met, and *Tone* was named its secretary. The agitation by means of these societies became most vigorous. The shining<sup>a</sup> progress of the French

<sup>a</sup> In his "Memoir" *Davis* has "stirring". See *J. Ph. Curran, The Speeches...*, p. XXI.—*Ed.*

Revolution, and the organisation of the political societies in England and Scotland<sup>294</sup> aided them. The United Irishmen increased in number, the Catholics in confidence, and the Volunteer Corps began to restore their array, and improve their discipline. The ministry grew alarmed. "In *December* (1792) the Catholics thundered out their demands ... they were supported by all the spirit and intelligence of the Dissenters.<sup>295</sup> *Dumouriez was in Brabant*—Holland was prostrate before him." (*Wolfe Tone*.)

7 *December 1792*. *Government Proclamation against all seditious meetings*: In this proclamation we read: "The *first battalion of National Guards* were to have paraded, clothed like Frenchmen etc." This proclamation answered by the *United Irishmen*.

16 *December 1792*, Rowan (of Dublin) Chairman, when the address was voted, Dr. Drennan wrote it.

The main content of this proclamation,<sup>a</sup> on account of which Rowan and Drennan were prosecuted, was: 1) It called the *Volunteers to arms*:

"To your formation was owing the peace and protection of this island; to your relaxation has been owing its relapse into impotence and insignificance. 2) Elective franchise to the whole body of the people ... reform in representation. 3) *Universal Emancipation* and representative legislature, in these 4 words lies all our power... We, therefore, wish for *Catholic Emancipation without any modification*, but still we consider this necessary enfranchisement as nearly the portal to the temple of national freedom.... The *Catholic cause* is subordinate to *our cause*, and included in it; for, as *United Irishmen*, we adhere to no sect, but to society—to no party, but the whole people, ... were it (*Catholic Emancipation*) obtained tomorrow, tomorrow would we go on as we do today, in the pursuit of that Reform, which would still be wanting to ratify their liberties as well as our own. 4) For both these purposes it appears necessary that *provisional conventions* should assemble preparatory to the convocation of the Protestant Convention (this then to communicate with the Catholic Committee or Convention in Dublin).... If a Convention on the one part does not soon follow, and is not soon connected with that on the other, the *common cause* will *split into the partial interest*—the people will relapse into inattention and inertness—too probably, *some local insurrections, instigated by the malignity of our common enemy, may commit the character, and risk the tranquillity of the island...* The *15th of February approaches...*<sup>296</sup> Let parochial meetings be held as soon as possible; let each parish return delegates; let the sense of Ulster be again declared from *Dungannon...* Citizen Soldiers etc." (This address was issued in meeting at a *fencing school*, Dublin, several corps of Volunteers with their side-arms going there, as well as *Napper Tandy* etc.)

In *December 1792* Rowan was arrested on an information and admitted to bail.<sup>b</sup>

The prosecution of the "*Northern Star*" of Belfast for publishing the *Declaration and Address* of the "*Irish Jacobins* (name of the society) of Belfast" on *15 December 1792*.

The *Declaration* of the "*Irish Jacobins*" says among other things:

<sup>a</sup> Marx means the proclamation "The Society of United Irishmen at Dublin. To the Volunteers of Ireland" quoted according to Davis' commentary in J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, pp. 154-55. The division of the text into points is by Marx.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The following two sentences are in German in the manuscript.—*Ed.*

### *Declaration*

“1st) Resolved—That this Kingdom (meaning the Kingdom of Ireland) has no *national government*, inasmuch as the great mass of the people are not represented in Parliament. [...] 3d) That the people of Ireland can never effectually constitute their own laws, without an extension of the elective franchise to all its citizens. 4th) That the elective franchise can never be obtained without a cordial, steady, and persevering union of all the Irish people of every denomination. 5) That the penal code of statutes which have for upwards of a century doomed our fellow-citizens, the Roman Catholics of this Kingdom, to a *state little inferior to the unlettered African*, is a disgrace to the land we live in. [...] 7) That to obtain this most desirable end (natural rights of men) we entreat our fellow-citizens of every denomination in Ireland, England, and Scotland, to turn their thoughts to a *National Convention*, in order to collect the sense of the people as to the most effective means of obtaining a *radical and complete Parliamentary reform*, an object without which these kingdoms must for ever remain wretched etc.”

### *“Address. The Irish Jacobins of Belfast to the Public”*

Among other things: “Where the mode of government is not derived from all the people clearly expressed, that nation has no constitution; need we say this is the case with Ireland; it possesses only an acting government [...]: in such a government the supreme authority has more power to oppress the subject than to defend his rights.... *Out of 5 millions of people* (meaning the Irish people) *90 individuals actually return a majority of the House of Commons*, who instead of representing the voice of the nation, are influenced by *English interests*, and that *aristocracy whose baneful exertions* have ever tended to sap the vital principles etc. of this unhappy and wretched country.... By unanimity and perseverance this divided land will be liberated *from the shackles of tyranny*.... *It is by procuring a renovated representation that liberty will be established in this country; this can only be accomplished by a National Convention*. The Roman Catholics are already convened; let the Protestants follow their peaceful example.”<sup>297</sup>

15 February 1793: *Volunteer Convention*, said to represent 1,250,000 people, met at *Dungannon*, passed resolutions in favour of *Emancipation and Reform*, and named a *permanent Committee*. This, doubtless, assisted the carrying of the *Relief Bill*, but it made the Ministry resolve to *crush the Protestants, while it conciliated the Catholics*.

*Irish House of Commons*. 10 January 1793. Lord Westmoreland opens Parliament [with a speech]. Complained of the *discontent of Ireland*, but said nothing of the *corruption, extravagance, and alien policy of ministers*. It complained of the *invasion of Holland* by France, but was silent of the European conspiracy against the Republic. It recommended a *relaxation of Catholic fetters*, but not the motives: English declaration of war against France, *Custine* had conquered the Rhine (21 October 1792), *Dumouriez's* battle of *Jemappes* (6 November 1792) and annexation of *Belgium*. The speech also stated that *Government* had *increased the military establishment*, and recommended the *formation of a militia*. This last was a *stroke against the Volunteers*. The Address moved was echo to the speech, Grattan moved a trivial amendment.

Catholics had acquired spirit and organisation by *Wolfe Tone, Keogh, Byrne, Todd Jones* and *M'Cormick*. The *Catholic Committee* negotiated with the Government, the



successes of France compensated them for the *baseness of their* [Catholic] *aristocracy*. Supported by the *United Irishmen*.

In opposition to the *Catholic Committee* and the *United Irishmen*, the Ministry stimulated Protestant bigotry and Catholic division. Out of doors they got the *exclusive Corporation of Dublin* to address the other Irish Corporations against Emancipation, and they intrigued with the *Aristocracy* (lay and clerical) of the *Catholics*. In Parliament they found the relics of the old exclusion Party.

11 January 1793: Curran supported Grattan's amendment which was carried.

"Parliament has become *unpopular in the country*... How could the credit of Parliament survive its independency? ...More than half of us have no connexion with the people.... The disunion of the people from this House raises from this—the people are not represented. And to restore the Union ... wanted a *radical Reform of the Commons*.... Without them (the Catholics) the country cannot be saved. *Give them no qualified Emancipation*.... *A hated Government, an unpopular Parliament, a discontented people*.... *The Catholic Petition (1792) has been rejected by the influence of the Irish Administration*."

Early in January 1793<sup>a</sup> Curran unsuccessfully resists the Attorney-General's motion for the committal of M'Donnell, the printer of the *Hibernian Journal*, for publishing that the House was not free and independent.

On January 14, 1793 (so persuasive were French victories) Grattan obtained a *Committee of the Whole House on Parliamentary Representation*, and moved resolutions [pointing out] among other things that of the *300 members only 84* [are] returned by counties, counties of towns and cities, together with the University, while the remaining *216* [are] returned by boroughs and manors. Finis: "Resolved—*That the state of the representation of the people in Parliament requires amendment*."

Curran supported this. He said:

"The *Catholic Question must precede a Reform*. Their place in the state must be decided first.... *Ireland feels, that without an immediate Reform her liberty is gone*."

*Motion lost by 71 to 153.*

But the *Opposition* had already yielded to the Ministers *Indemnity for their violent Proclamations against the Republican Volunteers*: they had consented to the *Militia and Gunpowder Bills*, and therefore the Resolutions were resisted.

11 March 1793 another *Government Proclamation*, forbidding *military societies, drilling, and the whole Machinery of the Volunteers, without naming them*.

April 1793: *Relief Bill* of the Catholics passed, admitting Catholics to the franchise, the bar, the University, and to *all the rights of property*; but *excluding them from Parliament, from State Offices, and from all, indeed, that the Bill of 1829 conceded*.<sup>298</sup>

The Bill of 1793 was brought in 10 days after the declaration of war against France.<sup>b</sup>

The same Parliament which passed the *Relief Bill*, passed the *Alien Act, the Military Foreign Correspondence, Gunpowder, and Convention Acts*, in fact, a *full code of coercion* and a *Secret Committee*. It got 20,000 Regulars and 16,000 Militia.

*Convention Bill*:

"A law," says Curran, "*not to restrain but to promote insurrection*." The law declares that no body of men may delegate a power to any smaller number, to act, think, or petition for them.

<sup>a</sup> According to Davis, on January 29, 1793. Cf. his commentary in J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. 152.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> On February 21, 1793.—Ed.

This [is] in fact a bill to prevent assemblies of the people to petition against grievances. According to the Convention Act it is a *high misdemeanour* in any part of the people to *assemble* for the purpose of choosing any persons to act for them in framing petitions or other representations for the producing of any change in anything established by law. It was intended to put an end to societies formed and forming, in 1793, for the purpose of procuring a *Parliamentary Reform*. (Cobbett.)<sup>299</sup>

Thus armed, the Government commenced its crusade of prosecuting and persecuting, and obtained fresh laws from time to time, and, after the truce of 1795, drove the quarrel to an Insurrection and to the Union.

1794. The agitation continued. (Government prosecutions against Volunteers, United Irishmen etc.) The *United Irishmen Society* was changed into a *secret and secretly organised body*. The Catholics still laboured; the French had conquered; their Government aroused by the *Irish Jacobin Resolutions of Belfast*, and the suggestions of some Irish patriots, bethought themselves to assist the discontented Irish to effect a separation. *Rev. Jackson* sent there as an agent, put himself in communication with Tone. Betrayed; arraigned for treason (after arrest), hanged.

29 January 1794, Curran as defender of Rowan:

“But now, if any aggregate assembly meets, they are censured; if a printer publishes their resolutions, he is punished; rightly, to be sure, in both cases, for it has been lately done. If people say, let us not create tumult, but meet in delegation, they cannot do it ... the law of last session has for the first time declared such meetings to be a crime.”

*The former system is flourishing.*

FROM 4 JANUARY 1795 TO THE END OF MARCH 1795.  
LORD FITZWILLIAM

4 January 1795, Lord Fitzwilliam,

*Whig, who had opposed Pitt,*

[was] sent by him to Ireland, charged with the *carrying of Catholic Emancipation* (and *Reform Bill*), and pacification of Ireland. The apparent causes [were] the *rapid progress of the United Irishmen and the French armies*, who had driven the Spaniards behind the Pyrenees, the Austrians behind the Rhine, destroyed the Duke of York's army, and prepared the occupation of Holland in the winter 1794-95.<sup>a</sup>

But from papers published (correspondence *between Fitzwilliam and Lord Carlisle*<sup>b</sup>) [it is] evident that Pitt (this was, perhaps, second thought, when the King's and Beresford's influence prevailed) has

<sup>a</sup> See Davis' commentary in J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. 233.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Marx refers to [Carlisle] “A Letter ... to Earl Fitzwilliam, in Reply to His Lordship's Two Letters” (London, 1795) and “A Letter from Earl Fitzwilliam to the Earl of Carlisle” (1795). Further on Marx cites facts according to Mitchel's *History of Ireland...*, Vol. I, pp. 218-19.—Ed.

chosen him as tool to agitate the Irish, inflame them, and drive them into Rebellion.

Fitzwilliam was one of the most indulgent landlords of Ireland and very popular. What Pitt wanted, was to raise the Catholics to the height of expectation, and by suddenly recalling Fitzwilliam, to drive them into commotions, which would throw the Protestants into the arms of England for protection, whilst the horrors would be aggravated by the mingled conflicts of parties, Royalists and Republicans.

Pitt had sent Fitzwilliam to Ireland with unlimited powers.

The day Fitzwilliam arrived, peace was proclaimed throughout all Ireland. The day he quitted it, she prepared for insurrection.

*Irish House of Commons. 22 January 1795:* Fitzwilliam opens with plausible speech. Grattan outdid the Ministers in servile adulation<sup>a</sup> (as to the Address). An *Emancipation Bill*<sup>300</sup> was read a first time, but *ample supplies were voted*, £2 millions loan was voted, and *Anti-Gallican frenzy* got upon certain classes. Fitzwilliam recalled.

### III

#### B) LORD CAMDEN'S ADMINISTRATION. APRIL 1795-END OF JULY 1798

*Camden's arrival* attended by almost insurrectionary outrages. The Beresfords assaulted, *Clare* (Lord Chancellor, i.e. Fitzgibbon) almost killed in his carriage.

Camden's *Chief Secretary Mr. Pelham (Earl Chichester)* afterwards replaced by his nephew *Stewart (Lord Castlereagh)*.

Camden became *extremely popular* amongst the *armed associations* which were raised in Ireland under the title of *Yeomen*. He was considered the guardian of that Institution.

*Irish House of Commons. 4 May 1795. Second Reading of the Emancipation Bill. Rejected by 155 to 84.*

Fitzwilliam's recall was a triumph for the separation party. An Irish Republic now became the only object of the United Irish. The bulk of the Presbyterians of *Down, Antrim, and Tyrone* joined, as did multitudes of Protestants and Catholics in *Leinster*. At this time the *Catholics of the North* were *Defenders or Ribbonmen*.<sup>301</sup> Both sides made ready for the worst.

An *Insurrection Act* passed, making death for any one to take an oath of Association; another allowing the Lord Lieutenant to *proclaim countries* [in a state of siege], in which case no one could go out at night; and *magistrates* obtained the *power of breaking into houses*, and *transporting to the navy all persons whom they suspected*. Other acts—*granting indemnity for magistrates guilty of any illegality*—giving the Lord

<sup>a</sup> Davis wrote "he outdid ministers in loyalty". See J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...* p. 233.—Ed.

Lieutenant the *power of arrest without bail—licensing the introduction of foreign troops (Germans), and establishing the Yeomanry Corps*—followed each other in quick succession.

The *Yeomanry* consisted of the *Tory Gentry*, and *their* dependants, undisciplined and unprincipled, *legal banditti*. No villainy but was perpetrated by them. Whipping, pitch-capping, half or whole hanging, sending to serve in the navy—the leisure or facilities of the officer allowed.<sup>302</sup>

1795. Among the papers found by Jackson *View of Ireland*, by Tone:

“The *Established Churchmen* in Ireland have engrossed, besides the whole church patronage, all the profits and honours of the country exclusively, and a very great share of the landed property. Aristocrats, adverse to any change, decided enemies of the French Revolution. *Dissenters ... Republicans* [...]. *Catholics*, the great body of the people, in lowest degree of ignorance, ready for any change, because no change can make them worse. The whole peasantry of Ireland, the most oppressed and wretched in Europe, may be said to be Catholic. Within these 2 years [they] have received a certain degree of information, [...] various insurrections, [...] bold, hardy race, and make excellent soldiers. [...] *Defenders*. [...] They are so situated that they have but one way left to make their sentiments known, and *that is by war*. [...] All Parliamentary, Grand Jury etc. Acts proceeding from aristocrats, whose interest is adverse to that of the people.”

*Defenders* (in the North). The *Lords' Committee of 1793* describes them

“as poor ignorant labouring men”, [fighting] for Catholic cause, relieved from hearth-money, tithes, county cesses, lowering of their rents. First they appeared in County *Louth*, April 1793, several of them armed; assembled mostly in the night, forced into the houses of Protestants and took from them their arms. Spread soon through the counties of *Meath, Cavan, Monaghan* and other parts adjacent. The Secret Committee tried to connect them with *Catholic Gentlemen*, and the *crown prosecutors* tried to trace them to the *United Irishmen Association* and French gold. Before *Drogheda, Spring Assizes, April 23, 1794, Drogheda Defenders*, declared not guilty. *Dublin Defenders, December 22, 1795. James Weldon*, connected with them, hanged.

*House of Commons. February 3d, 1796. Indemnity Bill.*

25 February 1796. *Insurrection Bill* (it gave the right of arbitrary transportation to magistrates).

Curran: “It is a Bill for the rich, and against the poor.”<sup>a</sup> “What is a Bill which puts the liberty of the poor man, who has no visible means of living but labour, in the discretion of the magistrates? [...] In Ireland,” where poverty [is] general, “it constitutes *poverty a crime*.” “Let the rich men of Ireland, therefore, fear when they enact a law against poverty, lest poverty should enact a counter-law against riches.” “Gentlemen have reasoned to prove that he who should be transported by this law would only be sent into an honourable retirement, where he might gain glory by fighting for his country from which his poverty had expelled him.”

*Irish House of Commons. 13 October 1796. French War.* Camden opened [Parliament with the call:] *resist invasion! (Hoche's force was just assembling at Brest,*

<sup>a</sup> Here and below in this paragraph italics is by Curran.—Ed.

and Wolfe Tone, Grouchy, and a part of that expedition, reached Bantry Bay on the 22 December and did not leave it till the 28.) Camden denounced also "popular passion and popular opinion".

Curran. "Government encourages every attack upon the reputation of the Catholics, and the *most wicked and groundless prosecutions against their lives.*" "Look at the scene that has been exhibited for 2 years in one of your counties, of robbery, and rape, and murder, and extermination" (of the Catholics). "...Law can give them no protection under a hostile and implacable government."

Ponsonby's Amendment defeated by 149 to 12. Then the Attorney-General moved for leave to bring in a Bill, similar to such as have been enacted on like occasions in England, to empower the Lord Lieutenant, to *take up and detain all such persons as were suspected of treasonable practices. Leave being given, the Bill was forthwith presented, read a first and second time, and committed for the morrow.*

14 October 1796. *Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act.* Leave to bring it in granted, read, 2 times, etc. all in a few minutes in the morning after midnight.

17 October 1796. *Catholic Emancipation Bill. Rejected.*

6 January 1797. *Hoche's Expedition.*<sup>303</sup> Secretary Pelham brought down a message from the Lord Lieutenant full of English palaver, in reference to France and especially the expedition of Hoche.

Curran. "You have already laid a shilling on the brogues of your beggar peasants; will you impose another shilling upon them? [...] What wealth they have? *Seven pence per day.*"

24 February 1797. *Internal Defence.* Sir Laurence Parsons moved an Address for an increase of the domestic army, especially the *Yeomen infantry.* Grattan supported, and the Ministers opposed, the Address. Neither party foresaw how the *patriots of the Clubs* would turn into the *scourges of the People*—traitors to their country and their oath, when under the *bribe of payment, the compulsion of discipline, and the spirit of the army.*

Curran. "At this moment the *gaols are crowded ... they*<sup>a</sup> *make a demand of redress an act of treason.*"

*Since end of March 1796* whole counties of Ireland proclaimed (put in state of siege).

*House of Commons. March 18, 1797: Disarming of Ulster.* Message of Lord Camden. (Pelham is still Secretary.) *General Lake*—cowardly, infamous, cruel—was to disarm the inhabitants together with the magistrates. *Lake's Proclamation. Belfast, 13 March 1797.*

19 March 1797. Grattan: "The Lord Lieutenant attaints one entire province of Ireland of High Treason."<sup>b</sup> Amendment of Grattan.

20 March 1797. Amendment rejected by 127 to 16.

Curran. "The North is deeply discontented. By what? Your own laws, your Convention Act, Gunpowder Act, Insurrection Act. The first denies the natural right of sufferers—the right of petition or complaint; the second, the power of self-defence ... the third, the defence of a jury against the attempts of power."

May 15, 1797. Last speech of Curran in the House of Commons, secedes from it, ditto Grattan; the Opposition ceased to attend, and House adjourned on 3 July 1797. *Castlereagh Chief Secretary.*

We have seen the *decreasing* minorities of the party who gallantly struggled to

<sup>a</sup> The Commoners.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Marx quotes Grattan probably according to J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. 267; see also H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. III, p. 299.—Ed.

maintain the parliamentary constitution of Ireland. But they grew daily more powerless. The people looked to the *United Irish Executive*, to *France*, to *arms*, to *Revolution*. The Government *persisted in refusing Reform and Emancipation*, continued the suspension of the Constitution, and incessantly augmented the despotism of their laws, the profligacy of their administration, and the violence of their soldiery—they trusted to intimidation. *Under these circumstances, the opposition determined to abandon the contest.*

*The Government and the United Irishmen* now face to face. The Government strengthened itself by *spies on the United Irishmen* (such as Maguane and others), the “*battalion of testimony*” (Bird, Newell, O'Brien etc.), *free quarters*, prosecutions, patronage, and calumny.

Orr hanged 14 October 1797 for having (allegedly) administered the *oath of the United Irish* to a private soldier. The Oath is: first, to promote a brotherhood of affection among men of all religious distinctions; secondly, to labour for the attainment of Parliamentary Reform; 3dly, an obligation of secrecy, added to it when the Convention Law had made it criminal for any public delegation to meet for that purpose. The Insurrection Act makes the administering of such an oath felony of death.

The *United Irish Society* of 1791 formed in 1791, for the achievement of Catholic Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform. In 1792-93 it increased, retaining its original objects. In 1794, the views of Tone and Neilson, who both desired an independent republic, spread; but the formal objects were unchanged, when, on 10 May 1795, the organisation of Ulster was completed. The recall of Fitzwilliam, the consequent disappointment of the Catholics, the accumulation of coercive laws, the prospects of the French Alliance, and the natural progress of a quarrel, rapidly spread the influence, and altered the whole character of the Society. The *test* of the Society was made more decisive, and less constitutional. In *the autumn of 1796 the organisation was made military in Ulster*. Towards the *middle of 1797*, this system spread to Leinster. So far back as *May 1796*, the Executive had *formally*<sup>a</sup> communicated with France, through Lord Edward Fitzgerald. Only on 19 February 1798 [it was] resolved “that they would not be diverted from their purpose by anything which could be done in Parliament”.

In the *winter of 1796-97*, the coming of the French was urged as a reason for immediate insurrection; but it did not prevail. In *May, 1797*, the order for the execution of the 4 soldiers of the Monaghan militia, was regarded by the militias as sufficient motive for action; but not so thought the Executive. In the *summer of 1797* the militia regiments sent a deputation, offering to *seize the Castle*. The Northern leaders were for an outbreak, so was Lord Edward. Still nothing was done. And again, in the *beginning of 1798*, the *people subjected to free quarters, whipping, burnings, and transportation*, pressed for insurrection. Lord Edward disposed to it. Emmet wanted to wait for France, and thus they were, when the sleek traitor *Reynolds of Kilkee* glided into their councils through Lord Edward's weakness. *Arthur O'Connor* was arrested at Maidstone, in the act of embarking for France; on 12 March, a meeting of Leinster delegates, including *Oliver Bond, McCann* etc., were arrested at *Oliver Bond's* warehouse, Dublin. *MacNevin, Thomas Emmet, Sampson* were not taken for some days. *Warrant against Lord Edward*; he escaped and lay concealed. *New Directory*, John Sheares one of it. On 19 May, just 4 days before the rising was to take place, Lord *Fitzgerald* was pounced on, and on 21st the two Sheares.<sup>b</sup> Thus the insurrection began, without its designers to lead it, and without time to replace them.

<sup>a</sup> The word “formally” is italicised by Davis.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Henry and John.—*Ed.*

23 May 1798 insurrection commenced, 17 July Lord Castlereagh announced its final defeat.

*Before the outbreak of the insurrection, trials took place in February and March 1798.<sup>a</sup>*

The insurgents during the struggle not treated as soldiers, but hanged. Burning every cottage, and torturing every cottager—the loyalists. Martial law proclaimed, and the courts of justice closed. No quarter on either side. *Bills of attainder* and all sorts of legal murder. Juries (packed) recorded the opinions given them by the judges.

25 July 1798 the state prisoners' negotiation with Government. Their lives secured [by] Mr. Cooke, on behalf of the Ministers. On the other hand, they were to describe the *United Irish affairs*, so far as they could, without implicating individuals. Byrne, however, was hanged: compact was finally settled on 29 July, at the Castle, by "deputies from the gaols". The Government broke the compact. They, not only in their press, but by their indemnity act, described the United Leaders as confessing guilt, and craving pardon, neither of which they did. Instead of allowing them to go abroad, they were kept in gaol here for a year, and then thrust into Fort George, from whence they were not released, till the Treaty of Amiens,<sup>304</sup> in 1802.<sup>b</sup>

Within 12 days from the first rising, the *people of Wexford* had cleared their county, with the exception of *Ross and Duncannon*, two places unfit to resist a skilful attack. Similar successes attended the *Kildare* insurrection.

*Antrim and Down* did not rise for a fortnight, and there, after similar blunders, and a shorter struggle, the Presbyterians were ousted.

The *Wexford men* protracted the war; partly from a vague hope for foreign assistance, but still more from despair, for they could not trust the faith of their persecutors; and not a few of these heroic men died in the *plains of Meath*, in an effort to force their way into Ulster.

The soldier having done *his own work*, and that of the *assassin and brigand*, too, [it was the turn of] the bow-string of the Attorney-General. Courts-martial hanged those taken in battle, and courts-civil slaughtered the prisoners. Most *unaccountably the insurgents did not retaliate*. They besides spared females, the loyalists did not.

*German and English troops* were also employed in these affairs.

#### PITT'S PLAN TO ENFORCE AND PROVOKE THE INSURRECTION

1784. Independence assailed by Pitt under colour of commercial tariff.

1789. The Prince Regent's Question determined to extinguish the Irish Legislature.

<sup>a</sup> This sentence is in German in the manuscript.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. Mitchel, *The History of Ireland...*, Vol. II, pp. 15. 19. 26. Further, till the end of the section, there follow excerpts from Davis' "Memoir" in J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. XXIV.—*Ed.*

1798. Rebellion used to terrify the minds of men out of common sense.

1798-99 and 1598-99 It is here well worthy of reflection, that the exercise of *free quarters* and *martial law*, the suspension of all municipal courts of justice, the *discretionary* application of *the torture* to suspected persons, executions in cold blood, and the various measures which *Mountjoy* and *Carew*, and the other officers of Elizabeth practised in Ireland by her authority, in 1598-99, were again judged to be expedient, and were again resorted to with vigour in 1798-99, 200 years after they had been practised by the ministers of Elizabeth.

*United Irish Societies known to Government.*

Though it appeared, from public documents, that Government had full and accurate information of the *United Irish Societies*, and that their leaders and chiefs were fully known to the British Ministry, the Government did nothing to *suppress*, but everything to *exasperate*, the people.<sup>a</sup>

*Under Camden's Administration:*

Earl of *Carhampton*, Commander-in-Chief of Ireland, first expressed his dissatisfaction of *Pitt's inexplicable proceedings*. Although martial law was not yet declared, Carhampton ordered his troops to intervene, wherever insurrectionary movements occurred.<sup>b</sup> This was prohibited by Camden. Carhampton found that troops in the garrison of Dublin were daily corrupted by the United Irishmen; he therefore withdrew them and formed two distinct camps on the South and the North, some miles from the capital. This measure also refused by the Lord Lieutenant whom Carhampton refused to obey. The King's sign manual was at length procured, ordering him to break up his camps, and bring back the garrison; this he obeyed and marched his troops into Dublin barracks. He then resigned his command, and *publicly declared*, that some deep and insidious scheme of the Minister was in agitation; for, instead of suppressing, the Irish Government was obviously disposed to excite, an insurrection. Mr. Pitt counted on the expertness of the Irish Government to effect a premature explosion. *Free quarters* were now ordered,

{*Free quarters* rendered officers and soldiers despotic masters of the peasantry, their homes, food, property, and occasionally, their families. This measure was resorted to, with all its attendant horrors, throughout some of the best parts of Ireland, previous to the insurrection, and for the purpose of exciting it.}

to irritate the Irish population; *Slow Tortures*<sup>c</sup> were inflicted under the pretence of forcing confessions; the people were goaded and driven to madness.

*General Abercromby*, who succeeded as Commander-in-Chief, was not *permitted to abate these enormities*, and therefore resigned with disgust. {*General Abercromby*, in general orders, stated that the army placed under his command, from their state of

<sup>a</sup> This paragraph and the text that follows it, till the end of the section, is Marx's rendering of the text from Mitchel's *History of Ireland...* (Vol. I, pp. 261-62) which is close to the original.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> This sentence and the one that follows it are in German in the manuscript.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Italics by J. Mitchel.—*Ed.*



disorganisation, would soon be much more formidable to their friends than to their enemies, and that he would not countenance or admit *free quarters*.}

Ireland was by those means reduced to a state of anarchy, and exposed to crime and cruelties to which no nation had ever been subject. The people could no longer bear their miseries. Pitt's object was now effected and an *insurrection was excited*.

### *United Irishmen and Pitt. (Poland and Prussia)*<sup>305</sup>

Until 1795 the *United Irishmen* were Protestants, of a minor division of the people. Many of them were Pitt's dupes. At the same time (1793 sqq) emissaries were sent from Berlin to Poland in order to form there Jacobinical Clubs, that they might offer a pretext for the introduction of new armies.<sup>306</sup>

### *Exorbitation of the People. Castlereagh's Boast*

The Irish people were to be tormented, outraged, forced into actual rebellion. Recall of Lord Fitzwilliam involved the country in consternation and dismay. To this succeeded, to fret and exasperate, the *Habeas Corpus Act Suspension Bill*, the *Searching for Arms Act*, the *Bill to transport persons not found at home from sunset to sunrise*; further *many persons were shot* because, being terrified, they attempted to escape when challenged, or, *being seized*, they were consigned to Prussia. Ensor met some of them at Berlin, and the law indemnified the perpetrators of such prodigious deeds. Then the *Yeomanry* were raised: these committed dreadful outrages, particularly in the North; burning houses in open day, commanded by their officers, who were also magistrates. The Militia rivalled the Yeomanry. It is said that *pitch-caps* were invented by some bravos of the North Cork Militia. Still more ferocious the *Dublin Corporation*. The riding-house, in Marlborough Street, distinguished for Protestant loyalty, and *torture was administered by the scourge and the triangle*. Summary executions not uncommon in preparing the Irish for the Union; bodies of Irishmen, deluded by the British Ministry, irritated and inflamed, tortured, tormented, in phrensy and despair, grasped such arms as they could seize, and defied their enemies. *This was called rebellion*; and *Castlereagh boasted that he had made the conspiracy explode. He charged that mine as well as fired it*.

PITT IN BRITISH PARLIAMENT DEFENDER OF THE UNION,  
IN ORDER TO PREVENT MEASURES OF PACIFICATION.  
CASTLEREAGH, 1797, IN IRISH PARLIAMENT

*Castlereagh* had been reformer in Ireland as Pitt in England, till office made him *explode*. Declared 1792 for Irish Parliamentary Reform. Ditto 1793 for Grattan's motion for Parliamentary Reform. When, lo! the Ministry of Ireland was changed and Camden succeeded Lord Fitzwilliam. With the change of men *Castlereagh's* opinion of Reform was upset. *In 1797*, the serpent, the viper, and snake made

another feat: *he declared for a wise and well digested plan of Reform at a proper time. Yet then he has nearly completed the scheme of the Union, and the extinction of the Parliament of his country.*

### *Pitt in British Parliament*

The *reign of terror* (Pitt thundered against the French one) prepared the Union. Pitt, while talking of the prodigious wickedness of interfering with prerogative orders and ancient customs, meditated during years of such verbose, political prudery, *the end and ruin of the fundamental constitution of Ireland*. At the very time when this his machination was completing, *he defended, with swollen rhetoric, the independence of Ireland's Parliament*. In the debate on the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam, in 1795, "he deprecated the discussion as a manifest violation of the independence of the Irish Parliament".<sup>a</sup> Two years later, in 1797, when Fox proposed to address His Majesty on the best means to tranquillise Ireland, this *W. Pitt* objected "on the unconstitutionality, the impropriety, and the danger to be apprehended from the interference of the British Parliament in the affairs of Ireland". This flagitious impostor deprecated any means for Ireland's prosperity; for he proposed, through its agonies and confusion, to effect its incorporate Union with Great Britain.

#### LORD CORNWALLIS' ADMINISTRATION (AUGUST 1798 SQQ). CASTLEREAGH CHIEF SECRETARY. THE UNION TRICK

Then there was *Lord Cornwallis*, the man thrashed by the Americans, during their War of Independence. As a governor for India, he was further qualified for destroying a nation's rights.

(There he incorporated Tippoo Sahib for the East India Company.)

*Cornwallis was the intermediate agent between Pitt and Robert Stewart, commonly called Lord Castlereagh.*<sup>b</sup>

In *India* Cornwallis had defeated *Tippoo Sahib*, but concluded a peace which only increased the necessity of future wars.<sup>307</sup>

*19 October 1781, capitulation of Cornwallis by Yorktown.*

Quietness was almost restored. Cornwallis affected impartiality, whilst he was deceiving both parties. He encouraged the United Irishmen, and he roused the Royalists; one day he destroyed, the next day he was merciful. His system, however, had not exactly the anticipated effect. Everything gave reason to expect a restoration of tranquillity, it was through the *impression of horror* alone that an Union could be effected, and he had no time to lose, lest the country might recover its reason.

Fortunate accident for him: A portion of an armament, destined by France to aid the Irish insurgents, had escaped the Irish cruisers, and landed about a 1,000

<sup>a</sup> Ensor's italics in this sentence.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> G. Ensor, *Anti-Union. Ireland as She ought to Be*, Newry, 1831, pp. 87, 88.—*Ed.*

troops at *Killala Bay* (in the North-West of Ireland).<sup>a</sup> They entered Killala without opposition, surprising the bishop and a company of parsons who were on their visitation. They were joined by a considerable number of peasantry, unarmed, unclothed, and undisciplined. But the French did their best to render them efficient. Marched into the country. *Lord Hutchinson* commanded the garrison of *Castlebar*, a few miles from Killala. His force numerous, with a good train of artillery. *General Lake* with his staff had just arrived. French attacked them. *In a few minutes, the whole of the royal army was completely routed.* About 900 French and some peasants took possession of *Castlebar*.<sup>b</sup> (This battle is called the *Races of Castlebar*.) The English fled in full haste to *Tuam*.

A considerable part of the *Louth and Kilkenny regiments* (militia), not finding it convenient to retreat, joined the victors, and in one hour were completely equipped as French riflemen. About 90 of these men were hanged by Cornwallis afterwards at *Ballynamuck*. The defeat of *Castlebar*, however, was *a victory to the Viceroy*; it revived all the horrors of rebellion, which had been subsiding, and the desertion of the militia regiments tended to impress the gentry with an idea, that England alone could protect the country.

Lord Cornwallis was supine, and the insurgents were active in profiting by this victory; 40,000 of them were prepared to assemble at the *Crooked Wood*, in *Westmeath*, only 42 miles from Dublin, ready to join the French and march upon the metropolis.

The French continued too long at *Castlebar*, and Lord Cornwallis at length collected 20,000 troops, with which he considered himself pretty certain of conquering 900 men. With above 20,000 men, he marched directly to the [*Shannon*]<sup>c</sup> to prevent the passage, but he was out[manoeuvred]: the insurgents had led the French to the source of that river, and it was *ten days* before *Castlereagh*, *by the slowest possible marches, which tended purposely to increase the public terror*, reached his enemy. After some skirmishes, in which the French [were] victorious, they capitulated at *Ballynamuck*.<sup>d</sup> They were sent to Dublin and afterwards to France.

Horrors now were everywhere recommenced; executions were multiplied. Cornwallis marched against the peasantry, still masters of *Killala*; and after a sanguinary conflict in the streets, the town was taken: some were slaughtered, many hanged, and *the whole district was on the point of being reduced to subjection*, when Cornwallis most unexpectedly *proclaimed an armistice*, and without any terms allowed the insurgents freely to disperse, and gave them *30 days*, either to surrender their arms or be prepared for slaughter; leaving them to act, as they thought proper in the interval. *This interval was terrific to the loyalists*; the 30 days of armistice were *30 days of new horror*, and the Government had now achieved the *very climax of public terror*, on which they so much counted for inducing Ireland to throw herself into the arms of the protecting country. *And the first step of Pitt's project was fully consummated.*

<sup>a</sup> On August 22, 1798; then follow, up to the section "More about the Union", excerpts from J. Mitchel's *History of Ireland...*, Vol. II, pp. 27-39, 43, 45, 47-51, 59-62, 76-77 and 79.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> On August 27, 1798.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> The manuscript is damaged here.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> On September 8, 1798.—Ed.

## THE UNION

Pitt now conceived that the moment had arrived to try the effect of his previous measures to promote a Legislative Union.

The Irish Peers, under Lord Clare's, Lord Chancellor's, despotism, [were] ready for anything. The lure of translation neutralised the scruples of Episcopacy. Single exceptions: *Marly*, Bishop of Waterford, and Dixon, Bishop of Down. The rebellion had commenced on 22 May 1798, and on 22 January 1799, an Union was proposed. 40,000 British troops were then in Ireland.<sup>308</sup>

Pitt now conceived the moment to have come to try the effect of his previous measures to promote a *Legislative Union*, and annihilate the Irish Legislature.

The measure *first proposed* indirectly by Speech from the Throne on 22 January 1799. Lord Cornwallis' unexpected warfare against 900 Frenchmen, evidently intended more for terror than for victory.

{ *King's title* was "George III, King of *Great Britain, France, and Ireland*, Defender of the Faith" etc. France was dropped on Amiens Peace. }

Clare's (Fitzgibbon's) only check [was] the bar, which he resolved to corrupt. He doubled the number of bankrupt commissioners, revived some offices, created others, and under pretence of furnishing each County with a local judge, in 2 months established 32 new offices, of £600-700 each.

*First Parliamentary debate* on 22 January 1799, lasted till 11 o'clock of 23 January (22 hours). Government obtained *majority of 1* by open sale of a certain Fox, lawyer.

*2nd debate* on 5 o'clock of 23 January 1799, continued till late in the morning of the 24, Government defeated. In every debate upon that measure, it was insisted upon that *Parliament was incompetent, even to entertain the question of the Union*. In this sense spoke *Saurin*, since Attorney-General, *Plunket*, since Lord Chancellor, *Sir John Parnell*, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, *Bushe*, since Lord Chief Justice, *Lord Oriel*, the then Speaker of the Irish House of Commons.

*Sir Lawrence Parsons* and others showed by irrefutable facts that the country had been worked upon by the English Minister, to terrify the Irish gentry into a resubmission to those shackles from which the spirit of the Volunteers and the nation had but a few years before released them. It was argued that the insurrection, first organised and fostered by Pitt, and protracted by Cornwallis, had been suppressed by the Irish Parliament; and that the introduction of foreign and mercenary Germans, to immolate the Irish, instead of extinguishing, had added fuel to the insurrection. Then great point: *the incompetence of Parliament to betray its trust. Act of Union in itself a nullity ab initio*,<sup>a</sup> and a fraud upon the then existing constitution.

Act of 23 George III "recognising the unqualified independence of Ireland, and expressly stipulating and contracting that *it should endure for ever*".

24 January 1799 111 Members decided *against* Union, 105 for. Voted that night 216. *Absent* 84.

*House of Lords* on 22 January 1799 in answer to the Viceroy's address voted for the Union.

The Irish Lords lay prostrate before the Government, but the leaders were not *inattentive to their own interest*. The *defeat of the Government in the Commons* gave them

<sup>a</sup> From the beginning.—*Ed.*

an importance they had not expected. The accounts of Lord *Annesley* etc. prove their corruption. A great proportion of the 1½ millions levied upon Ireland, and distributed by Castlereagh's *Commissioners of Compensation*, went into the pockets of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of Ireland.

Cornwallis coquetted with the persons, assuming to themselves the title of "*Catholic Leaders*". The *Catholic Bishops* were generally deceived into the most disgusting subserviency.

The members of the old opposition, who were returned to the new *Parliament in 1797*, did not exceed 50.

Strongest cause of division amongst the Members [was] the *Catholic Question*. Cornwallis flattered the Catholics promising certain emancipation; the *priests* bowed before him. Never yet did any clergy so retrograde as the *Catholic Hierarchy*, on that occasion. Corruptly deceived. In 1798 the Catholics were hanged, in 1799 caressed, in 1800 cajoled, in 1801 discarded.

Mr. Pitt, by *private* dispatch to Cornwallis, desired that the measure should not be then pressed, unless *majority of 50* [was] certain. Clare, the Chancellor, overhauled this. Thousands of addresses and petitions against any further discussion. As a punishment for the rejoicings at Dublin over the rejection of the Union, soldiers were ordered to fire amongst the people, of whom a few [were] killed and some wounded.

It appears in full proof, that in proportion to their respective numbers, the *British Commons*, at the period of the Irish Union, [had] ¼ more corrupted, corruptible, and influenced members than that of Ireland at any period.

*5 and 6 February 1800. Union accepted by Irish House of Commons.*

Castlereagh compelled even *felons* in the gaols to sign Union petitions.

English generals, who, at a moment *when martial law existed*, or a recollection of its execution was still fresh in every memory, could not fail to have their own influence over proclaimed districts and bleeding peasantry; tried to procure addresses to Parliament.

Mr. Darby, High Sheriff of King's County,<sup>309</sup> and Major Rogers of the artillery, had gone so far as to place 2 six-pounders towards the doors of the Court House, where the gentlemen and freeholders of the county were assembling to address as Anti-Unionists.

In interval between old and new Parliament, the Parliamentary patrons had breathing-time after the preceding session, and began to tremble for their patronage and importance; some desperate step by Government became necessary to insure continuance of their support. Now unparalleled measure.

*Castlereagh* publicly declared, *first*, that every nobleman, who returned Members to Parliament, should be paid, in cash, £15,000 for every Member so returned; *secondly*, that every Member who had *purchased* a seat in Parliament should have his purchase money repaid to him, by the Treasury in Ireland; *thirdly*, that all Members of Parliament, or others, who were losers by an Union, should be fully recompensed for their losses; and that £1,500,000 should be devoted to this service; in other terms, all who supported this measure were, under some pretence or other, to share in the bank of corruption. A declaration so flagitious and treasonable was never publicly made in any country; [it] had its effect; before the meeting of Parliament he had secured a *small majority of 8 above a moiety of the members*.

After the debate on the Union in 1800, he performed his promise, and brought in a Bill to raise 1½ million of money upon the Irish people, nominally to compensate, but really to bribe their representatives, for betraying their honour and selling their country. George III gives his assent to a Bill to levy taxes for the compensation of Members of Parliament, for their loss of the opportunities of selling what it was criminal to sell or purchase.

*The Union Bill but feebly resisted. The divisions of January and February 1800 reduced the success of the Government to a certainty.*

<i>Lord Shannon received for his patronage in the Commons.....</i>	<i>£45,000</i>
<i>The Marquis of Ely.....</i>	<i>£45,000</i>
<i>Lord Clanmorris, beside a British peerage .....</i>	<i>£23,000</i>
<i>Lord Belvidere, beside his douceur .....</i>	<i>£15,000</i>
<i>Sir Hercules Langrishe .....</i>	<i>£15,000</i>

*15 January 1800* Speech from the Throne, debate proceeded till past 10 o'clock on the 16th. (60 members absent. Not governmental ones.)

*5 February next division.* The Union propositions, as passed by the British Parliament, were, after a long speech, laid before the House of Commons by Castlereagh. After a debate of the entire night, at 11 the ensuing morning, the division took place.

Members 300, absent 27, rest 273. *For Castlereagh's Motion* 158, against 115, majority 43. (273 members present.)

The *House was surrounded by military*, under the pretence of keeping peace, in fact, to excite terror. (*British Regiment.*)

The Bishops Troy, Lanigan, and others, deluded by the Viceroy, sold their country, and basely betrayed their flocks, by promoting the Union. Rebellion had terrified the great body of Catholics who could not move. Besides the 1½ million Castlereagh also had unbounded *secret service money* from England. *British clerks and officers were smuggled into the Irish Parliament* to vote away the Constitution of the Country. By the subjugation of Ireland, England has gained nothing but an accumulation of debt, an accession of venality to her Parliament, an embarrassment in her councils and a progressive danger to the integrity of the empire. *The name of Union* has been acquired, but the attainment of the substance has been removed farther than ever. *Castlereagh* palpably purchased 25 Members before the *second discussion* in 1800, which made a difference of 50 votes in favour of Government. Thus Pitt and Castlereagh carried *the Union*.

\* \* \*

### *More about the Union<sup>a</sup>*

The Irish Parliament were only delegates for a few years. How could they vote their own dissolution and extinction for ever? If the Irish Parliament was authorised to destroy the Constitution, why not the English? *Why not pass a royal law? No appeal was made to the people.* This was done in *Scotland*<sup>310</sup>; [they] did not dare doing it in Ireland. Even the rotten boroughs sickened at the sound.

*The Irish Parliament of 1800* elected in 1797 for 8 years.

The Union carried during the reign of *Martial Law!* On the other hand, Resolution of the *English House of Commons in 1741*: "that *the presence of armed soldiers, at the election of members of Parliament, is a high infringement of the liberty of the subject, and an open defiance of the laws and constitution!*"

*Martial Law Bill in Ireland from commencement of the rebellion in 1798, renewed 1799, in 1800* revived, but in fact it was to be considered as a continuance of [the]

<sup>a</sup> The heading is in German in the manuscript. This section is Marx's rendering of a passage from Ensor's *Anti-Union...*, p. 126.—*Ed.*

former act passed (1799); in 1801, the act of 1800 was continued, for a very short time, by the *United Parliament, without any inquiry!*

*The Act of the Union is an Act of Conquest (Ensor).*

*Ireland's Union with England—Cromwell's scheme. It was among the delusions of Monk.* The English Government had no object by the Union, which means the extinction of Irish Legislature, but to deprive Ireland of its political consequence and authority, and subject her property and people to the mercy of England.

*The English Ministry, in guaranteeing Norway to Sweden, stipulated that Norway, by its union with Sweden, should enjoy an independent Parliament.*<sup>311</sup>

Just as the Union of Ireland with England was declared necessary, so had *Lord Grenville* declared: "*Hampshire* ought to be no more dear to us than *Hanover*."

*Popular Meetings (and Petitions)  
Despite Martial Law and the Suspension  
of All Guarantees for Popular Security.  
Ditto House of Commons during 1799<sup>a</sup>*

Popular indignation universal. Though sheriffs were chosen to obstruct petitioning, though the military opposed their assembling, and dispersed them; yet they met and protested, as at *Birr*, where Major Rogers actually marched with cannon against a county meeting. They met in *Dublin*, as in 1759, on the mere rumour of a projected Union. The people assembled in the towns of *Belfast*, *Limerick*, *Drogheda*, *Newry*, *Maryborough*, *Carrickfergus*, *Pontadown*, etc.; in the Counties of *Dublin*, *Cork*, *Limerick*, *Wexford*, *Cavan*, *Longford*, *Tipperary*, *Galway*, *Monaghan*, *Fermanagh*, *Kilkenny*, *Meath*, *Carlow*, the King's and Queen's Counties, *Leitrim*, *Kildare*, *Down*, *Westmeath*, *Armagh*, *Clare*, *Louth*, *Donegal*, *Mayo*, *Wicklow*, *Tyrone*, *Antrim*, *Waterford*. Thus the population in towns, cities and counties petitioned against that fatal measure, in spite of all terrors and opposition.

The *Irish Commons* coincided with them. Though a mere fictitious representation, first by the *borough system*, and secondly by its *election* (a mere farce), for the *annalist* remarks: "through *consternation of some, and hostility of others*, it had *little more than the formality of an election*." Yet the House of Commons had in 1799 rejected the Union by 111 to 105!

*Corruption etc. in 1800*

The English Government resumed the measure. Merciless profligacy. Vote with us or vacate your seat! Open, flagitious bribery! The bribe was administered in every form to wretches. Mr. *Edgeworth* relates that he was offered to vacate a seat, that a more convenient person might be elected in his place. *Offices* were granted simply, or divided among many; *pensions* added; endless promises. The *Church* afforded a great vent for the increase of prostitution; *rectories* and *bishoprics* were

<sup>a</sup> In this section and in the two sections that follow it Marx sets forth, very closely to the original, passages from Ensor's *Anti-Union...*, pp. 94-97 and 110.—*Ed.*

granted *thrice* in succession to clerical friends of members, advocates for the Union. The *army and navy, boards and concessions*, were exposed at the Union mart; *lawyers* were to be advanced to the *Bench*, by voting away the Parliament. *Commoners* were to be made *Lords*, and Lords to be *relorded with a superior title*.

So numerous were the *superadded placemen alone in the Commons*, that in the year of the Union 1800, *35 new writs were moved for the re-election of members*, who had accepted places from England's Minister! The Lords, and the other boro[ughmongers],<sup>a</sup> of course, obtained a grand division of the Union-bribe—£622,000 was voted in the *United Parliament*, in 1801, [as] *compensation for the borough-holders!* Only £622,000 paid, as a first instalment, by the borough-mongers of [England] to the borough-mongers of Ireland!

Yet, after this overwhelming corruption, prompt payment, and endless expectancy, the *minority opposed to the Union, in the first* [division], in a House of Commons, of whom *84 only* returned for the counties, counties of cities, and the University, and *216* for [boroughs and manors]. A simple bribe disqualifies a member from sitting in Parliament; and shall not such bribery, a small part of the corruption, dismiss the Act of Union from the Statute-Book?

### *Just Punishment of the Traitorous Catholic Hierarchy and the Few Higher Class Catholics Who Joined Them*

Cornwallis (Pitt) had promised them full emancipation. Fulsome address from the Catholic clergy and Bishop Lanigan from Kilkenny to Cornwallis. Yet King George III, as will be seen from the following, accepted the Union as means to make *no further* concessions to the Catholics. Pitt in 1801 handed in his resignation, on pretext that King kept not his word as to Catholics. This [was] mere show. He wanted not to be minister during truce with Bonaparte.<sup>312</sup> Re-entered afterwards the Ministry *without stipulating any favour for Catholics*.

George III, in his letters, published by Lord Kenyon, declares that he was inclined to assent to the Union, believing that the Union would for ever preclude any further concessions to the Catholics.

His words in his letter to Pitt, February 1, 1801, are: "When the Irish propositions were transmitted to me, by a joint message from both Houses of Parliament, I told the Lords and Gentlemen, sent on that occasion, that I would with pleasure, and without delay, forward them to Ireland; but that, as individuals, I could not help acquainting them, that my inclination to an Union with Ireland was principally founded on a trust, that the uniting the established churches of the 2 kingdoms would for ever shut the door to any further measures with respect to the Roman Catholics."<sup>b</sup>

### *On the Legality of the Union*

Attorney-General's *Scott's* (afterwards Lord Clonmel, principal agent of Pitt etc.) declaration of resisting the usurpation of England, in 1782, was repeated in 1800, by 2 successive Attorney-Generals of Ireland. *Mr. William Saurin*, in his place in

<sup>a</sup> The manuscript is damaged here.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...*, p. 110.—*Ed.*



*Parliament*, declared that he considered the *Irish representatives incompetent to exact a legislative Union*; and that any statute, made by a Parliament, thus constituted, *would not be constitutionally binding on the Irish people*. [After becoming] Attorney-General, [he] never afterwards repeated his scepticism.

Mr. *Plunket* made the same declaration, but in rather stronger terms, as he vouched for his son as well as himself; and soon after became Attorney-General.

In every debate upon that measure, it was insisted upon that the Parliament was incompetent, even to entertain the question of the Union. So *Saurin*, *Plunket* (since Lord Chancellor), Sergeant *Ball*, the ablest lawyer of Ireland, *Fitzgerald*, Prime-Serjeant of Ireland, *Moore*, since a judge, *Sir John Parnell*, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, *Bushe*, since Chief Justice, *Lord Oriel*, the then Speaker of the (Irish) House of Commons.

January 1799. *Irish House of Commons*. *Plunket* (Solicitor-General for Ireland under *Addington* Cabinet) declared: "I tell [you]<sup>a</sup> that if, circumstanced as you are, you pass this Act, *it will be a mere nullity, and that no man in Ireland will be bound to obey it.*"<sup>b</sup>

7 May 1802 *Forster* declared in the *United House of Commons* 1802 that *Castlereagh*, in Ireland, had made use of public money [for the purpose of obtaining votes in favour of the Union].

*Grey*, May, 1806, *House of Commons* said that "*these votes for Union were purchased by corruption*".

"The act [of]<sup>a</sup> borough-mongers and placemen is irrevocable, against the Irish Nation!" (*Ensor*).<sup>c</sup>

### *Opinions of English Liberals and Radicals on the Union*

*Lord Holland*: The *English* were injured (by the Union) particularly by the means it affords to *increased parliamentary corruption*. This was foreseen by *Lord Holland*, who, in *debating the Union preparatory to its enactment*, said "*that it was incompatible with the opinions of all those who wished for Parliamentary Reform*".

{The Representative Irish Peers, thickening the ranks of the House of Lords, have strengthened the prerogative. *The whole peerage of Ireland is a borough, of which the King is Patron.*}

*George Tierney* said, speaking of the Union before it was enacted, *that it would ruin Great Britain*. It has ruined both England and Ireland. The subjugation of Ireland has made England's people a mere taxable commodity. Instead of the *universal tranquillity*, which *Canning* promised, when advocating the Union, the Union was followed by new and severe laws, extraordinary commissions, and unlimited agitation. Ireland is *mocked with some of the minor forms of freedom*.

"Union of 1800 a ruin to the annexed, a torment to the annexing nation." (*Barrington*.)

*Cobbett*. *Political Register*, 14 February 1807, in connection with the "Threshers" disturbances in West Ireland,<sup>313</sup> lays the following ironical words in the mouth of an *Irish exciseman*:

<sup>a</sup> The manuscript is damaged here.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Cf. J. Mitchel, *The History of Ireland...*, Vol. II, p. 77.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...*, pp. 97-98.—*Ed.*

"He had no doubt but with an entire repeal of the Habeas Corpus Act, a due execution of the statutes for martial law, and the assistance of 60,000 regular troops, Ireland would become a valuable dependence to England, and produce so considerable a revenue, as to [be] able with the aid of Sir John Newport, in borrowing 2 or 3 millions a year, very nearly to pay the troops to keep the peace, the custom-house officers to collect the revenues, and the salaries and pensions of the 'friends of government'." <sup>a</sup>

In connection with the Irish *Insurrection Bill* of 1807, which was still in force in 1809:

*Cobbett. Political Register, 9 December 1809*: "Angry with the Irish; because—because what? Why, because their *existence endangers our safety!* Angry with them, because they are alive, and have a desire to enjoy life! Sad dogs those Irishmen must be to desire to keep alive, when *to keep alive may be dangerous to us!*" .... "We may, as I before observed, be *angry* with the *Irish*, because about 5 millions of them *continue to be alive*, we may hate them and curse them; we may wish their island sunk to the bottom of the sea; but, still they live, and live they will!" .... "It is, therefore, as useless to be angry with them as it would be to be angry with thunder and lightning." <sup>b</sup>

*Cobbett. Political Register, 20 February 1811*:

"What an infamy to the English nation, who really seem to desire to be deceived with regard to Ireland; but, whose silly and base desire will be frustrated in spite of themselves; for hear and see and *feel* the truth they must. They may hide their heads in their hoods and cloaks as long as they will; they may, as long as they please, pay impostors to sooth their cowardly fears, but all will not do. Ireland! Ireland! Ireland! will, maugre all their miserable devices, present herself to them in her true and formidable shape." <sup>c</sup>

*Ensor. "Ireland with its foundations is pressed downward by the accumulated burthens of England and her empire." (Pays 5 millions now for absentees etc. to England.)* <sup>d</sup>

*Curran*: She (Ireland) "thought the *circulation of the political blood* could be carried on only by the *action of the heart within the body, and could not be maintained from without*". "The instruments of our government have been almost simplified into the *tax gatherer and the hangman*." With the Union: "all semblance of national independence buried in that grave in which our legislation is interred, our property and our persons are disposed of, by laws made in another clime, and made *like boots and shoes for exportation to fit the wearers as they may*. ... It was, in fact, the real design of a rash, and arbitrary, and short-sighted projector, *at once to deprive you of all power, as to your own taxation, and of another power of not very inferior importance, and which, indeed, is invariably connected with taxation, to rob you of all influence upon the vital question of peace and war; and to bring all within the control of an English minister. This very power, thus acquired by that detested Union, has been a millstone about the neck of England.* From that hour to this she has been flaring away in her ruinous and wasteful war." <sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register*, No. 7, February 14, 1807, Vol. XI, p. 255.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 23, December 9, 1809, Vol. XVI, pp. 866-74.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 15, February 20, 1811, Vol. XIX, pp. 420-21.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...*, p. 118.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Marx quotes passages from Curran's speech made on October 17, 1812, at the General Election in Newry. See J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, pp. 465-66, 468-69.—*Ed.*

*Ensor*: "England paralysed at home and abroad." *Castlereagh*, advanced to be English minister by the Irish war. He taxed the English nation with "an ignorant impatience of taxation". "The whole House of Commons is a labyrinth of pretension, imposture, falsehood, injustice, and gloating corruption.... There is no shame, no regard to facts, no respect for consequences, since the Union, in the English Parliament." <sup>a</sup>

*Morning Chronicle*, 1828: "The hatred of the Union is the only point, we believe, as to which all Irishmen are agreed. It has been an unfortunate measure both for England and Ireland!" <sup>314</sup>

Petty said: "England has constantly lost, these 500 years, by the meddling with Ireland." <sup>b</sup>

### Loss to England<sup>315</sup>

*Irish Members—access of venality and corruption to the House of Commons. Increase [of] ministerial usurpation.*

"How the Irish Members precipitated themselves, when the Manchester Massacre was to be justified by *Castlereagh*, the manager of the Union! How they thronged to pass the 6 Acts!" <sup>316</sup> (*Ensor*)

"The French war strengthened the royal prerogative in England, as it increased the means of expenditure, and the fons of corruption. These effected the Union, and the Union multiplied every scheme of rapine and prodigality." (*Ensor*.)

*Ireland—one of the pretexts of keeping a large standing army.*

By the Union, the military of one country, when transferred, are in effect foreign mercenaries. War service in time of peace.

*English House of Commons*. "Increased members, and the increased and multiform business in the House of Commons, have lessened the attention of the great body of the members. The House of Commons, before the Union of Scotland and England, consisted of 513 members. At this period the business of the nation preceded application to private affairs. The legislature then met in the morning. The members were fined if they absented themselves when the Speaker took the Chair, and absence for a whole day was punished with an enhanced penalty. Now the House consists of 658 members, yet not a 10th are present when the Speaker takes the Chair on any day. Business is often transacted when there is, technically, no House." (*Ensor*.)

"Every acquisition of a nation by a nation is injurious to the liberty of both. The accessory country is a lapsed inheritance, while the people who make the acquisition are submissive to their own rulers, lest they might countenance any disturbance in the superadded nation; they submit at home for a barren, often expensive, superiority abroad. [...] This the whole story of the Roman history ... as the world fell before the Roman aristocracy, the Roman citizens were pauperised and enslaved. [...] Every impeachment of liberty in one country leads to its loss in another." (*Ensor*.)

"Talk about revolutionary principles! The Duke of Clarence, afterwards William IV, called, in 1793, an effort to abolish the slave trade part of 'the levelling principles of the French Revolution!'"

<sup>a</sup> G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...*, p. 11.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> W. Petty, *The Political Anatomy of Ireland*, Dublin, 1769, p. 320 (quoted from G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...*, p. 31).—Ed.

"Say not, then, that *England will never consent to relieve Ireland from the Union*—repeat not that she will never be bullied or frightened. The English are the sport of frights.... When Englishmen proclaim, we will not be frightened: it is as the coward's song, surprised by the darkness of night. The English not be frightened! ... England not to be frightened by Ireland! The whole history of the connexion of the 2 countries betrays terror, paralysis, distraction. England's numerous laws against Ireland's trade, manufactures, and commerce—against her people, as a religious community, as a political society—prove that the fears of England have neither measure nor limit.... Nay, their jealousy, their suspicion, their alarm, *confessedly induced them to force the Union on Ireland, by which they ensured the evil they laboured to prevent.*" (Ensor.)

### *Confiscations in Ireland*<sup>317</sup>

Sir W. Petty says generally: "*most of the lands of Ireland have been, within 150 years, forfeited*"<sup>a</sup>

In fact, *all Ireland has been confiscated, three times, again and again.* On some occasions, *such were the forfeitures, that the territory on sale, from the glut of the market, fell to 1/4 of its former annual value.* Lawrence mentions, "that from 1654-1660, not only the adventurers<sup>318</sup> and soldiers, but all persons who could command money, traded in land, and thereby obtained better estates in one year than by treble the sum they got ever before in 7 years' traffic".

This upsetting and dislocation of property, by force of arms, were aggravated by wicked inquisitions, and the practices of the crown lawyers. When the head of a clan died, if the descent followed the Irish custom, the land was forfeited: for this custom was repugnant to the English code. [Yet, if]<sup>b</sup> this land were distributed according to the English law, that was reputed irregular, for it should have been transmitted, said the lawyers, *according to the Brehon law.*<sup>319</sup> Thus the land was forfeited either way, and the Crown became the sole heir. By these means, whether in peace or alleged insurrection, property was subjected to chicane, and the people were systematically robbed. Sometimes the people revolted, e.g. under *Edward II* and *Charles I.*<sup>320</sup> Harris states the reasons of this last insurrection thus: "The preposterous rigour, and unreasonable severity—the covetous zeal and uncharitable fury of some men—and, lastly, *the fear of utter extirpation.*"

### *Scotch Union with England*

Scotland and England parts of the same island. But the population differed from that in England. In Scotland at that time there was peace at home and abroad. There were only *3,000 troops in Scotland* (Defoe).<sup>c</sup> Again, when the Parliament of Scotland was to be elected, the electors were apprised that they were to depute members to decide respecting the Union of the 2 countries. When Union [was] first proposed in the Scotch Parliament, *64 majority for Union.* Scotland by

<sup>a</sup> W. Petty, op. cit., p. 359 (quoted from G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...*, p. 51).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The manuscript is damaged here.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> D. Defoe, *The History of the Union of Great Britain*, Edinburgh, 1709; quoted from G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...* p. 56.—*Ed.*

the Union secured for itself the *republican form* of Church government. Presbyterianism became thus by law the religion of the State. By the Irish Union the *religion of 1/10 of the people was declared to be the State religion. Act of Union declares this to be the law for ever.* Yet the *repeal of the Scotch Union in the English House of Commons<sup>a</sup> in 1713 [was] rejected by a majority of 4 voices.<sup>b</sup>*

[IRELAND FROM THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION  
TO THE UNION OF 1801

SUMMARY]<sup>321</sup>

1) FROM 1778 TO 1782.  
(LEGISLATIVE INDEPENDENCE).  
(CATHOLICS)

a) Penal Code up to 1778 in full vigour against the Catholics.  
*Statè of Irish Parliament in 18th century until American War of Independence. Poynings' Law (a statute of Henry VII, by his Attorney-General, Sir Edward Poynings). Statute 6, George I.*

Only some opposition to England on commercial matters.  
*Influence of absentees. (Peers principally.)*

b) 1778 Irish Parliament relaxes *severity of the Penal Code,<sup>322</sup> Catholics were allowed to take leases of land.* This [is a] consequence of the American war, and the treaty of France with America (6 February 1778).

C) VOLUNTEER ORGANISATION.  
THE FREE TRADE MOVEMENT.  
FIRST CONCESSIONS OF ENGLAND

*June 1778 commenced war with France. Summer 1779 King of Spain accedes as ally to United States and France. Plymouth assailed by their united fleets (August 1779). Threatened invasion of Ireland.*

*The Volunteers—armed Protestantism of Ireland.<sup>323</sup> {(26 February 1780: Armed Neutrality founded by Russia.)}* In 1779 Ireland left ungarrisoned.

The *Armed Associations first local* and provincial, strongest in the North. *First against Invasion.* Protestant farmers rallied first under

<sup>a</sup> See Debates in the English House of Lords on the Union with Scotland on June 2, 1713, in *A Collection of the Parliamentary Debates in England, from the Year M. DC, LXVIII to the Present Time*, Vol. VI, 1740.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...*, pp. 54, 56-57. Ensor has: "... in the English House of Lords..."—*Ed.*

this cry. Catholics assisted. Soon cry of the *Volunteers*: “*Free Trade*” (i.e. *Free Export*) and emancipation of Irish industry and commerce from the shackles laid upon them by England (to free themselves mercantilely and industrially). England suspends, prohibits export of Irish manufactures, inundates Irish market with her own manufactures. *Non-Importation* and *Non-Consumption Agreement*. In the Volunteer movement *Association of all ranks*.

*Sessions of Irish House of Commons 1779-80* under this high popular pressure.

*Grattan* moves an amendment to the address, where we find the following:

“constant drain to supply absentees, and the unfortunate prohibition of our trade”, demands to “open a free export trade”.

*Amendment of Hussey Burgh* (the Prime Sergeant):

“that it is not by temporary expedients, that this nation is now to be saved from impending ruin”.<sup>324</sup>

Unanimously carried. Volunteers rightly attributed to themselves this success. Increase in their number and confidence. *Lord North* supercilious. Does nothing. *Non-Importation* and *Non-Consumption Act* now general [cry] in Ireland. *Dublin* (city) *Resolutions*. *Dublin Volunteers* chose *William, Duke of Leinster*, for their Chief. Soon 4 provincial armies organised, *Earl of Charlemont* first commander-in-chief of the Ulster army, soon *general commander-in-chief*.

*Free Trade* became the watchword of the Volunteers. *James Napper Tandy* at the head of *Dublin Volunteer Artillery*, with labels on the mouths of their cannon: “*Free Trade or Speedy Revolution*”. Meanwhile: 19 October 1781, *Cornwallis* capitulates at *York Town* (Virginia).

30 November 1782. *Paris Preliminary Treaty* between *United States* and *England*.

*Lord North* now frightened. America already lost.

*English House of Commons*. 24 November 1781 speech from the throne. 25 November 1781 *British Parliament* meets, first Bills of concessions receive royal assent.

2 December 1781. In hot haste these laws restrictive of commercial and manufactural restraint are now revoked, but *North* tried, by considering them bit by bit, in longer intervals, to get over the session of 1782 and do no more. Now, on the contrary, the *Irish Volunteers* became aware that under the pretext of making concessions *British Parliament* asserts its legislative authority over Ireland. *Free Parliament* becomes now a watchword added to that

of *Free Trade*. 14 Irish counties at once avowed to establish, at the risk of their lives and fortunes, the *independence of the Irish Legislature*.

*Resolutions entered into by almost every military camp, and every incorporate body, that they would no longer obey any laws, save those, enacted by the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland.*

At that time: *Poynings' Statute* subjected Irish Legislature to British Attorney-General and British [Privy] Council. 6, George I to *Statutes of British Parliament and British Appellant Jurisdiction*.

*Standing army in Ireland independent of Parliament, under the regulations of a British Statute, Perpetual Mutiny Bill and hereditary Revenue of the Crown.*

*Judges of Ireland hold their offices only during the will of the British Minister, and their salaries barely sufficient to keep them above want.*

*Irish Parliament met but once in 2 years. In the British Attorney-General was vested the superintendence of their proceedings, in the British Privy Council the alteration and rejection of their Statutes. Want of Protection for Personal Liberty in Ireland: No Habeas Corpus Act.*

9 October 1781. *Irish House of Commons. Resolution of vote of thanks for the Volunteers, for their exertions, and continuance. Unanimous.*

These brought down the British Government to the feet of the Volunteers—self-armed, self-governed, self-disciplined associations; by this time [they] exceeded in number the whole regular military force of the British Empire. Now **regular and public deliberative meetings of the Volunteers**. Catholic bodies entered the Volunteer army, officered by Protestants. Cry: "that their connection with England was only federative". Repeal of 6, George I asked.

The armed associations of Ulster first appointed delegates to declare their sentiments in a general Assembly. *Convention at Dungannon, 15 February 1782*. Agreed upon the celebrated *Declaration of Rights and Grievances*. Delegates of 25,000 Ulster soldiers.

Convention resolves to appoint 9 of their members to act as a *Committee at Dublin*, to communicate with the other Volunteer Associations, deliberate with them on carrying the *Dungannon Resolutions* into effect. In every Volunteer Corps of Ireland the *Dungannon Resolutions* accepted.

*Pressure of this on the Irish House of Commons*. Its sessions [were] biennial, and, consequently, their grants for the Government for 2 years at once. They now resolved on granting supplies to the Crown for 6 months only. This had its effect.

## C) DECLARATION OF IRISH INDEPENDENCE

Proceedings of Irish *voluntary bodies and corporate bodies* [became] every day more serious and decisive, tone in the House of Commons more menacing. *Lord North* no longer possible.

April 1782. *Marquis of Rockingham Cabinet (James Fox in it). Duke of Portland*, nominated *Lord Lieutenant of Ireland*, arrives at *Dublin* 14 April 1782, had to meet the *Irish Parliament* on 16 April.

*Message of George III to British Parliament, 18 April 1782*, wherein necessity expressed

“to come to a *final adjustment* with Ireland”.

*British House of Commons* express their full concurrence.

*House of Commons, 16 April 1782. Portland* had wanted to procrastinate, *Grattan* communicated to him that [this was] impossible without provoking anarchy. *Hely-Hutchinson*, *Lord Lieutenant* had ordered him to communicate *King's message* for “a *final adjustment*”. *Grattan's amendment of the address* in reply affirming Ireland to be a

“*distinct kingdom with a Parliament of her own the sole legislature thereof*” etc.

*G. Ponsonby* (on behalf of *Portland*) seconded this. *Unanimously passed*. Strictly before and after this scene firm Resolutions of the *Volunteer Corps*. Their firmness achieved this Revolution (even *Fitzgibbon* and *John Scott*, afterwards *Lord Clonmel*, on 16 April 1782 frightened into *patriotism*). *Immediately after this Portland* sends two despatches to England, one *public*, the other *private and confidential* to *Fox*, as to the necessity of yielding (ascertaining at the same time that he would act on the *Volunteers* through *Charlemont*, on the *House of Commons* through dissension of *Flood* and *Grattan*).

*Irish Parliament prorogued for three weeks, to wait on King's Answer*.

Meanwhile public reviews of the *Volunteers* (then 100,000 effectives); nearly  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the whole English Army, besides, are *Irish*; many sailors ditto.

*Irish House of Commons meets: 27 May 1782: Quasi Throne Speech of Portland*. Will concede to all demands, *British Parliament* ready; *King* gives his *Royal Assent* to acts to prevent the suppression of Bills in the *Privy Council of the Kingdom*, limits the Act (*Mutiny Bill*) for Army to 2 years. (Besides much soft-sawder.) *Grattan* fool, address of thanks.

“*The British Government had given up every claim to authority over Ireland*” (he says), “that we conceive the *resolution for an unqualified repeal* of 6 *George I* to be a measure of consummate wisdom”, “*that no constitutional question between the 2 nations will any longer exist.*”



*Grattan's Address carried* (only 2 votes against). *Bagenal* proposes to appoint committee for sum to be voted by Nation to Grattan.

*Britishers frightened*. Precipitantly Bills enacted for making the concessions to Ireland. 6, *George I repealed by British Parliament*, obtains sanction of King, instantly transmitted to the Irish Viceroy, by him communicated to all the Volunteer Corps.

*Irish House of Commons, 30 May 1782*. Bagenal's proposition for Grattan repeated. *Portland* offers him, as part of the intended grant, on the part of the Crown, the "*Vice-Regal Palace in the Phoenix Park*", the King's best palace in Ireland. Of course refused. Grattan got from House of Commons £50,000.

II) FROM 1782  
(SINCE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE)  
TO 1795

A) 1782-1783. (REFORM BILL DEFEATED.  
VOLUNTEERS HUMBLED)

*Some small measures to relax the severity of Penal Code against Catholics*. Opposed by bigots and Castle<sup>325</sup> influence. Passed however. *The concessions very limited*.

At length *Fox himself* declared in *British Parliament* that "the repeal of that Statute" (6, *George I*) "could not stand alone, must be accompanied by a *final adjustment*", "*treaty*, to be adopted by both Parliaments, to be entered upon ... to finally become an *irrevocable arrangement between the 2 countries*".

By this Viceroy's duplicity [was] exploded, Grattan's stupidity exposed, Flood is now still feebly supported in the House of Commons, but strongly by the Volunteers.

19 July 1782 Flood moves leave to bring in a Bill for the ascertaining of Irish legislative etc. independence. Even leave to bring in this Bill was *negatived without a division*. (*Grattan!*)

27 July 1782. *Irish Parliament*. Prorogued by *Portland*. In his proroguing speech: "*inviolable adherence to that compact etc.*"

*Marquis of Rockingham died 1782*. *Fox-North Coalition*. *Portland superseded by Earl of Temple* (later *Marquis of Buckingham*). His *Chief Secretary Mr.*, afterward *Lord Grenville*. His *Administration from 15 September 1782—3 June 1783*.

*More than 150,000 Volunteers* now on the Muster-rolls. *Strong accession to them of Catholics*. Resolved no longer to obey or suffer to be obeyed any law or statute passed in England for Ireland.

*Hence standstill. Magistrates, counsels acted ditto. Juries would not find for them. Action of many important laws suspended.*

*Parliament divided between Flood and Grattan. The latter (Whig spelt) always in majority. British Administration resolved to foster the division of Nation thus created. Baffled by injudicious conduct of some Members of the British Parliament.*

*Sir G. Young in British House of Commons. Lord Mansfield in the Court of King's Bench. Lord Abingdon in the House of Lords.*

*Volunteers beat to arms throughout Ireland. Above 120,000. Flood [has the] upper hand amongst them. New panic of British Ministry.*

*1783. 23 Act of George III. All right of legislative interference on the part of British Parliament, and appellant jurisdiction in England, repudiated. Without debate passed.*

*This British Renunciation Act discredited the Irish Parliament with the Irish People. Showed either its insufficiency or corruption, or would have been superfluous. Reform of the Irish Parliament now the cry.*

*Irish Parliament. Rotten Borough System. Members of House of Commons nominated by individuals, especially Peers, nominated by the King, voted by proxy in House of Commons. Membership purchased by money and its exercise sold for office. These purchases also made by servants of the Executive Government. The Volunteers had the facts sifted etc. 1 Peer nominated 9 Commoners etc.  $\frac{1}{4}$  of members only freely elected by people. New Delegates Assembly of Volunteers in Dungannon. 10 November 1783 was proclaimed for the first sitting of the Grand National Convention of Ireland at Dublin. Rotunda place of their meeting. British Ministers knew that if Reform [were effected] in Ireland [it] could not be withheld from England. Then commercial jealousy of England. Charlemont President by trickery. Plan of Reform passed, to be brought into the House of Commons by Flood. Sitings of Convention were made permanent till answer [was received].*

*The Government refused leave to bring in Flood's Bill, because it had originated from armed deliberation.*

*The Government knew that the triumph of the Parliament implied not only the destruction of the Convention, but of the Volunteers. Bill rejected by 158 to 49. 158 of the majority were placemen, as in 1800. Address to the King, offending the Volunteers, carried. Charlemont adjourns the Convention by tricks. Now struggle between the bigots (Charlemont) and Emancipation (Catholic) amongst the Volunteers and People. (Earl Bristol, Bishop of Derry for full emancipation. Address in that sense by Belfast Volunteers.) Foolish Charlemont made*

new "civil", not military "*Bill of Reform*" to be introduced in *House of Commons*. Of course rejected. Now begins the *Period of Moderate Parliamentarism*. The Volunteers survived the blows for some years, but [were] decaying. The Whig Orators (*Grattan* etc.) lost ground and influence.

B) FROM THE END OF 1783 TO 1791  
(FOUNDATION OF UNITED IRISHMEN)

*December 1783. Pitt Minister. Duke of Rutland Viceroy. Orde Minister. Rutland died October 1787.*

*Duke of Rutland Viceroy. (Orde Chief Secretary.) December 1783-October 1787.*

*In the House of Commons repeated useless attempts at Reform. Orde's Commercial Propositions.*

*May, 1784. Griffith proposes House of Commons inquiry into the commercial intercourse between Ireland and Great Britain, Irish trade he wanted to be protected against English competition. Government took that proposal out of his hands.*

*7 February 1785. Orde announced, and on 11 February 1785 moved, 11 Propositions on Trade. This plan proffered as a boon of reciprocity. Favour [to be] paid for by £140,000 new taxes.*

*22 February 1785. Pitt moved 20 Resolutions in the British House of Commons. Amended in English sense. Then sent to Ireland. Half the globe interdicted to Irish ships and interdicts laid on Irish goods. Whole Custom-House Legislation taken away from Ireland etc. (See p. 22<sup>a</sup>.)*

*Irish House of Commons. On 15 August 1785, after different previous stormy sittings, Orde had to abandon his Bill for the session, [and] for ever. Orde's Propositions merged into a secret design for the Union.*

*11 August 1785. Curran had threatened with opposition, "not only by words".*

*12 August 1785. Curran:*

*"the Bill portends a surrender of the Constitution and Liberties of Ireland".*

*Irish House of Commons. 14 February 1785. Bill for raising Militia. Against the Volunteers. (£20,000 for Militia.)*

*1784 renewed effort for Reform. Henry Reilly, Sheriff of the County of Dublin, in consequence of a requisition, summoned his bailiwick*

<sup>a</sup> Here and further on Marx refers to the main section of his manuscript (see pp. 240-41 of this volume).—Ed.

etc. for the **25 October 1784**, to elect members for a *national congress*. For this attached by the *King's Bench*, on a Crown Motion.

24 February 1785 Brownlow moved *vote of censure on the judges of that Court*, for the attachment. *Rejected by 113 to 71*.

The endeavour to *regain by corruption what was surrendered to force*, began in 1782, and increased greatly after the defeat of *Orde's Propositions*.

*Irish House of Commons 13 March 1786*. Forbes moves to limit the amount of *Pensions*. This failed.

12 March 1787. Forbes renewed his Bill. Failed again.

*No Ministerial Responsibility in Ireland*.

*Irish House of Commons January 19, 1787*. *Outrages in the South*, caused by misery of the people, from *tithes, rents, absenteeism, bad tenures, harsh treatment* etc. (Since the end of 1791, United Irishmen, *Political Parties* united themselves with the *peasants*, the *Republicans of the North*.)

1786. *Lord Lieutenant's Opening Speech* referred to "*frequent outrages*" in the South, "*Right Boys*" of Kilkenny. Yet the only Bill, brought in by Government, the *Dublin Police Bill*, against which the City of Dublin petitioned.

1787. *Viceroy's speech* on this subject much more positive. Fitzgibbon accused the landlords of grinding the people, and abetting the disturbances against the clergy, asked for more powers.

19 January 1787. Fitzgibbon said the disturbances commenced in *Kerry* etc. "*Captain Right*". Spread then through *Munster* etc. Their object the *tithes*, then to *regulate the price of lands, raise the price of labour, oppose the collection of hearth-money and other taxes*.

*Curran during the debates:*

"You may talk of *commerce extending* ... but what, in God's name, have they to do with the wretched peasantry?"

19 February 1787. *Right Boy Bill*. Bill committed by 192 against 31. By it *Riot Act*, introduced from England, passed.

20 February 1787: Proposed to *limit the Bill to Cork, Kerry, Limerick, Tipperary*. Motion lost without a division. By this Bill *capital punishment for tendering an oath* etc.

13 March 1787. *Tithes*. Grattan moved, that if tranquillity [were] restored, at the opening of the next session, the *House would consider the Tithe Question*. Motion lost, without a division. *English Secretary* declared

"he was a stranger to the distress" and would "*never have it considered by the Parliament*".

This Riot Act to be enforced by the very same landed proprietors whom Fitzgibbon had accused of grinding the peasant and instigating him against the clergy.

*Marquis of Buckingham (formerly Earl of Temple) second time Viceroy. 16 December 1737-5 January 1790. (Orde Secretary!) (Fitzherbert Chief Secretary.)*

*Influence of French Revolution of 1789 commences during this period.*

*Irish House of Commons. 21 April 1789. Disfranchisement of Excise Officers' Bill. Rejected by 148 to 93.*

*25 April 1789: Dublin Police. Motion*

"attended with waste, and useless patronage". Rejected by 132 to 78.

*Regency Bill, 1789. George III mad for some time, concealed, at the end of 1788 it could no longer be hid. In the ministers' draft of the address in answer to Lord Buckingham they praised themselves.*

*6 February 1789 Grattan moved amendment. ([People] believed that Fox would become Premier Minister under the Prince of Wales.) Carried without a division.*

*11 February 1789 Ministers tried to postpone division on the Regency; their avowed motive to know the Resolutions of the British Parliament (appointing Prince Regent with limited powers). (These resolutions passed in England on 23 January, accepted by Prince 31 January, but had not yet reached the Irish Government.) Postponement refused. Prince nominated Prince Regent of Ireland with unlimited Powers. Passed without division.*

*12 February 1789 Conolly moves address, February 17 concurrence of Lords, 19 February presented to Buckingham. Refused to transmit it, 20 February 1789 Deputation to Prince appointed. Vote of Censure against Buckingham. 27 February 1789 Deputation (of the Commons) send them letter with "warmest thanks" of the Prince, 20 March 1789 still more fervent letter of the Prince to Irish House of Commons on recovery of his father's health.*

ADMINISTRATION OF JOHN FANE, EARL OF WESTMORELAND  
(CHIEF SECRETARY HOBART,  
AFTERWARDS EARL OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE)  
(5 JANUARY 1790—4 JANUARY 1795)

*House of Commons, 4 February 1790. Stamp officers' Salaries. (Proposed to cut them down and regulate them. Rejected by 141 to 81.) (Curran in his speech alludes to the French Revolution.)*

*11 February 1790. Forbes moves an address describing and censuring several recent pensions. Rejected by 136 to 92.*

Curran states, afterwards (speech in *House of Commons*, February 12, 1791):

“During the whole of the session of 1790, we have, in the name of the people of Ireland, demanded from them the *Constitution of Great Britain*, and it has been uniformly denied. We would have passed a law to restrain the shameful profusion of a pension-list—it was refused by a majority. We would have passed a law to exclude persons, who must ever be the chattels of the government, from sitting in this House. Refused by a majority. A bill to make some person, resident among you, and therefore amenable to public justice, responsible for the acts of your governors ... refused. [...] This uniform denial ... proof to the people of Ireland, that the imputation of corrupt practices is founded in fact.”

### *Disputed Election of Lord Mayor in Dublin (1790)*

Citizens of Dublin pledged themselves to elect no one as *Lord Mayor* or *Member of Parliament* for the city, who held place or pension from Government.

16 April 1790 Aldermen choose *Alderman James*, a Police Commissioner, Lord Mayor for the ensuing year. Rejected by the Common Council, ditto 7 other names. They elected *Alderman Howison* (*Napper Tandy* led the popular party). Aldermen re-elect James. Before the Privy Council. Orders new election. Same farce repeated.

10 July 1790. Curran pleads before Privy Council for Howison. Privy Council for James, who resigns on 5 August 1790. Howison chosen [by the] Aldermen.

16 July 1790. *Napper Tandy* in Common Council carried Resolutions censuring Privy Council, Aldermen, and summoned meeting of freemen and freeholders at the Exchange. Adjourned to 3 August to draw up *State of Facts*, which [was] done accordingly.

24 July: Whig Club [passed] similar Resolutions. Their quarrel with *Fitzgibbon*.<sup>a</sup>

.....  
Insurrectionary outrages at Dublin on Camden's arrival. *Fitzwilliam's* recall triumph for the Separation party. *Irish Republic* soon object of the *United Irishmen*. Bulk of the Presbyterians of *Down*, *Antrim*, *Tyrone*, joined by multitudes of Catholics and Protestants in *Leinster*. Catholics of the North *Defenders* or *Ribbonmen*.

*Irish House of Commons* 4 May 1795. *Second Reading of the Emancipation Bill*. Rejected by 155 to 84. {An *Insurrection Bill* passed etc., law allowing the *Lord Lieutenant* to proclaim counties;

<sup>a</sup> The next, 9th, page of the manuscript is missing.—Ed

*magistrates* obtained power of breaking into houses, and transporting to the navy all whom they suspected. *Indemnity* for magistrates guilty of illegality—giving the Lord Lieutenant *power of arrest without bail*—licensing the *introduction of foreign troops* (German), establishing the Yeomanry Corps.}

*Irish House of Commons 3 February 1796. Indemnity Bill.*

*25 February 1796. Insurrection Bill.* {Right of arbitrary transportation to serve in the navy given to magistrates.} *Curran:*

“bill for the rich, and against the poor”.

**Since end of March 1796** whole counties of Ireland proclaimed.

*13 October 1796. French war.* (Hoche was just assembling at Brest, and Wolfe Tone, Grouchy, and a part of the expedition, reached Bantry Bay on the *22 December*, left it only the *28*.)

*Camden opens Parliament. Resistance to France (Invasion!) and “popular passion and public opinion”.*

*Curran.* Government has instigated persecution of Catholics, for 2 years [they] murdered etc. *in one of the counties.* *Ponsonby’s Amendment to Address rejected* by 149 to 12. Then [the] *Bill* (by *Attorney-General*) [was] passed, [the] *Bill* to empower the Lord Lieutenant to *take up and detain all such persons, as were suspected of treasonable practices* etc. It was read many times, once or twice committed for the morrow.

*14 October 1796. Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act.*

*17 October 1796. Catholic Emancipation Bill rejected.*

*6 January 1797. Hoche’s Expedition.* Pelham brings down message of Viceroy for new war taxes.

*24 February 1797. Internal Defence. Yeomanry Infantry* etc. (p. 38).<sup>a</sup>

*18 March 1797. Disarming of Ulster.* Message of Camden. (*Proclamation of General Lake. Belfast. 13 March.*)

*15 May 1797. Curran, Grattan* etc. secede from the House.

*3 July 1797* House adjourned. *Castlereagh Chief Secretary.*

*14 October 1797. Orr* hanged for having administered *oath of the United Irishmen* to a private soldier (proven only by an informer etc.)

{*10 May 1795. Organisation of Ulster* (United Irishmen) completed. *In autumn 1796* made *military* in Ulster. Towards the *middle of 1797*, this system spread to *Leinster*. Only *19 February 1798* the *Executive of the United Irishmen* resolved

“that they would not be diverted from their purpose by anything which could be done in Parliament”.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp.253-54.—Ed.

(Lose time for action.) *March 1798* Arthur O'Connor arrested, at Maidstone, in the act of embarking for France; *12 March*, Oliver Bond, McCann etc. at Oliver Bond's warehouse, Dublin. Shortly afterwards McNevin, Thomas Emmet, Sampson. *New Directory*. John Sheares one of it. *19 May*, just 4 days before the insurrection was to take place, Lord Fitzgerald pounced upon, *21 May 2 Sheares*. Thus the insurrection began without its designers to lead it.}

*23 May 1798* the insurrection commenced (Dublin), *17 July* Lord Castlereagh announced *its final defeat*.

*Treason trials were held in February and March 1798 before the beginning of the insurrection.<sup>a</sup> Free quarters. Slow tortures, under the pretence of forcing confessions etc. Summary executions. At the outbreak of the insurrection martial law proclaimed.*

*25 July 1798*. Negotiations of leaders from gaol with the Government. Settled *29 July*. (Released only by *peace of Amiens*, 1802!)

PITT'S PLAN TO ENFORCE AND PROVOKE THE REBELLION  
(P. 41 SQQ.)<sup>b</sup>

*1598-99 Elizabeth (Mountjoy and Carew); same 1798-99.*

*Earl of Carhampton. General Abercromby.*

*United Irishmen and Pitt. Prussia and Poles.*

*Castlereagh boasted that he had made the conspiracy explode. He charged the mine as well as fired it.*

*Pitt 1795 and 1797* opposed debates for pacification of Ireland in *British Parliament* on pretext that *it was an encroachment on Irish independence.*

LORD CORNWALLIS GOVERNMENT. UNION

*Pitt, Castlereagh, Cornwallis. (19 October 1781 Cornwallis's Capitulation at York Town, Virginia.)*

*Cornwallis wants terror to carry the Union.*

*Happy accident for him:*

*22 August 1798* about 1,000 French, under Humbert, entered Killala Bay, carried Castlebar *27 August*.

<sup>a</sup> This sentence is in German in the manuscript.—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 256-59.—*Ed*



8 September surrendered at Ballinamuck. (*Hardy's* flotilla taken on 11 October with Tone, who died on 19 November.)

*Revival of horrors.*

40,000 troops in Ireland. *Martial Law continuing* (it was constantly renewed, and discontinued in 1801).<sup>a</sup>

House of Commons 22 January 1799. Legislative Union first proposed in Speech from the Throne (debate lasted 22 hours, until the *morning of 23 January*). Government obtained majority of 1, by open sale of certain *Fox*, lawyer.

2nd *debate*, on 5 o'clock of 23 January 1799, lasted till morning 24. Government defeated. 111 members decided against Union, 105 for. (*Voters* 216, *Absent* 84.)

*Lords Spiritual and Temporal* use this House of Commons' Opposition to get money etc. out of Government, stipulated for their sale.

*Cornwallis* bamboozles the *Catholic Bishops*; [their] disgusting subserviency.

Petitions, Addresses, Dubliners fired into for their rejoicings.

5 and 6 February 1800 Union accepted by Irish House of Commons. Still minority of 115 of a total of 273 votes. In interval between old and new Parliament corruption broadcast (pp. 48, 49<sup>b</sup>).

*Castlereagh's shameless measure.*

*The House of Commons* was surrounded by a British Regiment.

*Castlereagh* palpably purchased 25 members before the 2nd *division* in 1800, which made a difference of 50 votes in favour of Government. Thus Pitt and *Castlereagh* carried the Union.

Written in October-November 1869

Reproduced from the manuscript

First published in Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 45,  
Moscow, 1975

<sup>a</sup> The sentence in brackets is in German in the manuscript.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 262-63.—*Ed.*

## Frederick Engels

[NOTES ON GOLDWIN SMITH'S BOOK  
*IRISH HISTORY AND IRISH CHARACTER*] <sup>326</sup>

1) GOLDWIN SMITH,  
*IRISH HISTORY AND IRISH CHARACTER*  
(PART OF IT IN NOTEBOOK III UNDER O'CONNOR <sup>327</sup>)

Goldwin Smith, *Irish History and Irish Character*, Oxford and London, Parker, 1861.

Behind the cloak of objectivity, the apologetic English bourgeois professor. Even from a geographical point of view, Ireland, he says, was destined to be subjugated by England, and he attributes the slow and incomplete conquest to the width of the Channel and to the position of Wales between England and Ireland.

Ireland is said to be a GRAZING COUNTRY by nature, see Léonce de Lavergne.<sup>a</sup> Smith thinks that

“it is difficult, over a great part of the island, to get in a wheat harvest ... its natural way to commercial prosperity seems to be to supply with the produce of its grazing and dairy farms the *population of England*” (p. 3).

There *are* coalfields in Ireland (p. 4).

The climate is supposed to have debilitated the Irish and retarded their development, in comparison with such BRACED PEOPLE as the Scandinavians

(and Laplanders?). On the other hand, the prospect is held out to the Irish

of the VILLAS OF NOBLES and MERCHANT PRINCES, such as can now be found in Scotland (p. 5)

(IN THE GROUSE MOORS AND DEER FORESTS!).

Greatly deplores the lack of *moderation* in Irish eloquence. Nevertheless the Irishman complements the Englishman, and it

---

<sup>a</sup> Léonce de Lavergne, *The Rural Economy of England, Scotland and Ireland*. Translated from the French. Edinburgh, 1855. See this volume, p. 159.—*Ed.*

would be unfortunate if as a result of emigration the Celtic element were DRAINED OFF.

Originally the clan or tribe [was] the social form common to all Celts (and to other nations)

in Wales as well. Soon more intermingling of the different clans in the Irish plain and loosening of ties within the clans; on the other hand [there existed] the rule of the more powerful over those who were weaker, the beginnings of monarchy. The main prerogative of the king seems to have been the exaction of tribute, rather than regular jurisdiction.

The FACTION FIGHTS of the Irish, TWO YEAR OLDS and THREE YEAR OLDS, are vestiges of the old clanships, as are also the COUNTY jealousies and COUNTY FIGHTS<sup>a</sup> (cf. the FIGHT between Cork and Tipperary on the emigrant ship).

The FAIRIES too have their FACTION and COUNTY FIGHTS<sup>b</sup> (cf. Kohl).<sup>328</sup>

The old loyalty to the clan chief and submission to his will explain much in the Irish character.<sup>c</sup>

The land of the clan [was] communal property. In this context Smith realises that in Ireland it was *never the Irishman, but only the Englishman who held land as private property*, although he merely says that private property confronted the Irishman only in the "form of insecurity, degradation, and despair" (p. 21).

Sir John Davies, pp. 135, 136,<sup>d329</sup> writes of the CHIEFRIES that "though they had *some portions of land allotted to them*", [their income] "did consist chiefly in *cuttings and cosheries and other Irish exactions*, whereby,

the English LAWYER says,

"they did spoil and impoverish the people at their pleasure. And when their chieftains were dead, their sons or next heirs did not succeed them but their tanists who were elective and *bought their election by strong hand*; and by the Irish custom of gavelkind, the inferior tenancies *were partable amongst all the males of the sept both bastards and legitimate* and after partition made, if anyone of the sept had died, his portion was not divided among his sons, but the chief of the sept made a new partition of all the lands belonging to the sept and gave everyone his part according to his antiquity."

Quoted p. 22.

The English LAWYERS are supposed to have called this, and TANISTRY in particular, "no estate, but only a transient and scambing possession", and Davies was entirely

<sup>a</sup> G. Smith, op. cit, pp. 15-17.—Ed

<sup>b</sup> J. G. Kohl, *Reisen in Irland*, Bd. I, Dresden und Leipzig, 1843, S. 34.—Ed

<sup>c</sup> Ibid, p. 19.—Ed

<sup>d</sup> Engels' note in the margin: "Davies, excerpts, pp. 4, 2."—Ed

in agreement with this and also with the king being obliged to compel the people, if necessary by force, to accept CIVILITY,<sup>a</sup>

i.e. the English law.

How often a new division took place is not clear (!), certainly not at every death. (See Hallam.<sup>b</sup>)

*Every two or three years*, see Davies, excerpts, p. 82.<sup>c</sup> In any case it is obvious that because of the English conquest, the Irish up to 1600 had not yet gone beyond communal property! But Smith (p. 24) asserts that as early as the

“invasion the land which a member of a sept had occupied seems generally to have passed at his death, as a matter of course, *to all his sons*”.

This is wrong; see Davies, who considers that partition still exists at least in the northern part of Ireland.<sup>d</sup>

Even today, he says, “spend me and defend me” is more natural to the Irish peasant than the relationship of landlord and tenant.

The term GAVELKIND was introduced into Ireland by English LAWYERS, for they confused Irish law with the Kentish GAVELKIND, which knows no primogeniture either (p. 25).

St. Bernard's pronouncement about the Irish Church, on the basis of which Henry II justified Adrian's Papal Bull,<sup>330</sup> because it was necessary to bring the whole church under the sway of Rome in the face of external enemies, contains nothing but trash:

1) They pay no first-fruits or tithes. 2) they do not properly marry

(i.e. not in accordance with the formalities prescribed by Rome),

nor do they go to confession (?), no one exhorts them to do penance and no one imposes a penance. Moreover, 3) there are far too few priests. *But all this had already been put right by St. Malachy, as St. Bernard himself admits. (De vita St. Malachiae, ch. 8.)*

Giraldus Cambrensis however repeats the same accusations:

they pay neither tithes nor first-fruits, disregard the “rites of marriage, do not come to church and marry the wives of deceased brothers”.<sup>e</sup> In addition one can merely say that the hierarchy is incomplete, there are far too many bishops and for a long time there were no archbishops at all, and their ORDINATIONS are not quite lawful (p. 33).<sup>f</sup>

<sup>a</sup> J. Davies, *Historical Tracts*, London, 1786, pp. 134-35.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> H. Hallam, *The Constitutional History of England, from the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of George II*, Vols. I-III, London, 1869.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> In the manuscript this is written above the preceding quotation.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> In the manuscript this remark is inserted between the lines.—Ed.

<sup>e</sup> Giraldus Cambrensis, *Topographia Hibernica, et Expugnatio Hibernica*. Edited by James F. Dimock, London, 1867, p. 289.—Ed.

<sup>f</sup> See St. Bernard, *De Vita S. Malachiae...*, Ch. 10; p. 33 refers to Smith's book.—Ed.

The only towns were those of the Danes  
(says Davies).<sup>a</sup>

That heathen elements are still evident in their religion is obvious, it was so everywhere. Thus in Ireland one can find "the pledge of blood" in addition to the touching of a relic when concluding an agreement, the noisy, orgiastic WAKES which accompany funerals, the fact that the right arm is not baptised etc.

In Germany and England one can find quite different things.

FOSTERAGES and the special emphasis laid on sponsorship (GOSSIPREDE) as being binding for life, are probably also of pagan origin. Cambrensis: "As for their own brethren and kinsmen, the Irish persecute them when living unto death, and avenge them when slain; while such love and fidelity as they show is confined to their foster-brethren and foster-children." Quoted p. 37.<sup>b</sup>

Marriage however seems to have been in a bad way, for Davies, p. 146,<sup>c</sup> speaks of "their common repudiation of their wives, their promiscuous generation of children, their neglect of lawful matrimony"; he associates this with "their uncleanness in apparel, diet, and lodging, and their contempt and scorn of all things necessary for the civil life of man".

The fact that in law BASTARD CHILDREN are placed on a par with legitimate children is connected with this but also with communal property.

The Irish squire of the last century is said to have still eaten at the same table with the RETAINERS of his HOUSEHOLD, almost like the old clan chief (p. 39).

The laws of the conquerors against bards and STROLLING SINGERS were directly political,

because they were the upholders of the NATIONAL tradition. As late as the end of the 18th century there were still a few old travelling harpists.<sup>d</sup>

But their Irish can no longer be understood today.

The Normans in Ireland "formed only a military colony, or rather garrison, holding its ground against the natives with difficulty, and living in a perpetual state of border war". From the outset therefore [they tried to gain the] ASCENDANCY. The Pale<sup>331</sup> was a part of feudal England on the other side of the Channel (p. 56).

THE ENGLISH INTEREST and the ANGLO-IRISH INTEREST in the Pale arose already at that time. The Irish barons were jealous of the English officials who came from England, etc., and of those who also owned English ESTATES, and who for the most part were absentees<sup>332</sup> and remained English.

During the Wars of the Roses<sup>333</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The parenthesis was inserted later.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Giraldus Cambrensis, op. cit., Vol. II, p. III; p. 37 refers to Smith's book.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The page reference—which is not given in Smith's book—was presumably inserted by Engels later.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> G. Smith, op. cit., p. 43.—*Ed.*

the government of the Pale became so weak that it entrusted the policing and keeping of order to the private BROTHERHOOD of St. George.<sup>a</sup>

(Moore sub anno 1472, not in the Chronology.)<sup>334</sup>

The Statute of Kilkenny<sup>335</sup> is said to be merely an act of self-defence AND there was NOTHING PECULIARLY MALIGNANT IN IT. That crimes against Irishmen were not punishable is said to have been the natural consequence of the fact that in Ireland two nations living in the same country were subject to two different codes of law!

"An Irishman who had murdered an Englishman would have been only fined for it by his Brehon!!"

Proof of this is

the affair of the sheriff whom an Irish chief was prepared to admit into his territory, provided the government fixed the wergeld to be paid for him should the case arise.<sup>b</sup>

The *quinque sanguines*<sup>c</sup> are correctly understood as 5 clans.

English statesmen, such as Spenser, Davies and Bacon, who were interested in Ireland, regarded "the settlement and subjugation of Wales by Edward I" as an ideal.<sup>d</sup>

At any rate Davies, see pages 105-07, notebook 3, 2.<sup>e 336</sup>

Finally under: Poynings' administration (Henry VII) every murder was made punishable according to English law<sup>f</sup>

(i.e. within the Pale). Almost all his laws are said to *have benefited Ireland*, because they placed IMPERIAL (here it is simply a euphemism for English) INTERESTS AND POLICY above ASCENDANCY (!).

"It can hardly be doubted that the most obnoxious of his statutes, as they tended to make imperial policy and imperial interests paramount over the policy and interests of ascendancy, were at the time of their enactment beneficial to the *Irish people*"!! (p. 73).

These Acts were effective only within the Pale, and not a trace of the Irish people could be found there! (Davies, pp. 136-39).<sup>g</sup>

He claims that with Henry VIII and Wolsey "the deep and reflecting statecraft of a politic age now began to appear" in the Irish administration of the regents sent to Ireland (p. 74).

<sup>a</sup> G. Smith, op. cit., p. 66.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Engels' note in the margin: "Davies, pp. 134, 135; notebook pp. 4, 2; Spenser, p. 20."—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> Five bloods. See this volume, p. 292.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> G. Smith, op. cit., p. 71.—Ed.

<sup>e</sup> This note was inserted later.—Ed.

<sup>f</sup> G. Smith, op. cit., pp. 72-73.—Ed.

<sup>g</sup> The source reference was inserted later.—Ed.

Yes indeed, the French wars and the Wars of the Roses had come to an end!

The war against the Geraldines<sup>337</sup> in the reign of Henry VIII was waged by both sides with great cruelty and caused much destruction; in addition there was treachery and perfidy on the part of the English against Fitzgerald and his five uncles, and against others as well.

Under Elizabeth "there was corruption, corruption in the very vilest form, corruption which preferred war to peace because war held out hopes of lucre which peace threatened to destroy".

Then, in the age of the adventurers,

"the eagle took wing for the Spanish main, the vultures descended upon Ireland"....

But in Ireland, too, Raleigh had a castle and an estate granted to him at Lismore. Wakefield, Vol. I, p. 70.<sup>a 338</sup>

"A dexterous use of intrigue, chicanery and the art of inciting to rebellion, procured for the sharper in Ireland wealth ... in the shape of confiscated lands" (p. 79).

In 1561 Shane O'Neill came to England with a guard of GALLOWGLASSES, who were bareheaded, wore GLIBS, SAFFRON shirts, short skirts and shaggy cloaks and were armed with *hatchets*<sup>b</sup>

(at a time when muskets were in use!).

P. 86. Elizabeth's expenditure for the war in Ireland amounted to at least £4-500,000 per annum, hence the counterfeit money. "Assuredly whoever may have profited by the misery and depression of Ireland, *it has not been the English nation.*" (!) "To the English nation Ireland has been a source of expense, danger, and weakness without intermission from the conquest almost down to the present hour."

And *à qui la faute?*<sup>c</sup> Surely that of THE ENGLISH NATION!

James is said to have been obliged to create SHAM BOROUGHS, not only to obtain a majority, but also because there were no real boroughs!!! (p. 96).

Just as Potemkin's villages had likewise been a historical necessity.<sup>339</sup> Good for the reformers.

Sir Thomas Smith's first colonies "were planted in Down and Antrim on lands which were *presumed in law to be vacant* by the attainder of O'Neill". This failed, "the native occupants, says Hallam, not acquiescing in this doctrine of our lawyers".

Arthegal in Spenser's *Faerie Queene* is LORD DEPUTY Gray.

<sup>a</sup> Engels wrote the passage from "But in Ireland..." to "... Vol. I, p. 70." in the margin and marked the place for it in the text.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> G. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 80.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Whose fault is it?—*Ed.*

“When the chieftains of the septs O'More and O'Connell<sup>a</sup> were attainted, in the reign of Mary”

(King's and Queen's Counties),<sup>340</sup>

“the septs pleaded that the chieftain could not by his attainder forfeit the sept land *which he never had possessed*. A feeling that the land was still theirs and that they were unjustly kept out of their possessions ... is perhaps not extinct even at the present day” (p. 101).

To show his impartiality, Strafford also extorted considerable sums from the colonists of Londonderry, because they had committed a small formal BREACH OF THE COVENANT, thus arousing the wrath of London, the mother city, against him and Charles.<sup>b</sup>

“It is not too much to say that the English Puritans regarded the Irish Catholics, after O'Neill's massacre, with the rage of the Orangeman<sup>341</sup> towards the Papists added to the rage of the Englishman of Calcutta towards the Sepoy mutineer<sup>342</sup> (p. 113).

so that on the whole, Cromwell countenanced as few murders as he possibly could.

Cromwell's transportation of Irish rebels to the West Indies to be employed there *as slaves* is said to be less harsh

“than the measure which the Catholic House of Austria dealt at the same time to the Protestants of Bohemia and other conquered provinces in the Thirty Years' War” (p. 114).

*To be looked up.*<sup>343</sup>

In defence of the judicial murder of Archbishop Plunket [he says that] although Titus Oates' plot was an invention, “there was a Popish plot for the extirpation of Protestantism and liberty throughout Europe, of which the King of France<sup>c</sup> was the powerful head, of which the Jesuits were the restless and unscrupulous agents, in which the King and the heir presumptive to the crown<sup>d</sup> were deeply engaged and which all but overthrew the religion and liberties of England in the next reign” (p. 119).

*Not a word about the breach of the Treaty of Limerick.*<sup>344</sup>

“James II issued a mandatè nominating a Papist to the Professorship of the Irish language in Trinity College. It turned out that *no such Professorship existed*” (p. 135).

The money which the ABSENTEES take with them is said to be mainly expended on unproductive work and thus for the most part lost in any case; therefore it does not matter much that the money is not spent in Ireland (p. 144).

What does the West End of London say to this?

<sup>a</sup> A mistake in Smith's book, it should be “O'Connor”.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Charles II.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Louis XIV.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The Duke of York, later James II.—*Ed.*



In his *Modest Proposal*, Swift speaks of young unemployed Irishmen (A. D. 1729) "who either turn thieves for want of work or leave their dear native country to fight for the Pretender;<sup>a</sup> or sell themselves to the Barbadoes".<sup>b</sup>

That is into slavery lasting for a longer or shorter time.

He then proposes that some of the children be assigned to the butcher, and in his *Maxims* he suggests that the Irish be permitted to sell their surplus population into slavery.<sup>c</sup>

Even before the reign of James II the potato is said to have been the symbol and REPROACH OF IRELAND. Under James II "an Irish deputation was followed about the streets of London by a mob with potatoes stuck on poles" (p. 150).

Ireland's distress ... "overflowed to England, and bringing pauperism" (!) "and disease" (!! "into our great cities, punished England for whatever share she may have had in Irish wrongs" (p. 151).

According to Phelan's *Remains*, Vol. II, p. 42, the landlords preferred Catholic SERFS to Protestant TENANTS, especially because the former always offered to pay the highest rent. The Protestants therefore emigrated to America.

(No date mentioned.)

MacGeoghegan says in his *History of Ireland*<sup>345</sup>: "from calculations and researches made at the French war-office, it has been ascertained that from the arrival of the Irish troops in France in 1691, up to 1745, the year of the battle of Fontenoy, more than 450,000 Irishmen died in the service of France."

In the independent Irish Parliament before the Union

(according to an INQUIRY MADE [in] 1784 FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE ENGLISH GOVERNMENT) out of "300 seats 116 were shared among 25 proprietors (one nobleman had 16) and that the government could count on 86 votes of members for proprietary seats, the owners of which let them out for titles, places or pensions, 12 votes of their own, 45 votes of placemen, and 32 of gentlemen who had promises or had avowed their expectations" (Massey, *History of England*, Vol. III, p. 264).

And what about the English Parliament of the time?

Sir Jonah Barrington was JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT OF ADMIRALTY IN IRELAND.

Pitt would have given parliamentary reform and Catholic Emancipation to Ireland, but his

"liberal policy ... was fatally arrested and the world" (!) "was flung into dismay, despair of liberty and absolutist reaction, by the tremendous eruption of absurdity, cruelty, and ultimately of military vanity and rapacity, which Frenchmen imagine to be the grandest and most beneficent event in history" (p. 165).

No trace of objectivity remains here.

"An alien and disaffected element incorporated in a nation can only be a source of internal division and weakness. It would be better in every point of view, that

<sup>a</sup> The Old Pretender, James Francis Edward Stuart, Chevalier de St. George.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See G. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 147.— *Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> G. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 148. Smith has *Modest Proposal* instead of *Maxims*.— *Ed.*

the British Empire should be reduced to a single island, to England, to Yorkshire, or Kent, *than that it should include anything which is not really its own*" (p. 179).

!! *Donc*—! After 700 years of struggle!

Federation, he declares, is impossible between Ireland and England (*he does not speak of a real federation with a federal parliament responsible for federal affairs, but only of a personal union*).

"This dog-collar-union, two independent parliaments and two independent governments linked together by a nominal allegiance to the same crown ... must be an irony or a nuisance" and would end either in complete separation or in the rule of the English parliamentary government over Ireland too, as between 1782 and 1798, as a result of corruption and intrigue (p. 181).

What about Sweden and Norway? And Austria-Hungary?<sup>346</sup>

"The course of events has left no basis whereon Irish nationality can be established." The Irish and the English are said to be composed of the same elements, although in different proportions ... "but what is of most importance and in fact *almost decisive*, the language of both islands is the same" (p. 183).

Hence, the two are *one* nation and separation of any kind is absurd! As though the English language had not made the Irishman even more Irish!

From p. 184 onwards [he deals with] "the agrarian outrages, of which the *surplus population was the main cause*"!!<sup>a</sup>

#### GOLDWIN SMITH.

#### CONCLUSION

#### (PASSAGES QUOTED WORD FOR WORD AND ADDENDA)

"The dampness of the climate, while it is the source of vegetable wealth and vegetable beauty, could not fail to relax the energies of the people and to throw them back in the race of nations for preeminence in things requiring physical exertions. We see this when we compare the early history of the Irish with that of the Scandinavians, braced to daring and enterprise by the climate of the North" (p. 4).

Edward III and Henry V fought the battles of Crécy, Poitiers, etc., in France,<sup>347</sup> "on these famous fields where, in the overthrow of the French chivalry by peasant hands, feudalism found its grave!" (p. 65, see below p. 71).<sup>b</sup>

#### *Statute of Kilkenny:*

"*There is nothing peculiarly malignant in the attempt* of that Statute to restore a sharp division between the English and the natives. The object of the framers was not to prevent the beneficial fusion of the two races into one nation, but to prevent the one which they very naturally and rightly thought the more civilised, from degenerating into the barbarism of the other; and at the same time to check the increase of the 'rebel' elements in the country ... the same legislators forbid, under

<sup>a</sup> After this paragraph there follows the note: "(For the end see p. 5)".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, p. 292.—*Ed.*

the severest penalties, the making of private war upon the Irishry,<sup>348</sup> and the exciting them to war" (p. 68).

(Very kind!)

"It sounds shocking that the killing of an Irishman by an Englishman should have been no felony and that it should have been a good plea to an indictment for murder that the murdered person was not an Englishman nor a member of one of the five 'bloods' or septs which had been admitted within the pale of English law. *But nothing more is in fact implied in this than that the Irish were not under the English but under the native or Brehon jurisdiction.* The existence of two races in the same country under different laws, and with different punishments for crimes, inconceivable as it appears now"

(he does not know the Levant!),

"appeared quite natural at a time when the distinction of races was far stronger and when law was the peculiar custom of the race, not a set of principles common to all mankind. It would have been the same in England had the Anglo-Saxons succeeded in obtaining from {William} the Conqueror 'the laws of Edward the Confessor'. One kingdom would then have contained two nations, the Normans and the Saxons, living under different penal codes. *The rule of impunity held good for both sides. An Irishman who had murdered an Englishman would have been only fined for it by his Brehon.* The Government having on one occasion desired a native chief to receive a sheriff into his territories, the chief consented, but at the same time desired the Government to say what sum of money, or eric, they set upon the sheriff's head, in order that, if he was killed, that sum might be duly assessed upon the sept" (p. 69).

*England* as a government is said to have always been well disposed towards Ireland:

"The truth is that the Plantagenet Government, when it found time to attend to Ireland, intended not evil but good to the Irish people (p. 68)... The English Government was not unwilling to admit the Irishry to the English law. Five *whole septs*" (!!)"the five bloods ... were admitted collectively, and individual denization seems to have been freely granted" (pp. 69-70).

But the bad Irish barons did not want this and it is they who frustrated the good intentions of the government (pp. 68, 69).

*"The idea that the English Government deliberately excluded the Irish from the pale of humanity vanishes away"* (p. 70).

(Certainly—in his mind!)

*"From the ruins of the feudal aristocracy which the Wars of the Roses had laid in the dust, arose the powerful monarchy of the Tudors"* (p. 71).

Hence it had not found its grave as a result of those battles in France!

"At no period of the struggle" (Henry VIII and Elizabeth) "unhappily could England put forth her whole power to *strike, in mercy*, a decisive blow" (p. 77).

## Under Elizabeth:

"Finally, there was corruption; corruption in the very vilest form; corruption which preferred war to peace because war held out hopes of lucre which peace threatened to destroy. The great events and discoveries of the Elizabethan era produced a love of adventure which broke forth in every direction, and varied in the dignity of its objects and its character, from the height of heroism to the depth of baseness. The eagles took wing for the Spanish main; the vultures descended upon Ireland. A daring use of his sword procured for the adventurer in the Spanish colonies romantic" (!) "wealth in the shape of ingots and rich bales; a dexterous use of intrigue, chicanery and the art of inciting to rebellion, procured for the sharper in Ireland wealth less romantic but more solid and lasting in the shape of confiscated lands" (p. 79).

"The reign" (of James I) "began well, with a broad act of oblivion" (?). "Even the arch-rebel Tyrone was received into favour"

(! after all, he had made his peace even before the death of Elizabeth!) (p. 94).

By the judgment of the King's Bench<sup>349</sup> (1605) which stated that Irish TENURE was unlawful, and introduced English law, "*the chiefs gained a boon* by having their demesne lands and their territorial rights finally made hereditary instead of elective" (p. 95).

Ten years later living in exile and completely expropriated these chiefs (those of them that still lived in 1605) were able to ponder what a *BOON* it was!

"There seems no reason to doubt that it was in honest pursuance of the same policy of civilising and conciliating" (!!) "*the Irish*, by giving them English institutions, that a Parliament more regular and comprehensive than any which had preceded, was called for all Ireland, without distinction of race or religion." (??) "It is true that the Government took active measures to obtain a majority, and that it created a number of rotten, or rather of sham boroughs. But it does not seem that freedom of election was **otherwise**" (!!) "interfered with" (!) (pp. 95-96)... "It was necessary to create sham boroughs, not only to give the Government a majority, but also because real boroughs there were none" (!!!) (p. 96).

"It appears, to say the least, extremely doubtful whether the lands of Tyrone and Tyrconnel, on which the Ulster colony was planted, had been forfeited for any real offence and whether the plot in which these noblemen were alleged to have been engaged, was not invented by the teeming brain of officials desirous of sharing their estates. They fled, it is true, but not from justice; for justice, when the forfeiture of land was in prospect, there was none" (p. 100).

He asserts that in 1640 and 1641, Richelieu and the Pope<sup>a</sup> fomented civil war in England and Ireland, and the Irish officers who had returned from France and Spain also added fuel to it. Then came the Catholic rising

"with that great massacre of the Protestants in Ulster which is connected with the name of Sir Phelim O'Neill.<sup>350</sup> To doubt that there was a great massacre seems

<sup>a</sup> Urban VIII.—Ed.

idle, since Clarendon,<sup>a</sup> a contemporary, well informed and sober writer, reckoned the number of persons killed at 40 or 50,000" (!). "It seems not less idle to doubt which party struck the first blow; as well might it be doubted which party struck the first blow in the Sicilian Vespers.<sup>351</sup> An abstract of depositions describing some of the scenes which occurred in the massacre has been preserved by Rushworth (*Collections*, Vol. IV, p. 405).<sup>b</sup> It presents an appalling but *perfectly credible* picture of the vengeance which a people brutalised by oppression wreaks, in the moment of its brief triumph, on the oppressor. *Well might phantoms of horror haunt the accursed spots and the ghosts of the murdered be heard to shriek from beneath the bridge at Portmadown*" (pp. 107-08).

This is again very vague!

"Under the Protectorate" (Cromwell) "... the Protestant community at least (in Ireland) presented a picture of prosperity such as the island had never before seen" (??) (p. 114).

This sycophant regards Macaulay as A GREAT WRITER.

"It would be as easy to sing of the siege of Troy after Homer, as to write about the siege of Londonderry after Macaulay" (p. 120).

While he advises the Irish (see Preface)

"to pay more attention to general causes"

so as to be able to explain away such infamies in an objective manner, he always attributes the actions of the Irish to petty parochial causes. Thus under James II:

"The Irish people, it has been justly observed, in entering upon the civil war, were moved, not by attachment to the House of Stuart or to its political principles, but, like the Highland Clans, by *motives of their own* ... probably the mass of James's party, though they were fighting for the Catholic religion, were fighting less for the Catholic religion than for that old and terrible subject of Irish civil wars, the *land*" (p. 121).

(That is their own land!).

"**Land** had been the great source of contention and misery in Ireland throughout her history" (p. 125).

Not the Englishmen's greed for land, but the *land* itself must be blamed for it. IT'S CHITTY THAT'S DONE IT.

"Their descendants" (the descendants of Cromwell's landlords) "became probably the very worst Upper Class with which a country was ever afflicted. The habits of the Irish gentry grew beyond measure brutal and reckless, and the coarseness of their *debaucheries* would have disgusted the crew of Comus. Their *drunkenness*, their *blasphemy*, their *ferocious duelling*, left the squires of England far behind" (!). "If there was a grotesque side to their vices which mingles laughter to

<sup>a</sup> E. H. Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in Ireland, Begun in the Year 1641*, Oxford, 1712.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> J. Rushworth, *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State...*, London, 1682.—Ed.

our reprobation, this did not render their influence *less pestilent* to the community of which the malice of destiny had made them the social chiefs. Fortunately their recklessness was sure, in the end, to work, to a certain extent, its own cure; and in the background of their swinish and uproarious drinking bouts, the Encumbered Estates Act rises to our view" (p. 140).<sup>352</sup>

"In 1778 the *increasing spirit of toleration* began sensibly to exert its power" and the worst PENAL LAWS were repealed. In "1778 Lord North proposed (somewhat under duress, it is true) large relaxations of the iniquitous and absurd restrictions on Irish trade ... two years later the same minister, taught wisdom by his American disasters, proposed and carried further concessions. Twenty years more, and Mr. Pitt, having come into power *instinct with all the liberal ideas* of the new era, extinguished one" (!) "source of misery and discord by giving Ireland a *full measure of Free Trade*"

(that is with England!)

"as an article of the Union" (!) (pp. 158-59).

The "nice *spirit* of toleration", the "liberal ideas of the new era", etc., have brought all this about. Not the Englishman's fear of the Americans and French! These are the "*general causes*" which have to be kept in mind, but by no means the real ones!

"Among the phantoms of hatred and suspicion which arose from this field of carnage, was the horrible idea that the English Government had intentionally stimulated the Irish people into rebellion in order to pave the way for the Union. *No evidence in support of this charge can be produced*" (p. 176).

"A nation must be very shallow or very depraved which, in the meridian light of modern philosophy, can imagine that a mere extension of its territory, unsanctioned by nature and morality, can add to its greatness" (p. 179).

And this when the English have been engaged in conquests throughout the century!

Conclusion:

"The original source of the calamities of Ireland was the partial character of the Norman Conquest, which caused the conquerors instead of becoming an upper class, to remain a mere hostile settlement or Pale.... The next great source of mischief was the disruption of Christendom at the period of the Reformation and the terrible religious wars which ensued upon that disruption and into which both nations, in common with the other nations of Europe, were drawn. Then Ireland became a victim to the attempt of Louis XIV, which was in part a sequel of the religious wars, to destroy the liberty and religion of England through his vassals, the House of Stuart. Finally the French Revolution breaking out into anarchy, massacre and atheism, at the moment when the Government of England under Pitt had just entered on the path of reform and toleration, not only arrested political progress in this as in other cases, but involved Ireland in another civil war" (p. 193).

Again fine "general causes"! As general as possible!

Preface:

"It" (this book) "would serve a good purpose if it should fall into the hands of any popular writer on Irish history, and induce him to pay more attention than writers

on that subject have generally paid to *general causes*, to cultivate *the charities of history* and in the case of the rulers as well as of the people, to take fair account of misfortunes as well as of crimes."

On Ireland's INDEPENDENCE, p. 180:

"Independence would of course be feasible in itself if it could only be accompanied by geographical separation; *but so close a neighbourhood would involve contact and contact would bring on collision*"

(hence as on the Continent where the countries are in direct contact?);

"rivalry, jealousy, hostility would spring up all the more certainly because there would be between the two countries the memory of a former union and of a recent divorce; and Ireland, menaced by the power of England, would become the ward and the vassal of France, or some other foreign power which for its own purposes would constitute itself her protector."

All this applies also to Russia and Poland, to Hungary and Austria and indeed between 1815 and 1859 to Austria and Italy, and to every case of subjugation. It is appropriate that England's former infamies have to serve as a pretext for the infamies committed at the present time.

Federation in this case requires two partners of equal strength, "but it could not be naturally or usefully formed between two states one of which is far more powerful than the other, since in the Federal Council the vote of the more powerful would always prevail".

Written in November 1869

Printed according to the manuscript

First published in Marx and Engels, *Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 45, Moscow, 1975

## Frederick Engels

### VARIA ON THE HISTORY OF THE IRISH CONFISCATIONS<sup>353</sup>

#### *16th Saeculum.<sup>a</sup> Henry VIII*

1536. Parliament in Dublin introduces the OATH OF SUPREMACY to the King and he is given the privilege of taking the first-fruits of all ECCLESIASTICAL LIVINGS. Quite different in the doing, however, and the subsequent insurrections were directed, among other things, against the Oath. Refusal to take the OATH OF SUPREMACY was high treason in Ireland just as in England (Murphy, p. 249).<sup>b</sup>

#### *16th Saeculum. Edward VI and Mary*

*Confiscations in Queen's and King's Counties.* During the reign of Edward VI, the O'Moores of Leix and the O'Connors of Offaley carried on a feud with some lords of the Pale,<sup>c</sup>

as was usual in Ireland.

The government qualified this as rebellion. General Bellingham, later Lord Deputy, was sent against them and forced them to submit. They were advised to see the King and submit to him in person as O'Neill had done successfully in 1542.<sup>d</sup> O'Moore and O'Connor, unlike O'Neill, were imprisoned and their estates confiscated. But that was not the last of the clans. The inhabitants declared that the land belonged to the clans, not to the chiefs, who therefore could not forfeit it, and were, at most, liable to forfeiting their private domains. They declined to move out. The government sent troops, and had the land cleared after unintermittent fighting and extermination of the population (Murphy, p. 255).

This was the pattern for all subsequent confiscations under Elizabeth and James. The Irish were denied all rights against the

<sup>a</sup> Century.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. N. Murphy, *Ireland, Industrial, Political, and Social*, London, 1870, pp. 248, 249.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 254.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In Murphy's book no date is given.—*Ed.*



Anglo-Irish of the Pale, with resistance treated as rebellion. From then on that sort of thing became usual.

By Acts in the 3rd and 4th years of the reign of Philip and Mary, c. 1 and 2, the LORD DEPUTY, the Earl of Sussex,<sup>a</sup> was endowed with "full power and authority [...] to give and to grant to all and every Their Majesties' subjects, English or Irish [...], at his election and pleasure, such estates in fee simple, fee tail,<sup>354</sup> leases for term of years, life or lives" in these two counties "as for the more sure planting or strength of the countries with good subjects shall be thought unto his wisdom and discretion meet and convenient" (Murphy, p. 256).

### *16th Saeculum. Elizabeth*

*English policy* under Elizabeth: to keep Ireland in a state of division and strife.

"Should we exert ourselves," the English Government averred, "in reducing Ireland to order and civility, it must soon acquire power, consequence and riches. *The inhabitants will be thus alienated from England*; they will cast themselves into the arms of some foreign power, or erect themselves into an independent and separate state. Let us rather connive at their disorders, for a weak and disordered people can never attempt to detach themselves from the Crown of England." Thus Sir Henry Sidney and Sir John Perrot, successive LORD DEPUTIES (the last-named the best that they ever had, held the post in 1584-87), describe this HORRID POLICY, against which they protest (Leland, Vol. II, p. 292<sup>b</sup> and Murphy, p. 246). Perrot's intention of granting the Irish equal rights with the Anglo-Irish and obviating confiscations was blocked by the English party in Dublin.

(Yet he it was who had O'Donnell's son<sup>c</sup> brought aboard a ship, filled with drink and borne away.)

*Tyrone's rebellion*, among other things, against religious persecution: "He and other lords of Ulster entered into a secret combination, about this time, that they would defend the Roman Catholic religion ... that they would suffer no sheriffs nor garrisons to be within the compass of their territories, and that they would [...] jointly resist all invasions of the English" (Camden).<sup>355</sup> The conduct of Deputy Mountjoy in this war is described by Camden: "He made incursions on all sides, spoiled the corn, burnt all the houses and villages that could be found, and did so gall the rebels, that, pent in with garrisons and streightened more and more every day, they were reduced to live like wild beasts, skulking up and down the woods and deserts" (Murphy, p. 251).

See Holinshed, *Chronicles*<sup>d</sup> (p. 460) on how Ireland was laid waste in this war. Half the population is said to have perished.

<sup>a</sup> Thomas Radcliffe.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Th. Leland, *The History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II*, Vols. I-III, London, 1773. Here and below quoted from Murphy.— *Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Hugh O'Donnell, "Red Hugh".— *Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, Vol. VI, London, 1807.— *Ed.*

According to the RETURNS for 1602 by John Tyrrell, the Mayor of Dublin, prices there climbed: wheat from 36/- to 180/- the QUARTER, barley malt from 10/- to 43/- and OAT MALT from 5/- to 22/- the BARREL, peas from 5/- to 40/- the PECK, oats from 3/4 to 20/- the BARREL, BEEF from 26/8 to 160/- the CARCASS, MUTTON ditto from 3/- to 26/-, VEAL ditto from 10/- to 29/-, lamb from 1/- to 6/-, and a pig from 8/- to 30/- (Leland, Vol. II, p. 410).

*Desmond* was deprived of his estates in all counties of Munster except Clare, and also in Dublin. They were worth £7,000 per annum. The Irish Parliament of 1586 expropriated 140 landowners by confiscation in Munster alone under the Act of the 28th year of Elizabeth's reign, c. 7 and 8. MacGeoghegan lists the names of the GRANTEES of *Desmond's ESTATES*<sup>3</sup>; some of these families are still, and up to 1847 nearly all were, in possession.

(? probably *cum grano salis*).

The annual Crown rent on these ESTATES was 2d to 3d per acre, with no indigenous Irish admitted as TENANTS and the government undertaking to keep adequate garrisons.

Neither provision was observed. Some estates were abandoned by the GRANTEES and reoccupied by the Irish. Many of the UNDERTAKERS stayed in England and appointed AGENTS, "ignorant, negligent, and corrupt" (Leland, Vol. III, p. 311).

### 17th Saeculum. James I

*Penal Laws against Catholics* (Elizabeth, in the 2nd year of reign, 1560, c. 1, *Irish [Statutes, Vol. I, p. 275]*<sup>356</sup> are applied more and more from the very beginning of the reign of James I, it becoming dangerous to practise [Catholicism].

Under Elizabeth 2 c. 1, the FINE of 12d was imposed for every NON-ATTENDANCE AT PROTESTANT CHURCH and, in 1605, under James, imprisonment was added by ROYAL PROCLAMATION alone and, hence, unlawfully. This did not help. Besides, in 1605 all Catholic priests were ordered out of Ireland in 40 days on pain of death.

*SURRENDERS OF ESTATES AND REGRANTS* (see Davies, 7<sup>b</sup>).<sup>357</sup> These followed the pronouncement of TANISTRY and GAVELKIND<sup>358</sup> as unlawful by the COURT OF KING'S BENCH<sup>359</sup> in the HILARY TERM in the third year of the reign of James I. A Royal Proclamation stipulated SURRENDER [of estates] and REGRANT under new valid titles. Most Irish chiefs came forward to receive incontestable title at last, but this was made conditional on their giving up the clan relationship in favour of the English LANDLORD-TENANT relationship (Murphy, p. 261).

This in 1605 (see "Chronology"<sup>360</sup>).

*PLANTATION OF ULSTER.* According to Leland, Irish UNDERTENANTS and SERVANTS were TACITLY EXEMPTED from the OATH OF SUPREMACY, whereas all the other planters were compelled to take it.

Carte says<sup>361</sup> that all Irish settlers and the NATIVES who were allowed part of their land were exempted, but this was irrelevant

<sup>3</sup> Engels took the reference to MacGeoghegan's *History of Ireland* (Dublin, 1844) from Murphy, pp. 257-58.—Ed.

because it [the taking of the Oath] could not be enforced anyway. The Scottish Presbyterians in Ulster also refused to take the OATH OF SUPREMACY, and *this was suffered* by the authorities (Murphy, p. 266). That may have been useful for the Irish as well.<sup>a</sup>

Carte estimates the number of English settlers in Ulster in 1641 at 20,000 and of Scottish settlers at 100,000 (*Ormonde*, Vol. I, p. 177).<sup>b</sup>

Sir Arthur Chichester, LORD DEPUTY, was rewarded for his services in this PLANTATION with the territory of Innoshowen (?) "and all the lands possessed by O'Dogherty, a tract of country far exceeding the allotments generally made to nothern undertakers" (Leland, Vol. II, p. 438). As early as 1633 these ESTATES were valued at £10,000 per annum (Strafford's *State Letters*,<sup>c</sup> Vol. II, p. 294). Chichester was the ancestor of Marquis Donegal, who would have had £300,000 per-annum for his Belfast estate alone, if one of his ancestors had not surrendered it to others under long LEASES (Murphy, p. 265).

The PLANTATION of Ulster culminated the first period, with a new means discovered for confiscation: *DEFECTIVE TITLES*. This is effective under James and Charles, until Cromwell renews the invasion. See extracts from Carte [*Ormonde*], 2<sup>a, b</sup><sup>362</sup>

Another nice pretext for confiscation was that

old Crown rents, long forgotten by Crown and landowners, were still due from many ESTATES. These were now pulled out and, wherever unpaid, the ESTATE was FORFEITED. Nor receipts existed, and that was enough (Murphy, p. 269).

Concerning the attempt to confiscate Connaught (see "Chronology", and O'Connor, *Catholics*),<sup>363</sup> recall James' dirty trick:

when the people of Connaught SURRENDERED their titles to a specially appointed ROYAL COMMISSION in 1616 and had these RECONVEYED BY NEW PATENTS, THEY PAYING £3,000 FOR THEIR ENROLMENT IN CHANCERY, the titles were not registered. A new commission was named *on this pretext* in 1623 to declare them null and void by reason of deliberate default, an oversight that depended not on the landowners but the government. (See Carte, *Ormonde*, [Vol. I,] pp. 47 and 48.) In the meantime, James died.

A COURT OF WARDS for Ireland was established in 1614; Carte avers in *Ormonde*, Vol. I, p. 517, that no lawful BASIS existed for it as for that in England. Meant to bring up Catholic heirs in the Protestant religion and English customs. Its president was the good<sup>d</sup> Sir William Parsons, who had helped plan it.<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> In the manuscript the last two sentences are written in the right-hand, blank column, opposite the preceding sentence.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Th. Carte, *An History of the Life of James, Duke of Ormonde, from his Birth in 1610, to his Death in 1688*, London, 1736. For quoting this work Engels made use of Murphy's book and of his own excerpts from it.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Letters and Dispatches, with an Essay towards His Life by Sir G. Radcliffe*, London, Vols. I-II, 1739.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The word "good" does not occur in Murphy.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Quoted according to Murphy, pp. 269-70 and 277-78.—*Ed.*

### 17th Sæculum. Charles I

That the Irish insisted in the "GRACES"<sup>364</sup> that "three score years' possession" (of an ESTATE) "should conclude His Majesty's title" was quite understandable, for this was the "law of England" (Strafford, *State Letters*, Vol. I, p. 279) by the Act of the 21st year of James' reign (Murphy, p. 274).

Yet English law applied to the Irish only in so far as *it suited the [English] Government.*

Strafford wrote to the English Secretary of State on December 16, 1634, that in his Irish Parliament "the Protestants are the majority, and this may be of great use to confirm and settle His Majesty's title to the plantations of Connaught and Ormond; for this you may be sure of, *all the Protestants are for plantations, all the others are against them*; so as these, being the great number, you can want no help they can give you therein. Nay, in case there be no title to be made out to these countries in the crown, yet should not I despair, forth of reasons of state, and for the strength and security of the Kingdom, to have them passed to the King by an immediate Act of Parliament" (*State Letters*, Vol. I, p. 353).

Outside Connaught, too, money was extorted continuously on pain of INQUIRY INTO TITLES.

The O'Byrnes of Wicklow, for example, twice paid £15,000 to preserve a portion of their ESTATES, while the City of London paid £70,000 to prevent confiscation of its PLANTATIONS in Colrain and Derry for alleged breach of covenant (Leland, Vol. III, p. 39).

The COURT OF HIGH COMMISSION established by Wentworth in the year 1633, after the English model,<sup>365</sup> "with the same formality and the same tremendous powers" (Leland, Vol. III, p. 29), and this naturally without Parliament's consent, in order "to bring the people here to a conformity in religion, and, in the way to that, raise, perhaps, a good revenue to the Crown" (January 31, 1633, *State Letters*, Vol. I, p. 188). The Court saw to it that all newly-appointed officials, doctors, barristers, etc., and all those who "sued out livery of their estates" should take the OATH OF SUPREMACY,

which, as Macaulay observed, was A RELIGIOUS INQUISITION where that of the STAR CHAMBER was political.

Then the CASTLE CHAMBER, called STAR CHAMBER<sup>366</sup> as in England, which, Lord Deputy Chichester said, was "the proper court to punish jurors who will not find a verdict for the King upon good evidence"

(oft-quoted passage from *Desiderata Curiosa Hiberniae*, Vol. I, p. 262<sup>a</sup>).

It is said therein that the penalties there employed consisted in "imprisonment and loss of ears"; and "fines, pillory, boring through the tongue, marking on the forehead with an iron and other infamous punishments" were likewise applied, as is stated in the indictment of Strafford (Murphy, p. 279).

When Strafford went to Connaught in 1635, he took with him 4,000 HORSE "as good lookers on, while the plantations were settling" (Strafford, *State Letters*, Vol. I,

<sup>a</sup> Quoted according to Murphy against p. 279.—Ed.

p. 454). In Galway he imposed fines not only on the jury that would not find a verdict for the Crown, but also on the sheriff "for returning so insufficient, indeed, we conceive, so packed a jury, in £1,000 to His Majesty" ([*State Letters*], August 1635, Vol. I, p. 451).

By the 28th of Henry VIII, c. 5, 6 and 13, all recourse to the Pope's jurisdiction was prohibited and all Irish came under the Protestant ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS, whose verdict could be appealed against to the King alone. They took cognizance of all marriages, baptisms, burials, wills, and ADMINISTRATIONS, and punished RECUSANTS FOR NON-ATTENDANCE AT CHURCH under the 2nd of Elizabeth, c. 2, and also collected the tithes. Bishop Burnet (*Life of Dr. Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore*, p. 89)<sup>a</sup> said these courts "were often managed by a chancellor that bought his place, and so thought he had a right to all the profits he could make out of it. And their whole business seemed to be nothing but oppression and extortion.... The officers of the court thought they had a sort of right to oppress the natives, and that all was well got that was wrung from them ... they made it their business to draw people into trouble by vexatious suits, and to hold them so long in that, for 3d worth of the tithe of turf, they would be put to a £5 charge".

In the "GRACES", which never materialised,

Protestant clergymen were to have been forbidden "to keep private prisons of their own" for spiritual offences, so that offenders should be committed to the King's public gaols (Murphy, p. 281).

About the Protestant clergy see Spenser, excerpt 5<sup>a</sup>.<sup>367</sup>

Borlase and Parsons encouraged the rebellion everywhere. According to Lord Castlehaven's *Memoirs*,<sup>b</sup> they said: "The more rebels, the more confiscations." Leland (Vol. III, p. 161), too, observes that, as before, "extensive forfeitures were the favourite object of the chief governors and their friends".

By that time, the Irish Royalist army was to have been 50,000 strong through reinforcement from England and Scotland.

See Carte, *Ormonde*, Vol. III, p. 61, for the instructions to the army.<sup>368</sup>

The motto of the Kilkenny Confederates<sup>369</sup> was: *Pro deo, pro rege, et patria Hibernia unanimes*<sup>c</sup> (Borlase, *Irish Rebellion*, p. 128)<sup>d</sup>

— so that is where the Prussians lifted it from.

### 17th Saeculum. Cromwell

*Drogheda MASSACRE*.<sup>370</sup> After a successful assault "quarter had been promised to all who should lay down their arms—a promise observed until all resistance was at an end. But at the moment that the city was completely reduced, Cromwell ... issued his fatal orders that the garrison should be put to the sword. His soldiers,

<sup>a</sup> G. Burnet, *The Life of William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore in Ireland...*, London, 1685. Quoted according to Murphy's book, p. 280.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *The Memoirs of James Touchet ... Earl of Castlehaven...* Quoted according to Murphy, p. 288.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> For God, King and Ireland unanimous.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Ed. Borlase, *The History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion...*, London, 1680. Quoted from Murphy, p. 289.—*Ed.*

many of them with reluctance, butchered the prisoners. The governor and all his gallant officers, betrayed to slaughter by the cowardice of some of their troops, were massacred without mercy. For five days this hideous execution was continued with every circumstance of horror" (Leland, Vol. III, p. 350). A number of ECCLESIASTICS found within the walls were bayoneted. "Thirty persons only remained unslaughtered ... and these were instantly transported as slaves to Barbadoes" (Leland, Vol. III,] p. 350).

Petty (*Political Anatomy*, Dublin edition of Petty's tracts, pp. 312-15)<sup>a</sup> estimates that 112,000 British and 504,000 Irish inhabitants of Ireland died in the war of 1641-52. In 1653, SOLDIERS' DEBENTURES<sup>371</sup> were sold at 4/- to 5/- in the pound, so that with 20/- being the price [nominal] of 2 acres of land, and there being 8 million acres of good land in Ireland, all Ireland was purchasable for £1 million, though in 1641 it was worth £8 million. Petty estimates the value of the livestock in Ireland in 1641 at £4 million, and in 1652 at less than £500,000 so that Dublin had to get meat from Wales. Corn was 12/- per BARREL in 1641 and 50/- in 1652. The houses of Ireland, worth £2 million in 1641, were worth less than £500,000 in 1653.<sup>b</sup>

Leland, too, admits in Vol. III, p. 166, that "the favourite idea of both the Irish Government and the English Parliament" (from 1642 onwards) "was the utter extermination of all the Catholics of Ireland".

See Lingard (Vol. VII, 4th ed., p. 102, note) on the transportation of Irish as slaves to the West Indies (figures vary from 6,000 to 100,000). Of the 1,000 boys and 1,000 girls to be sent to Jamaica, the commissioners wrote in 1655: "Although we must use force in taking them up, yet it is *so much for their own good and likely* to be of such great advantage to the public, that you may have such number of them as you shall think fit" (Thurloe, Vol. IV, p. 23).<sup>d</sup>

By the first ACT OF SETTLEMENT, the forfeiture of 2/3 of their estates had been pronounced against those who had borne arms against the Parliament and 1/3 of their estates against those who had resided in Ireland any time from October 1, 1649 to March 1, 1650 and had not manifested their CONSTANT GOOD AFFECTION to Parliament. The Parliament had power to give them, in lieu thereof, other lands to the proportion of value thereof. The second Act concerned resettlement

(see Prendergast,<sup>c</sup> Excerpts, VII, 1<sup>a</sup><sup>372</sup>).

Distribution of land to soldiers was limited to those who had served under Cromwell from 1649 (Murphy, p. 302).

See Carte, *Ormonde*, Vol. II, p. 301, about some cases of land surveying, especially by ADVENTURERS.<sup>373</sup>

According to Leland (Vol. III, p. 397), the Commissioners in Dublin and Athlone kept considerable domains for themselves.

A PLANTATION ACRE=1 ACRE 2 ROODS 19 PERCHES 5 YARDS and 2 1/4 FEET IMPERIAL STATUTE measure, or 121 PLANTATION acres=196 STATUTE ACRES (Murphy, p. 302).

<sup>a</sup> W. Petty, *The Political Anatomy of Ireland*. In: *Tracts; Chiefly Relating to Ireland*, Dublin, 1769.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> The last two paragraphs are excerpts from Murphy's book, pp. 292-94.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> J. Lingard, *A History of England, from the First Invasion by the Romans*, Vols. I-VIII, London, 1819-30.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esq.;... Containing Authentic Memorials...*, Vols. I-VII, London, 1742. Quoted from Murphy's book, p. 298.—Ed.

<sup>e</sup> J. P. Prendergast, *The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland*, London, 1865.—Ed.

### 17th Saeculum. Charles II

#### A result of confiscations under Cromwell and Charles II.

The 7,708,238 STATUTE ACRES confiscated by Cromwell were *distributed finally, by 1675*, as follows:

	STATUTE ACRES
1) <i>To Englishmen</i>	
ADVENTURERS .....	787,326
SOLDIERS .....	2,385,915
"FORTY-NINE" OFFICERS .....	450,380
DUKE OF YORK .....	169,431
PROVISORS .....	477,873
DUKE OF ORMOND AND COLONEL BUTLER .....	257,516
BISHOPS' AUGMENTATIONS .....	31,596
	4,560,037
2) <i>To Irishmen</i>	
DECREES OF INNOCENCE .....	1,176,520
PROVISORS .....	491,001
KING'S LETTERS OF RESTITUTION .....	46,398
NOMINEES IN POSSESSION .....	68,360
TRANSPLANTATION .....	541,530
	2,323,809
Remaining still unappropriated in 1675, being	
part of towns or land possessed by	
English or Irish without title or DOUBTFUL .....	824,392
[Total in] <i>Statute acres</i> .....	7,708,238

On "Forty-Nine" officers see O'Connor and Notes.<sup>374</sup>

THE DUKE OF YORK<sup>a</sup> received a GRANT of all the lands handed over to the ATTAINTED REGICIDES.<sup>b</sup> "Provisors were persons in whose favour provisoes had been made by the Acts of Settlement [1662] and of Explanation. Nominees were the Catholics named by the King restored to their mansions and 2,000 acres contiguous."

At that time the profitable lands of Ireland =  $\frac{2}{3}$  of all land, or 12,500,000 STATUTE ACRES. Of the rest, considerable tracts were occupied without title by soldiers and ADVENTURERS. In 1675, the 12  $\frac{1}{2}$  million ACRES of arable land were distributed as follows:

"Granted to English Protestants of profitable land forfeited under the Commonwealth .....	4,560,037
Previously possessed by English Protestant Colonists and by the Church .....	3,900,000
Granted to the Irish .....	2,323,809

<sup>a</sup> James Stuart, future James II.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The reference is to those who were associated with the execution of Charles I.— *Ed.*

Previously possessed by 'good affectioned' Irish .....	600,000
Unappropriated as above .....	824,391
	<hr/>
STATUTE ACRES .....	12,208,237"

[This table] was compiled by Murphy<sup>a</sup>;

the figure of 3,900,000 acres was taken from the ACCOUNT PUBLISHED BY THE CROMWELLIAN PROPRIETORS and the rest on the basis of the *Grace Manuscript quoted by Lingard* and the REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS TO THE ENGLISH HOUSE OF COMMONS, December 15, 1699. It accords with Petty (*Political Anatomy*), who wrote: "Of the whole 7,500,000 plantation acres of good land (in Ireland) the English and Protestants and the Church have this Christmas (1672) 5,140,000 (=8,352,500 statute acres) and the Irish have near half as much" (Murphy, pp. 314 and 315).

(On the confiscations of William see p. 18.<sup>b</sup>)

*17th Saeculum. William III*<sup>375</sup>

By the ACTS OF SETTLEMENT AND EXPLANATION, 2,323,809 STATUTE ACRES were granted to the Irish, they having 600,000 previously in their possession, totalling .....	2,923,809 STATUTE ACRES
--	-------------------------------

Of these lands, 1,060,792 PLANTATION ACRES were escheated under William worth £211,623 6s 3d. per annum (REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS 1699) .....	1,723,787 STATUTE ACRES
---	-------------------------------

---

[There remain] 1,200,022  
STATUTE  
ACRES

or as Murphy calculated <sup>c</sup> (he probably erred when subtracting?) .....	1,240,022 STATUTE ACRES
---	-------------------------------

<sup>a</sup> J. N. Murphy, op. cit., pp. 313-15.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> P. 17 in the manuscript; it contains only the heading "17. Saeculum, Charles II, James II".— *Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> J. N. Murphy, op. cit., pp. 317-18.— *Ed.*



In addition, RESTITUTED BY SPECIAL FAVOUR OF THE KING ON PARDONING (65 persons) .....	125,000 STATUTE ACRES
the COURT OF CLAIMS RESTORED (792 persons) .....	388,500 STATUTE ACRES
[Total] .....	513,500 STATUTE ACRES
Making the total still in Irish hands .....	1,753,522 <sup>a</sup> STATUTE ACRES

Compiled by Murphy on the basis of the REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS (ENGLISH) in DECEMBER 1699.

Written in March 1870

First published in *Marx-Engels Archives*,  
Russian edition, Vol. X, Moscow, 1948

Printed according to the manu-  
script

---

<sup>a</sup> Engels points out that Murphy may have erred in his calculation by 40,000 acres, in which case the total would have been 1,713,522.—*Ed.*

## Frederick Engels

### PLAN FOR *THE HISTORY OF IRELAND*<sup>376</sup>

1. Natural conditions.
2. Old Ireland
3. English conquests.
  - 1) First invasion.
  - 2) PALE AND IRISHRY.
  - 3) Subjugation and expropriation. 152...<sup>a</sup>-1691.
4. English rule.
  - 1) PENAL LAWS. 1691-1780.
  - 2) Rebellion and Union. 1780-1801.
  - 3) Ireland in the United Kingdom.
    - a) The period of the small peasants. 1801-1846.
    - b) The period of extermination. 1846-1870.

First published in *Marx-Engels Archives*,  
Russian edition, Vol. X, Moscow, 1948

Printed according to the manu-  
script

---

<sup>a</sup> The last figure is missing in the manuscript.—*Ed.*

## Frederick Engels

### [PLAN OF CHAPTER TWO AND FRAGMENTS FOR *THE HISTORY OF IRELAND*]<sup>377</sup>

#### Old Ireland

- I. Sources. 1) The ancients. 2) Irish literature, buildings and inscriptions. 3) Foreign sources: the Scandinavians, St. Bernard, Giraldus.— 4) Later sources, especially late 16th century.<sup>a</sup>
- II a. Race and language. Legends about the invaders. Information from the ancients. What can be deduced about Irish literature from the laws, Giraldus and later sources.
  - b. The clan system, landownership, laws.
- III a. Introduction of Christianity. Ir[ish] missionaries and scholars. J. Scotus Erig[ena].
  - b. Danish period, etc., up to invasion. System of government at this time.
 

.....

    - a. *Senchus Mor*, XI.<sup>b</sup> Giraldus.— Spenser, Davies, Camden, Campion, etc., Ledwich.<sup>378</sup>
    - b. N[ennius], *Brit.*<sup>c</sup> S[*enchus*] M[*or*], XI and orig[ina]l. Cf. also Ledwich.

Ad I

[Ad II]

<sup>a</sup> This paragraph is crossed out in the manuscript.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Engels refers to his notebook containing excerpts from *Senchus Mor*.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Nennius, *Historia Britonum*, London, 1819.—*Ed.*

Ad III

T. Moore, II, pp. 9 ff and orig[inal]. Chron[ology]. Gordon.<sup>a</sup>  
Hegel, *Geschichte der Philosophie*.—  
Danica.

Tigernach (Tierna) the ANNALIST died in 1088 according to the *Annals of the Four Masters*.

---

The *Annals of the Four Masters* compiled in the 17th century by M. O'Clary and 3 others from ancient Irish annals.<sup>b</sup>

---

The *Annals of Ulster* exist in a manuscript dated 1215.

---

Poet-chroniclers, mainly 9th-11th centuries.

---

An eclipse of the sun correctly recorded by Irish chroniclers on May 3, 664 (in Tigernach).

---

Irish chiefs of all ranks constantly waged war not only among themselves but also with their superior princes as well as the nominal king.

---

The TANIST is believed to have been both chief commander and chief judge, that is very powerful against the king. His title (supreme king) *Righ-damnha*=*rex in fieri*,<sup>c</sup> but minor chiefs also had their TANISTS.

---

---

<sup>a</sup> J. Gordon, *A History of the Rebellion in Ireland in 1789*, Dublin, 1801; *A History of Ireland...*, Dublin, 1805.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, p. 173.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Future king.—*Ed.*

The hierarchical relations between princes in Ireland are believed only to have involved tributes, COSHERY,<sup>379</sup> BONAGHTY but by no means military service.

---

The supremacy of the kings of Meath and the chroniclers' triennial national assembly in Tnamor (Tara) seems to have only existed on paper, it might have been enforced from time to time but always lapsed again.

---

The land allocated to the chief of the clan was not divided (ditto that belonging to soldiers, priests, singers, chroniclers). The remaining land owned by the clan and could be divided up.

---

With communal property the right of inheritance of illegitimate sons—in the whole clan—was unquestioned. Gavelkind: Davies (p. 136) describes the division of land “TO EACH ACCORDING TO HIS ANTIQUITY” (i.e. his traditional rank in the clan),<sup>a</sup> which in Moore (Vol. I, p. 177)<sup>b</sup> has already been turned into SENIORITY!

---

According to an obscure tradition the Milesians or Scots did not apparently practise any crafts until Tuathal died in A. D. 164; from then on, however, they did as a result of his [restoration] expulsion in 126 by the Plebeians (attacots-attach-tuatha translated by O'Reilly as Plebeians). In any case [from] at the time of the invasion all traces of the ruling race had disappeared although the families of the chiefs may have been Scottish. The first Plebeian war A. D. 90.—In both cases the legitimate Scottish family finally regained power.

---

There are some Irish poems, believed to date back to the earliest days of the Milesians, which in the manuscript<sup>c</sup> have notes in between the lines. Without them they are incomprehensible, but

<sup>a</sup> J. Davies, *Historical Tracts*, London, 1786.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Th. Moore, *The History of Ireland*, Vol. I, Paris, 1835.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> Engels refers to the judicial collection *Senchus Mor*.—Ed.

even the notes are in a very obsolete language and very difficult to understand.

---

Hereditary positions in families (i.e. not all of them, only certain ones). Thus in Camden's time, and later too, the O'Cullinan family in Cork constantly had one or more doctors, and people used to say that if someone had resigned himself to death not even an O'Cullinan could cure him. Similarly with herolds, bards, musicians (and Seanachies<sup>a</sup>). This natural considering the land allocated to them.

---

Slaves and slave trade.

---

Johannes Scotus Erigena.

---

The oldest Irish manuscripts late 9th century, and the oldest SONGS OCCUR AS SINGLE FRAGMENTS in the annals; these appear more frequently from the 6th century.

---

In the BREHON LAWS all fines were expressed in livestock, that means there was still no money as yet.

---

There are still numerous manuscripts in existence bearing on the BREHON LAWS.

---

St. Bernard was never in Ireland.

---



---

<sup>a</sup> Chroniclers.— *Ed.*

In Ireland in ancient times boats were made of wickerwork covered in skins; after 1810 these were still the only kind of boats on the west coast, cf. Wakefield,<sup>a</sup> XII, p. 6,<sup>b</sup> where the passages from Pliny and Solinus are also to be found.

---

Irish literature?—17th century, poetry, histor[ical] and jurid[ical] literature], then completely suppressed due to the eradication of the Irish *literary language*—exists *only in manuscript*—publication is only just beginning—this is [possible] only with a downtrodden people. See Serbs, etc.

---

The English have been able to reconcile people of the most diverse races to their rule. The Welsh, who cling so strongly to their nationality and their language, have been completely integrated into the British Empire. The Scottish Celts, although rebellious until 1745,<sup>380</sup> and since then almost exterminated, first by the government and later by their own aristocracy, have no thought of rebellion. The French of the Channel Islands fought bitterly against France even during the Great Revolution. And even the Frisians of Heligoland,<sup>381</sup> sold to England by Denmark, are content with their lot, and it will surely be a long time before the laurels of Sadowa and the achievements of the North-German Confederation<sup>382</sup> arouse in them the agonised cry for unification with the great Fatherland. Only the Irish have proved too much for the English to cope with. The tremendous resilience of the Irish race is to blame for this. Despite the most savage suppression, shortly after each attempt to wipe them out the Irish stood stronger than ever before. Indeed, they drew their main strength from the foreign garrison imposed on them to subdue them. Within the lifetime of two generations, often of one, the foreigners had become more Irish than the Irish themselves, *Hiberniores ipsis Hibernis*; and the more they adopted the English language and forgot Irish, the more Irish they became.

---

<sup>a</sup> Ed. Wakefield, *An Account of Ireland. Statistical and Political*, Vols. I-II, London, 1812.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Engels refers to his notebook containing excerpts from Wakefield.—*Ed.*

The bourgeoisie turns everything into a commodity, hence also the writing of history. It is in its nature, a condition of its existence, to falsify all commodities: it falsified history. And the version of history which is most highly paid is that which is best falsified for the purposes of the bourgeoisie. *Teste* Macaulay,<sup>a</sup> who is therefore the unattainable model of the less skilled G. Smith.

---

QUEEN'S EVIDENCE.—REWARDS FOR EVIDENCE.

England is the only country where the state openly dares to bribe witnesses, be it by an offer of exemption from punishment, or by ready cash. That prices are fixed for the betrayal of the whereabouts of a victim of persecution is comprehensible, but that they say: who gives me evidence on the strength of which someone can be sentenced as the perpetrator of some crime or another—this infamy is something not only the Code,<sup>b</sup> but also Pr[ussian] common law have left to Eng[lish] law. That COLLATERAL EVIDENCE is required alongside that given by the informer changes nothing; as a rule there is evidence for somebody to be suspected, or else it is fabricated, and the informer only has to adjust his lies accordingly.

Whether this pretty usage has its roots already in Eng[lish] legal proceedings is hard to say, but it is certain that it has received its *development* on Irish soil at the time of the Tories<sup>383</sup> and the penal laws.

---

On March 15, 1870, when the government sought to justify the removal of an Irish sheriff (Coote of Monaghan) by arguing that he had packed the jury panel, G. H. Moore, M. P. for Mayo, said in Parliament<sup>c</sup>:

\* "If Capt. Coote had done all the things of which he had been accused, he had only followed the practice which, in political cases, had been habitually sanctioned by the Institute Executive."

As one instance out of many that might be cited, he would mention *that though County Cork had a proportion of 500,000*

<sup>a</sup> Macaulay, *The History of England from the Accession of James the Second*, London, 1862.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Code Napoléon*, Paris, Leipzig, 1808.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Moore spoke in the House of Commons on March 14, 1870. See *The Times*, No. 26699, March 15, 1870.—*Ed.*



*Catholics against 50,000 Protestants, at the time of the Fenian trials in 1865,<sup>384</sup> a jury panel was called, composed of 360 Protestants and 40 Catholics! \**

---

The German Legion of 1806-13 was also sent to Ireland. Thus, the good Hanoverians who refused to put up with French [bondage] rule, *were used by the English to preserve English rule in Ireland!*

---

The agrarian murders in Ireland cannot be suppressed *because and as long as* they are the sole effective weapon against the extermination of the people by the landlords. They *help*, which is why they persist, and will persist, despite all coercive laws. Quantitatively they fluctuate, as do all social phenomena; at times they may even become epidemic, occurring on quite insignificant occasions. The epidemic can be suppressed, but not the disease itself.

---

Dublin botanical gardens—total absence of protection for the flowers and yet no abuse on the part of the public as in England—Churchyard in Glasnevin like no other in England.

---

THE ENGLISH LADY. There is no creature more superfluous and useless on earth. Custom, education and inclination exclude her from all the truly intellectual aspects of life, whereas THE FRIVOLITIES OF LIFE, or at the most dabbling with serious matters, make up the entire content of her life and are alone taken seriously by her.

Written in 1869-70

Printed according to the manuscript

First published in *Marx-Engels Archives*,  
Russian edition, Vol. X, Moscow, 1948

## APPENDICES



RECORD OF A SPEECH ON THE IRISH QUESTION  
 DELIVERED BY KARL MARX  
 TO THE GERMAN WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY  
 IN LONDON ON DECEMBER 16, 1867<sup>385</sup>

On December 16, Karl Marx delivered a lecture to the London German Workers' Educational Society on the conditions in Ireland, in which he showed that all attempts of the English government to Anglicise the Irish population in past centuries had ended in failure. The English, including aristocrats, who immigrated before the Reformation<sup>386</sup> were transformed into Irishmen by their Irish wives, and their descendants fought against England. The brutalities of the war against the Irish under Queen Elizabeth, the destruction of crops and the displacement of the population from one area to another to make room for English colonists did not change anything in this respect. At that time, GENTLEMEN and MERCHANT ADVENTURERS received large plots of land on condition that they would be colonised by English people. In Cromwell's time, the descendants of these colonists fought with the Irish against the English. Cromwell sold many of them as slaves in the West Indies.<sup>a</sup> Under the Restoration,<sup>387</sup> Ireland received many favours. Under William III, a class came to power which only wanted to make money, and Irish industry was suppressed in order to force the Irish to sell their raw materials to England at any price. With the help of the Protestant Penal Laws,<sup>388</sup> the new aristocrats received freedom of action under Queen Anne. The Irish Parliament<sup>389</sup> was an instrument of oppression. Catholics were not allowed to hold public office, could not be landowners, were not allowed to make wills, could not claim an inheritance; to be a Catholic bishop was high treason. All these were means for robbing the Irish of their land; yet more than half of the English

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 288-89.— *Ed.*

descendants in Ulster have remained Catholic. The people were driven into the arms of the Catholic clergy, who thus became powerful. All that the English government succeeded in doing was to plant an aristocracy in Ireland. The towns built by the English have become Irish. That is why there are so many English names among the Fenians.

During the American War of Independence the reins were loosened a little. Further concessions had to be granted during the French Revolution. Ireland rose so quickly that her people threatened to outstrip the English. The English government drove them to rebellion and achieved the Union<sup>390</sup> by bribery. The Union delivered the death blow to reviving Irish industry. On one occasion Meagher said: all Irish branches of industry have been destroyed, all we have been left is the making of coffins. It became a vital necessity to have land; the big landowners leased their lands to speculators; land passed through four or five lease stages before it reached the peasant, and this made prices disproportionately high. The agrarian population lived on potatoes and water; wheat and meat were sent to England; the rent was eaten up in London, Paris and Florence. In 1836, £7,000,000 was sent abroad to absent landowners. Fertilisers were exported with the produce and rent, and the soil was exhausted. Famine often set in here and there, and owing to the potato blight there was a general famine in 1846. A million people starved to death. The potato blight resulted from the exhaustion of the soil, it was a product of English rule.

Through the repeal of the Corn Laws Ireland lost her monopoly position on the English market, the old rent could no longer be paid. High prices of meat and the bankruptcy of the remaining small landowners further contributed to the eviction of the small peasants and the transformation of their land into sheep pastures. Over half a million acres of arable land have not been tilled since 1860. The yield per acre has dropped: oats by 16 per cent, flax by 36 per cent, potatoes by 50 per cent. At present only oats are cultivated for the English market, and wheat is imported.

With the exhaustion of the soil, the population has deteriorated physically. There has been an absolute increase in the number of lame, blind, deaf and dumb, and insane in the decreasing population.

Over 1,100,000 people have been replaced by 9,600,000 sheep. This is a thing unheard of in Europe. The Russians replace evicted Poles with Russians, not with sheep. Only under the Mongols in China was there once a discussion whether towns should be destroyed to make room for sheep.

The Irish question is therefore not simply a question of nationality, but a question of land and existence. Ruin or revolution is the watchword; all the Irish are convinced that if anything is to happen at all it must happen quickly. The English should demand separation and leave it to the Irish themselves to decide the question of landownership. Everything else would be useless. If that does not happen soon the Irish emigration will lead to a war with America. The domination over Ireland at present amounts to collecting rent for the English aristocracy.

First published in Marx and Engels,  
*Collected Works*, Second Russian Edition,  
Vol. 16, Moscow, 1960

Printed according to Eccarius'  
manuscript

RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECHES ON CHANGING  
THE PLACE OF THE CONGRESS  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL IN 1868

FROM NEWSPAPER REPORTS  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETINGS  
OF MAY 26 AND JUNE 16, 1868<sup>391</sup>

[*May 26, 1868*]

Notice of motion was given that a resolution should be moved on Tuesday next<sup>a</sup> to cancel the resolution of the last congress<sup>b</sup> appointing Brussels as the place of meeting for the next congress, and that London be appointed instead.<sup>c</sup>

The Council considers it incompatible with the honour and dignity of the Association to assemble a congress, surrounded, as it would be, by French spies, and in a country whose Government is capable of committing such wanton outrages as have been perpetrated against the half-starved miners of Charleroi.<sup>392</sup>

[*June 16, 1868*]

The mover of the resolutions<sup>d</sup> then stated, that besides the foregoing assurances things had transpired since he had given notice which compelled the Council to abstain from revoking the vote of the Lausanne Congress.<sup>393</sup> The Belgian section had already taken action. M. Bara, the Minister of Justice, was reported to have said in the Chamber of Deputies, that he would not permit the Congress to assemble<sup>e</sup>; in a remonstrance signed by all the members of the Brussels committee and the executive of the Free

<sup>a</sup> June 2.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In Lausanne.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> For the text of the resolution, tabled by Marx, see this volume, p. 6.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Karl Marx.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> J. Bara, Speech in the Chamber of Deputies on May 16, 1868, *La Liberté*, No. 47, May 17, 1868.—*Ed.*

Workmen—an affiliated political society of Verviers, the resident members of the Association had declared that “in spite of all the vain rhodomontade of the Minister of Justice, the International Congress should be held at Brussels”.<sup>a</sup> The question, therefore, was strictly one of resistance of the Belgian working men against the police regulations of their government, with which the Council had no right to interfere. He should, therefore, withdraw his resolutions.<sup>b</sup>

First published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, Nos. 346 and 349, May 30 and June 20, 1868

Reproduced from the newspaper

---

<sup>a</sup> *La Tribune du peuple*, No. 5, May 24, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The newspaper report further has: “which met with general approval, several members declaring that only the altered state of the case had changed their opinion”.—*Ed.*



## Wilhelm Eichhoff

### THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION ITS ESTABLISHMENT, ORGANISATION, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL ACTIVITY, AND GROWTH<sup>394</sup>

#### 1. FOUNDATION OF THE ASSOCIATION

The immediate motive for the foundation of the International Working Men's Association was the latest Polish insurrection. The London workers sent a deputation to *Lord Palmerston* with an appeal in which they called on him to intervene on behalf of Poland. At the same time, they issued an address to the workmen of Paris, calling on them to take joint action.<sup>a</sup> The Parisians responded by sending delegates to London. To welcome them, a public meeting gathered at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, on September 28, 1864, at which Britons, Germans, Frenchmen, Poles and Italians were represented in large numbers.

This meeting gave birth to the International Working Men's Association. Apart from the political purpose for which the meeting was called, it also raised the subject of general social conditions. It revealed that workmen of all nations had the same grievances, that they were subjected to the same basic evils in all countries. It showed that the interests of all of them coincided. It elected a provisional Central Council, later renamed the General Council,<sup>b</sup> which made its seat in London and was composed of various nationalities. The Council was provisionally entrusted with the central administration of the future Association, the publication of the Inaugural Address (a kind of programme), and the drafting of the Provisional Rules.<sup>c</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> "Address of English to French Workmen", *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 112, December 5, 1863.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the German original the name of the General Council is given in brackets in English and French after the German equivalent.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> K. Marx, "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association". "Provisional Rules of the Association".—*Ed.*

Unanimity and enthusiasm reigned at the meeting. Each nation was represented by men who did it honour. As a result, the English workers, who had fought the ruling classes independently of, and uninfluenced by, the political and social movements of the rest of Europe since 1824, when the legislature was compelled to grant them the right of association,<sup>395</sup> now came out of their national isolation for the first time and agreed with the workmen of all nations on the necessity for joint action. Hence the enthusiasm: the gathering was aware that it was ringing in a new era in the workers' movement.

---

## 2. DIFFICULTIES IN THE INITIAL PERIOD OF THE ASSOCIATION

New movements are not created overnight even if they are called upon to fill a pressing need of the times. To begin with, it is essential to steer clear of reefs on which new organisations have foundered so often before or which have, at the very least, diverted them from their original and true goal, for representatives of declining forms of the movement join the new one to make it a vehicle of the old. This was the case here, too. The Italian members of the provisional Central Council were followers of *Mazzini*. They laid before the Central Council a draft of the Inaugural Address and the Provisional Rules<sup>396</sup> drawn up by *Mazzini* himself. In his address, *Mazzini* repeated his old political programme garnished with a bit of socialist phraseology. He thundered against the *class struggle*. His Rules were formulated in a strictly centralised manner fit for secret political societies. From the start they would have destroyed the very basis of an international working men's association which was not conceived to create a movement but only to unite and weld together the already existing and dispersed class movement of various countries.

*Mazzini's* name was in high repute at the time among the English workers, notably since *Garibaldi's* triumphant visit to London.<sup>397</sup> *Mazzini* was therefore fairly confident that he would be able to take charge of the International Working Men's Association. But he had reckoned without his host. *Karl Marx*, who had been elected to the provisional Central Council at the meeting in St. Martin's Hall, submitted his drafts of the Inaugural Address and Provisional Rules in opposition to *Mazzini's*. Both

of his drafts were unanimously adopted and published, and the Provisional Rules later won final acceptance at the Geneva Congress in 1866.<sup>a</sup>

It was therefore a German who gave the International Working Men's Association its definite tendency and organisational principles. And we might also note that the Central Council in London has repeatedly been confirmed in its functions.

---

### 3. THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF KARL MARX<sup>398</sup>

In the closest possible translation of the English original, the Address reads as follows:

Working Men,

It is a great fact that the misery of the working classes has not diminished from 1848 to 1864, and yet this period is unrivalled in the annals of history for the development of its industry and the growth of its commerce. In 1850, a moderate organ of the British bourgeoisie, seemingly 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>399</sup> Alas! On April 7th, 1864, Mr. *Gladstone*,<sup>b</sup> the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, delighted his audience<sup>c</sup> by the statement that the total import and export trade of England had grown in 1863 to £443,955,000, which amounted to about three times the trade of the comparatively recent epoch of 1843. With all that, he was compelled to refer to the social misery. He had to speak of those who were on the border of starvation, of wages that had not increased by a single penny, of human life that was in nine cases out of ten but a daily struggle for existence.<sup>d</sup> 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

---

<sup>a</sup> *Status de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs votés à la séance du 5 septembre au Congrès de Genève.* In: *Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Statuts et Règlements*, London, 1866.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "Mr. Gladstone" does not occur in the original English text.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The original English text has "Parliamentary audience".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In the original English text this passage from Gladstone's address is given in direct speech.—*Ed.*

in a sudden fit of terror. When the garotte panic<sup>400</sup> 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 of 1863,<sup>a 401</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, 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 might just suffice to avert starvation diseases. Dr. *Smith*, the medical commissioner of Parliament, ascertained that 28,000 grains of carbon, and 1,330 grains of nitrogen were the weekly allowance that would just about be enough to keep an average adult over the level of starvation diseases, and he found furthermore that this quantity pretty nearly agreed with the scanty nourishment to which the pressure of extreme distress had actually reduced the poor cotton operatives.\* But that is not all. The same learned Doctor was later on again deputed by the government<sup>b</sup> to inquire into the nourishment of the poorer part of the working class. The results of his researches are contained in the "Sixth Report on Public Health", published by order of Parliament in the course of the present year (1864).<sup>c</sup> What did the Doctor discover? That the silk weavers, the needle women, the kid glovers, the stocking weavers, and other workers, received, 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".

\* 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 only carbon, while bread contains carbonaceous and nitrogenous substances in a due proportion. [*Note by Karl Marx.*]

<sup>a</sup> *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> The English original has "by the medical officer of the Privy Council".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Public Health. Sixth Report of the Medical Officer of the Privy Council (1863)*, London, 1864. Pp. 13-15 of this report are cited below.—*Ed.*

"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 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."

Further, the report brings out the strange, and rather unexpected fact that of the four divisions of the United Kingdom, those of 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 End of London.\*

Such are the official statements published by order of Parliament in 1864,<sup>a</sup> 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>b</sup>

\* *Translator's note.* In the Preface to his recently published book, *Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Oekonomie. Von Karl Marx. Hamburg 1867*, Marx observes most correctly:

"The social statistics of Germany and the rest of Continental Western Europe are, in comparison with those of England, wretchedly compiled. But they raise the veil just enough to let us catch a glimpse of the Medusa head behind it. *We should be appalled at the state of things at home*, if, as in England, our governments and parliaments appointed periodically commissions of inquiry into economic conditions; if these commissions were armed with the same plenary powers to get at the truth; if it was possible to find for this purpose men as competent, as free from partisanship and respect of persons as are the English factory inspectors, her medical reporters on public health, her commissioners of inquiry into the exploitation of women and children, into housing and food. Perseus wore a magic cap that the monsters he hunted down might not see him. We draw the magic cap over eyes and ears as a make-believe that these are no monsters." [*Note by Eichhoff.*]

<sup>a</sup> In Eichhoff's pamphlet mistakenly: "1863".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Here and further the quotations are from Gladstone's speech in the House of Commons of April 16, 1863 (see *The Times*, No. 24535, April 17, 1863).—*Ed.*

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>402</sup>

If you want to know with how many victims of broken health, tainted morals, and mental ruin, that "intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power entirely confined to classes of property" was, and is being, produced by the classes of labour, look to the picture hung up in the last "Public Health Report"<sup>a</sup> of the workshops of tailors, printers, and dressmakers! 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 the future was fraught with the gradual extinction of the race, 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 seemingly 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 during this time, 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,

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

<sup>b</sup> Cf. *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...*, London, 1862.—Ed.

teach us that the persons with yearly incomes, valued<sup>a</sup> 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 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 had 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. It will be remembered that not long 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 somewhat advanced; while in most cases, given the universally rising prices, 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 necessities rising in price according to official estimates from £7 7s. 4d. in 1852 to £9 15s. 8d. in 1861. 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

---

<sup>a</sup> The English original has "valued by the tax-gatherer".—*Ed.*

to hedge other people in a fool's paradise, that no improvement of machinery, no appliance of science to industrial and agricultural production, no aids and 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 a social institution, during this intoxicating epoch of economical progress, in the metropolis of the British Empire. That epoch is 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<sup>a</sup> 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 loyal subjects.<sup>b</sup> 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 this period has not been without its compensating features. We shall here only point to two great facts.

---

<sup>a</sup> In the English original this is followed by the phrase: "partly owed to the diplomacy of the English Government, acting then as now in fraternal solidarity with the Cabinet of St. Petersburg", which was omitted by Eichhoff.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The English original says: "turned into 'political blacks'".—*Ed.*



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>403</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 men of science, such as Dr. *Ure*, Professor *Senior*, and other sages of that stamp, the British bourgeoisie 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 laws of supply and demand which form the political economy of the bourgeoisie, 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 bourgeoisie 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. We speak of the cooperative movement, especially the cooperative 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,

\* *Translator's note:* It is common usage in England to describe workers as hands, while sheep and oxen are counted by heads.<sup>a</sup> [*Note by Eichhoff.*]

<sup>a</sup> In Eichhoff's German text the words "hands" and "heads" are given in brackets after their German equivalents.—*Ed.*

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 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 cooperative system were sown by *Robert Owen*; the same working men's experiments, tried on the Continent, were, in fact, the practical upshot of the theories, not invented, but loudly proclaimed, in 1848.

The experience of the period from 1848 to 1864 has proved beyond doubt that, however excellent in principle, and however useful in practice, cooperative 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 bourgeois spouters, and even keen political economists, have all at once turned nauseously complimentary to the very cooperative 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, cooperative 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>404</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 in an alliance and led towards a known goal. 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 Working Men's Association.

Another conviction swayed that meeting.

If the emancipation of the working classes requires their fraternal concurrence, how are they to fulfil that great mission if the foreign policy of governments pursues criminal designs, playing upon 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 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>405</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 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!

#### 4. THE RULES OF THE ASSOCIATION <sup>406</sup>

These follow in the final, essentially unchanged, wording as sanctioned by the Geneva Congress (1866):

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 first International Working Men's Congress 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 citizen, not only for himself, but for every man who does his duty. No rights without duties, no duties without rights<sup>407</sup>;

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

1. This Association is established to afford a central medium of communication and cooperation 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 transactions of the General Council. 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 cooperating associations, so that the working men in one country be constantly informed of the movements of their class in every other country; that the inquiry into the social state of the different countries of Europe be made simultaneously, and under a common direction; that the questions of general interest mooted in one society be ventilated by all; and that, when immediate practical steps should be needed, as, for instance, in case of international quarrels, the action of the associated societies be simultaneous and uniform. Whenever it seems opportune, the General Council shall take the initiative of proposals to be laid before the different national or local societies. To facilitate the communications, the General Council shall publish periodical reports.

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 circumstances whether it has to deal with a few national centres of working men's associations, or with a great number of small and disconnected local societies; the members of the International Association shall use their utmost efforts to combine the disconnected working men's societies of their respective countries into national bodies, represented by central national organs. It is self-understood, however, that the appliance of this rule will depend upon the peculiar laws of each country, and that, apart from legal obstacles, no independent local society shall be precluded from directly corresponding with the General Council.

7. The various branches and sections shall, at their places of abode, and as far as their influence may extend, take the initiative 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.

---

5. THE PRELIMINARY CONFERENCE IN LONDON,  
SEPTEMBER 1865<sup>408</sup>

The Central Council (later named the General Council) elected at the meeting in St. Martin's Hall had decided to hold the first Congress of the International Working Men's Association in Brussels at the beginning of September 1865. Later, it found this decision to be ill-advised, because, on the one hand, there had not been time enough for the Association to sink deeper roots, while on the other, the Belgian Government, which bows to orders from Paris in matters of internal policy, renewed the law that permits it to expel foreigners at will.<sup>409</sup> Instead of a general Congress in Brussels, the Central Council therefore convened a preliminary conference in London. Only delegates of the few *leading* committees from the Continent could take part in it.

The London Conference determined what questions would be discussed at the next general Congress in September 1866. Geneva was chosen as the place of the Congress.

---

6. THE GENEVA CONGRESS, 3rd TO 8th SEPTEMBER 1866<sup>410</sup>

Sixty delegates were present, of whom 45 were members of 25 sections of the International Working Men's Association and 15 were members of 11 affiliated societies.

At the beginning of the debates, there ensued a heated discussion about the right of participating in the Congress. Many individual members of the Association had come from France who, though they could not present credentials from any section, wished to be admitted as delegates of the Paris sections and to participate in the proceedings of the Congress. They referred to the French legislation which forbade them to have a regular organisation. Some members supported their demand. In their opinion, the organisation of the Congress had been neither complete nor final, and they should not therefore be too strict or scrupulous and should rather admit to the proceedings any individual member who subscribed to the principles of the Association. The British delegates maintained, however, that they had come as representatives of branches and societies each of which had many thousands of members and that on these grounds they demanded the representative system to be applied at the Congress; admission of individuals who represented no organised body would impair the rule of equality in voting and prejudice the rights of the British delegates. The Congress decided that the right of participating in the debates and in the voting should be granted exclusively to delegates who were able to present regular credentials:

After the credentials had been checked, the Congress proceeded to elect the Presidium and the Bureau, and a member of the London General Council, watchmaker *Jung*, was elected to the chair. He conducted the ensuing debates most skilfully. The hot-blooded Frenchmen, who would rather hear themselves speak, than others, made it rather difficult to run the proceedings, but the president's tact, calm and dignity, supported by the firm and sensible attitude of the English and German workers, prevailed over every threatening disturbance.

It would take us too far to present even a brief summary of the debates here.\* The discussion chiefly concerned the "Instructions

\* Detailed reports on the proceedings of *all* congresses of the Association were contained in the journal *Der Vorbote. Politische und sociale Zeitschrift*, which has been published since 1866 as the central organ of the German-speaking section of the International Working Men's Association under the editorship of *Joh. Phil. Becker* by the publishing house of the Association at Pré-l'Évêque 33 in Geneva. [Note by *Eichhoff*.]

for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council",<sup>a</sup> whose provisions were in substance endorsed by the Congress. The most important points were the following:

§ 1 of these Instructions concerns the *organisation* of the International Association. The Rules, set forth above, which had stood the test of two years' practice, were recommended for final adoption, London was proposed as the seat of the General Council for the next year, and the proposal to elect the General Council and a General Secretary with a weekly salary of £2 as the only paid officer of the Association was laid before the Congress.

The Congress sanctioned the Provisional Rules, decided that London should remain the seat of the General Council, confirmed the provisional General Council in London in its functions for the administrative year of 1866 to 1867, and fixed the opening of the next congress in Lausanne on the first Monday of September 1867.

§ 2 of the Instructions concerns the *international aid* which the Association could give the workmen of all countries in their struggle against capital. This question, it points out, embraces the whole activity of the Association, which aims at combining and generalising the till now disconnected efforts for emancipation by the working classes in different countries. In one case the Association could already claim credit for having successfully counteracted the intrigues of capitalists always ready to misuse the foreign workman as a tool against the native workman in the event of strikes. 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. As one more international combination of efforts it was proposed to carry out a "*statistical inquiry into the situation of the working classes of all countries to be instituted by the working classes themselves*". To make it successful, the most relevant questions were listed in the scheme that is given below. By initiating so great a work, the workmen will prove their ability to take their own fate into their own hands. It was therefore proposed that all branches of the Association should immediately commence the work, and that the Congress should 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 all reports and evidence should be forwarded

---

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, "Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council. The Different Questions".—*Ed.*



to the General Council which should elaborate them into a general report, adding the evidence as an appendix, and that this report together with its appendix should be published after having received the sanction of the Congress.

The proposed general scheme of inquiry contains the following items, which may of course be modified to suit local conditions:

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; (c) scale paid by middlemen. Weekly, yearly average.
5. (a) Hours of work in factories. (b) The hours of work with small employers and in homework, if the business be carried on in those different modes. (c) Nightwork and daywork.
6. Mealtimes 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 the year, whether commodities are subject to great price fluctuations, whether exposed to foreign competition, whether destined for home consumption or for export, etc.<sup>411</sup>

These proposals of the General Council were adopted by the Congress unanimously, and the workers' statistical inquiry into and assessment of their own condition have been proceeding steadily since.

§ 3 of the Instructions concerns the *limitation of the working day*. This, it says, is a preliminary condition, without which all further attempts at improvement and emancipation are bound to founder. 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. For this reason the Congress should declare itself in favour of a *legal limitation of the working day to eight hours*. This limitation being generally claimed by the workmen of the United States,<sup>412</sup> the vote of the Congress would raise it to the common platform of the working classes all over the world. Nightwork is to be permitted in but exceptional cases, in trades and branches specified by law, with the tendency being to gradually suppress all nightwork. This proposal, however, referred

only to adult persons 18 years of age and older, male or female, though the latter should be rigorously excluded from all nightwork whatever, and all sort of work hurtful to the delicacy of the sex, or exposing their bodies to poisonous and otherwise deleterious effects.

The Congress acceded to these proposals with a majority of 50 to 10 votes. The minority consisted of those French delegates who were content to have a legal limitation of the working day to 10 hours.

§ 4 of the Instructions attacks the social evil of "*juvenile and children's labour (both sexes)*" at its very root.

The tendency of modern industry to make children and juvenile persons of both sexes cooperate in the great work of social production is admitted to be a progressive, sound and legitimate tendency, although under capital it has been distorted into an abomination. In a rational state of society *every child* of the age of 9 years should begin to become a productive labourer so that no able-bodied adult person should have to be exempted from the general law of nature, which says: work in order to be able to eat, and work not only with the brain but with the hands too.

For the present, however, the Congress is concerned only with the working population. Here it distinguishes *three classes* of children and juvenile persons of both sexes, each of which is to be treated differently; the first class to range from 9 to 12, the second from 13 to 15, and the third from 16 to 17 years of age. It was proposed that the employment of the first class in any workshop or housework should be legally restricted to *two*, that of the second class to *four*, and that of the third to *six working hours*, and that for the third class there should be legally provided a break of at least *one* hour for meals or relaxation.

It was said to be desirable to begin elementary school instruction before the age of 9 years, but the Congress dealt here only with the indispensable antidotes against the tendencies of a social system which degrades the working man into a mere instrument for the accumulation of capital, and compels parents by the necessity of obtaining a livelihood to sell 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 care for their well-being.

If the bourgeoisie and aristocracy neglected their duties toward their offspring, it was their own fault. Sharing the privileges of these classes, the child was also condemned to suffer from their prejudices.

The case of the working class stood quite different. The working man was no free agent. In regrettably too many cases, he was even too ignorant to understand the true interests of his child, or the normal conditions of human development. The more enlightened part of the working class, however, fully understood that the future of its class, and therefore of mankind, altogether depend upon the formation of the rising working generation. The workers knew perfectly well that above all else the children and the juvenile workers were to be saved from the crushing effects of the present system of labour. This could be done only by converting social reason into social force, and, under given circumstances, there existed no other method of doing so, than through general laws enforced by the power of the state. If the working class supported the government in enforcing such laws, it would not thereby in the least fortify governmental power. On the contrary, it would transform that power, now used against it, into its own agency. By a general act it would achieve what it would vainly have attempted by a multitude of isolated individual efforts.

Proceeding from this standpoint, the Congress declared that no parent and no employer should be allowed to use juvenile labour, except when combined with education.

Three things were to be understood by education:

First, *mental education*.

Second, *bodily education*, such as is given in schools of gymnastics, and by military exercise.

Third, *technological 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 should correspond to the classification of the juvenile labourers. The costs of the technological schools should be partly met by the sale of their products.

The combination of paid productive labour, mental education, bodily exercise and polytechnic training, would raise the working class far above the level of the higher and middle class.

It was self-understood that the employment of all persons up to 17 years inclusively<sup>a</sup> in nightwork and all health injuring trades should be strictly prohibited by law.

The Congress agreed unanimously with these explanations, and added a resolution to the effect that the technical training of

<sup>a</sup> The English original says: "all persons from [9] and to 17 years (inclusively)".—*Ed.*

juvenile persons should be of a practical as well as of a theoretical nature so that not factory overseers and foremen but working men should be trained at the projected technological schools.

---

7. THE LAUSANNE CONGRESS,  
2nd TO 8th SEPTEMBER, 1867<sup>413</sup>

Sixty-four delegates came to this Congress, among whom the German element was represented by 25 members.

All opening ceremonies were dispensed with, and the Congress proceeded at once to elect the Presidium and the Bureau. *Eugène Dupont*, member of the General Council and delegate of the French section in London, was elected to the chair, and coped smartly with his none too simple duties. He was fortified in his task by the magnificent behaviour of the assembly. No unfriendly words had to be smoothed over, no improper pronouncements had to be rebutted, no tactless motions had to be registered. This time, too, the difficulty of conducting the discussion in three languages (English, German, and French) was happily overcome, as it had been at the first congress.

The most important at this Congress were the reports of the individual sections and affiliated societies on the actual successes and the growth of the Association. It would take us too far afield if we were to reproduce the content of these most interesting reports if only in outline, and we may dispense with it here all the more because the present expansion of the Association will be taken up in a later section. The official proceedings of the Congress of 1867 have been published in French by *Chaux-de-Fonds, Imprimerie de la Voix de l'Avenir*.<sup>a</sup>

Indicative of the spirit of the Congress was the following:

*Gaspare Stampa* from Milan, delegate of the Central Council of Italian working men's associations, which embraces 600 workers' societies and has its seat in Naples, announced at the sitting of the 4th of September that *Garibaldi* would be passing through Lausanne on his way to the Peace Congress in Geneva; he moved that the Congress should appoint a deputation to go to Villeneuve to greet *Garibaldi* on behalf of the Congress, and to invite him to visit the Congress in his capacity as honorary president of the above-mentioned Italian working men's associations. Other dele-

---

<sup>a</sup> *Rapports lus au Congrès ouvrier réuni du 2 au 8 septembre 1867 à Lausanne, Chaux-de-Fonds, 1867.—Ed.*

gates opposed this motion. However popular *Garibaldi* may be, a Congress representing the working class could not pay homage to any single individual. If, however, *Garibaldi* wished to assume his seat at the Congress as honorary president of the Italian working men's associations, he would be as heartily received as any other delegate. Having done with *Stampa's* motion, the Congress passed on to the agenda.

The nearly simultaneous holding of the international Peace Congress<sup>414</sup> in Geneva (9 to 12 September), in which many members of the Working Men's Congress intended to take part in a private capacity, compelled the latter to define its position in relation to the Peace League in Geneva. This was done in the following heartily applauded resolution<sup>a</sup>:

"Considering that the pressure of war weighs more heavily on the working class than on any other class of society, because it is not only robbed by it of its means of subsistence but is also the class that is made to shed most blood in it;

"Considering that the pressure of so-called armed peace weighs as heavily on the working man as that of war by consuming the best energies of the people in unproductive and destructive labour;

"Finally, considering that any radical remedy of this evil necessitates altering the prevailing social conditions which repose on the exploitation of one part of society by another,

"The Congress of the International Working Men's Association declares its complete and emphatic allegiance to the Peace League constituted in Geneva on the 7th of September, and to its efforts in the interest and for the maintenance of peace, and demands not only that war be abolished but also that standing armies be disbanded, and that a universal and free alliance of the peoples be constituted in their place on the basis of reciprocity and justice, *but with the proviso* that the working classes be emancipated from their unfree and oppressed condition and social discrimination, and that an end be put to the mutual struggle of classes through the rectification of the obtaining contradictions."

The Geneva Working Men's Congress of 1866 had been an object of lively debate in the French press, especially that of Paris and Lyons. The big London papers, however, had passed it over in dead silence. Not so the Congress in Lausanne a year later. *The Times* had its own correspondent there. Furthermore, it published editorial articles about the International Working Men's Association,<sup>b</sup> and its example was followed by the dailies and weeklies of all England. After *The Times* had set the tone, the other papers, too, no longer considered it beneath their dignity to devote not

<sup>a</sup> *Adresse collective au Congrès de la paix à Genève, de la part des Travailleurs réunis en Congrès à Lausanne.—Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "The International Working Men's Congress (From a Correspondent). Lausanne", *The Times*, Nos. 25909, 25911, 25912, 25913, September 6, 9, 10, 11, 1867.—*Ed.*

only notices but even long editorials to the labour question. All of them discussed the Working Men's Congress. It was only natural that many papers treated the subject in a superior and ironic vein. For every undertaking has its funny side apart from the sublime, and how could the Working Men's Congress with its loquacious Frenchmen be completely free of it? But for all that, the English press has on the whole treated the Congress very decently. Even *The Manchester Examiner*, which is in fact the organ of *John Bright* and the Manchester School,<sup>415</sup> portrayed it in a pertinent editorial as an important and epoch-making event. Where it was compared with its step-brother, the Peace Congress, the comparison was always in favour of the elder brother. In the Working Men's Congress they discerned a threatening and fateful tragedy, whereas nothing but farce and burlesque was seen in the other.

---

#### 8. THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION, THE TRADES' UNIONS, AND THE STRIKES<sup>a</sup>

With the foundation of the International Working Men's Association a new era began for the English Trades Unions. Previously, they were exclusively engrossed in the struggle over wages and the working time, and were bound down by the narrow-mindedness of the medieval guilds system.

The trades unions are not only a wholly lawful but also a governmentally recognised body sanctioned by Act of Parliament in 1825<sup>b</sup> and necessitated by the daily conflicts between labour and capital. Their purpose is to stand up for the interests of workmen against masters and capitalists. Their *ultima ratio* is the strike,<sup>c</sup> whose legality is enshrined in the aforementioned Act of Parliament on the condition that any direct breach of the peace is avoided and no forcible restraint of trade<sup>d</sup> is attempted. Under the protection of this Act, the trades unions have spread in all factory districts of England and have, by virtue of their numbers, organisation and funds, grown into a powerful body which

<sup>a</sup> In the German original the English terms "Trades' Unions" and "Strikes" are given in brackets after their German equivalents.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> An Act to repeal the Laws relating to the combinations of Workmen, and to make other Provisions in lieu thereof.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The German original has the English and French terms "Strikes" and "Grèves" in brackets after their German equivalent.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The German original has the English terms "breach of the peace" and "restraint of trade" in brackets after their German equivalents.—*Ed.*

confronts, and commands the respect of, the employers, and makes its influence felt in many different ways. They have survived all the periods of political reaction, all the counter-schemes of the masters and capitalists, all the shortages and commercial crises of the past decades, and have the same importance for the organisation of the working class as the establishment of communes in the Middle Ages had for the middle classes of bourgeois society, as *Karl Marx* has, indeed, demonstrated as early as 1847 in his work against *Proudhon*, entitled *Misère de la Philosophie. Réponse à la Philosophie de la Misère par Mons. Proudhon* (Paris 1847).<sup>a</sup>

It has now been brought home to these trades unions that, on the one hand, without knowing it, they are a means of organising the working class, and that alongside their immediate and current aims they must not forget the general aim of winning the complete political and social emancipation of the working class. On the other hand, it has equally been brought home to them that no ultimate success was possible without international combination and that by its very nature the workers' movement cut across state and national borders.

That is why the following resolution was framed and adopted at the big conference of delegates from the trades unions of the United Kingdom at Sheffield in 1866<sup>416</sup>:

"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>b</sup>

The London Trades' Council,<sup>c 417</sup> which is the central body of England's trades unions, had by then concluded an agreement with the General Council of the International Working Men's Association in London. The Secretary of the Trades' Council, Mr. *Odger*, was and still is also a member of the General Council of the International Association. Only from then on did the activities of the trades unions in England gain a universal character, which became evident very soon when they took a direct part for the first time in the political movement. How successful they were is

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy. Answer to the "Philosophy of Poverty" by M. Proudhon.*—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *Report of the Conference of Trades' Delegates of the United Kingdom...*, Sheffield, 1866.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> The German original has the English term "Trades' Council" in brackets after its German equivalent.—Ed.

common knowledge. After the fall of the *Russell-Gladstone* cabinet in June 1866 it had seemed that the parliamentary reform would be indefinitely postponed. The Tory leaders declared to the loud acclaim of the majority that no reform was necessary. At this point, the workers took charge of the movement. Mass meetings on a large scale were called in London, Birmingham, Manchester, Glasgow, Bristol, and other cities, in which the trades unions took part in their own capacity. The Trades' Council gave its support to the Reform League,<sup>418</sup> the governing body of the movement. Within a few months, victory was achieved, and the Tory government was forced to initiate the parliamentary reform.<sup>419</sup>

---

In England as well as on the Continent the years 1866 to 1868 were especially plentiful in strikes on the part of the workers and in factory lock-outs on the part of the capitalists.\* The common reason for this was the *crisis of 1866*<sup>420</sup> and its aftermaths. The crisis paralysed speculation. Large enterprises came to a standstill, and those entrepreneurs who, owing to the changed situation on the money market, were unable to meet the financial commitments they had made at the time when speculation was at its highest, were forced into bankruptcy. The stagnation of all trading enterprises had reached a point where it was surpassed only by the extraordinary glut of gold in the banks of England and France. And the gold had piled up in the banks because it could no longer find any use for business purposes. This led to a general stoppage of commerce and a general decline of prices. Victuals alone, notably bread, the workers' most vital necessity, had gone up in price owing to the crop failures of 1866 and 1867. And precisely during this general shortage came the calamity of universal crisis, which made itself felt to the workmen through the reduction of the working time and the lowering of wages by the employers. Hence the many strikes and lock-outs. It so happened, furthermore, that the laws against working men's coalitions had only just been lifted in France and other countries of the Continent.<sup>421</sup> Unquestionably, too, the resolutions of the working men's congresses in Geneva and Lausanne had had a moral effect, made still stronger by the workmen's awareness everywhere that

\* Lock-out—temporary closure of whole factories and all workshops of any industrial branch, the capitalists' instrument of forcing workers to accept low wages. [Note by Eichhoff.]



they could rely on the powerful backing of the International Association.

But that part of the European bourgeois press which denounced the International Working Men's Association for inciting these conflicts was mistaken. Nowhere did the Association initiate any strikes, and confined itself merely to intervening where the character of the local conflicts justified its doing so and required it to take action.

Specifically, it intervened in three important cases, where it also used the opportunity to make successful propaganda for its principles.

First, a few general remarks about the tactics of the Association during the English workers' strikes, in which its cooperation had been required. An account of this is given in the "Third Annual Report"<sup>a</sup> which the London General Council placed before the Congress in Lausanne, and which says:

"It used to be a standard threat with 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 General 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 of the Association 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."

Indeed, this was how the manoeuvres of the English capitalists were frustrated during the strikes relative to workshop and factory lock-outs of railway excavators, conductors and engine drivers, zinc workers, wire-workers, wood-cutters, and so on. In a few cases, such as the strike of the London basket-makers, the capitalists had secretly smuggled in labourers from Belgium and Holland. Following an appeal of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, however, the latter made common cause with the English workers.

Still greater services were rendered to a certain group of workers by the Association's administrative committee in Paris. In

---

<sup>a</sup> "Third Annual Report of the International Working Men's Association". In the original, the English title is followed by its German translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

Roubaix, the ribbon manufacturers introduced arbitrary penal regulations in their factories which naturally mainly amounted to deductions from wages. The inescapable result of this system of fines was the dismissal of the workers who protested against it, the lock-out leading to a revolt and to an armed intervention by the authorities.<sup>422</sup> Here, however, the Central Council of the International Association in Paris stepped in and proved that the manufacturers had made themselves guilty of breaking the law with their regulations by playing legislator, judge and gendarme off their own bat. As a result, the French government was compelled to declare that any private factory regulations, insofar as they were not purely administrative, but imposed fines, were *unlawful* and constituted an unmitigated usurpation.

The decisive and most important cases of intervention by the International Working Men's Association, however, were the following three:

### 1. *Closure of the Paris Bronze Workshops in February 1867*

The great, fundamental importance of this conflict was the following:

Trade unions had only just been legally allowed in France. The bronze-workers, a body of approximately 5,000 persons, were the first to take advantage of this and to form a union on the English model at the beginning of 1866. Naturally, from the start, this association was a thorn in the side of the masters, and they decided to destroy it at the first opportunity. This opportunity came in February 1867, when the union found itself compelled to intervene on behalf of its members and to require five of the masters to comply with its directions. Instantly, the capitalists formed a coalition, which demanded of their workers that they either resign from the union or leave the workshops. This culminated in a lock-out of some 1,500 bronze-workers by 87 employers.

In this case, therefore, *the existence of this important factor of the movement in France* hung in the balance.

At the beginning of the lock-out, the union of bronze-workers had a fund of 35,000 francs. It decided to pay each of the dismissed workers 20 francs weekly, and to obtain a loan from the English trades unions for this purpose through the good offices of

the International Association against a monthly repayment of 5,000 francs.

The workers won thanks to the moral and pecuniary support of the London General Council, which obtained the desired contributions from the English trades unions, and also thanks to the intervention of the Paris Central Council of the International Association which persuaded the other trade unions in France to render the bronze-workers vigorous support.

Besides the social significance of the *French* workers' coming out victorious with the help of their *English* brethren, the case has its international importance, of which the *Courrier français* of March 24, 1867 says the following<sup>a</sup>:

"M. Thiers said that no new policy is conceivable in international relations. Yet a noteworthy and in no way isolated fact has just taken place which, coming from the people, serves notice of something that is really new.

"We cannot tell if the bitter, hundreds of years old and almost inhuman hatred between the English and the French is still rooted in the bosom of a part of the two nations. But the fact that the English proletariat offers alliance and pecuniary assistance to the Paris bronze-workers to support them in a question of employment and wages is a symptom of a new policy which the old parties do not and cannot comprehend."

## 2. *The Geneva Strike in the Spring of 1868\**

While the case of the Paris bronze-workers concerned the existence of trade unions in France, the case here concerned *the*

\* A thorough description of this strike is given in the following little brochure: *Die internationale Arbeiterassociation und die Arbeitseinstellung in Genf im Frühjahr 1868*. Von Joh. Phil. Becker. Deutsche Verlagshalle, Pré-l'Évêque 33, Geneva, 1868. The workers who read this book are most strongly recommended to acquire both the brochure of the stout-hearted Joh. Phil. Becker, the proceeds from which are exclusively intended for covering the costs incurred in supporting the strike, and the monthly journal *Vorbote*. Joh. Phil. Becker is himself a worker in origin and has fought for the working class with sword, word and pen all his life long with the utmost self-sacrifice and devotion. A veteran of the labour movement, he is as energetic as he is original in his thinking, and deserves the recognition of the entire working class in contrast to the present-day *petits grands hommes*<sup>b</sup> of "satiated virtue and solvent morality"<sup>c</sup> who are pushing themselves forward everywhere in labour circles. He is the life and soul of the international labour movement in Switzerland and has, indeed, also enlisted all the German elements who so far adhered to the Association in Germany itself. [Note by Eichhoff.]

<sup>a</sup> V. Huriot, "M. Thiers a dit qu'en matière de relations internationales, il n'y avait point de politique nouvelle...", *Le Courrier français*, No. 12, March 24, 1867.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Little great men.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> Heinrich Heine, *Neue Gedichte: Romanzen* 7, Anno 1829.—Ed.

*existence of the International Working Men's Association on the Continent.*<sup>423</sup>

The conflict between the International Working Men's Association and a part of the employers in Geneva broke out and ran its course in the following way.

Ever since August 1867 there were signs of deep dissatisfaction over their condition among the Geneva building workers. A general meeting of the building workers, held on January 19, 1868, moved to elect a joint committee, which would enter into negotiations with the employers and by amicable agreement secure a reduction of the working time from 12 to 10 hours and a wage increase of 20 per cent. A memorandum was drawn up and forwarded to all the masters. Instead of deferring to the workers, the employers formed a counter-coalition and called a general meeting of building masters for the 18th of March, their provisional committee turning down the repeated proposals of the workers' committee to have amicable talks between delegates of the two sides before the general meeting was to take place.

This attitude of the masters' provisional committee showed the workers what they should expect from the coming general meeting of masters. Their committee declared that it had failed in its task of negotiating an understanding with the masters' committee, and in the evening of the 14th of March it requested the Geneva Central Committee of the International Working Men's Association to take the matter in hand and to mediate an agreement.

It was the duty of the Association to comply with this request. It appointed a commission of three Geneva citizens, whose private attempts at mediation, however, also failed to yield results. On the 20th of March, therefore, after the general meeting of the 18th had finally constituted an employers' association, the commission issued a public invitation to the "Messieurs les building contractors" to come to a meeting on the 23rd of March. On the very next day a public reply appeared in the newspapers which let the commission of the International Association know in the name of the general meeting of the 18th of March that the masters' general meeting had decided, with only three votes against, to have no negotiations with it whatsoever.

In the morning of the 23rd of March, the commission formed by the International Association made this state of affairs known in wall posters, serving notice that if no favourable result was achieved by the evening of that day and all prospects of an amicable understanding with the employers vanished, it would

beat the drums and call a general meeting of all the sections of the International Association. At six in the evening the signal was given, and members of the Association thronged from all sides to the Rue du Rhône, where the union had its premises. The bourgeoisie was panic-stricken. Shops and houses were locked up, the cash-boxes were placed in safety, and the employees of some of the *comptoirs*<sup>a</sup> were issued arms and ammunition. In the meantime, the Association, 5,000 men strong, marched in model order to the shooting-range, where the announced general meeting discussed the gravity of the situation and unanimously assured the building workers of the support of the International Association. After this had taken place, it was not the International Association but the governing bodies of the trade unions which, to their members' thunderous cheers and enthusiastic assurances of support, declared a strike of block-cutters, bricklayers, plasterers and house-painters in Geneva. Thereupon, the gathering dispersed quietly. By nine in the evening Geneva had already resumed its usual appearance.

Word of the strike, which had been unavoidable, was sent to the General Council of the International Association in London and the administrative councils in Brussels, Paris, and Lyons on the 25th of March; they were approached for urgent support because the Geneva section of the Association had been unprepared for the strike, whose magnitude exceeded its capacities.

In the meantime, the masters lost no time either to invite workers for themselves, mainly from Ticino and Piedmont. But these were brought to the premises of the International Association the moment they arrived, and were there informed of the state of affairs and won over to the side of the strikers.

It goes without saying that during this time the International Association was subjected to the most savage attacks and the most venomous accusations. The *Journal de Genève* set the tone and was most vigorously backed by the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, the *Neue freie Presse*<sup>b</sup> of Vienna, and other organs of the radical, liberal and conservative bourgeoisie. As a result of the energetic behaviour of the Geneva Central Council, the cause of the strike faded completely into the background, while the International Association was pushed to the forefront of the movement.

On the 28th of March, the masters' association put up wall notices dated the 26th of March, in which the masters promised to

<sup>a</sup> Offices.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See *Neue freie Presse*, Nos. 1286 (supplement), 1288, 1291, March 29 and 31, and April 3, 1868.— *Ed.*

consider the workers' grievances in all fairness, warned them against the despotism and menace of the International Working Men's Association, which they said was maintained on foreign money and had instigated the strike, reminded them of the previous friendly mutual understanding, and called on them to return to work in good faith as individuals; the masters would be glad to improve the workers' lot and would for the time being grant them an 11-hour working day. Should they, however, contrary to expectations, fail to comply with this, the masters would be compelled, for their part, also to close down workshops in those branches of the building trade which had not yet joined in the strike.

All attempts to come to an understanding foundered because the masters did not wish to deal with delegates of the International Association, and since no individual workers reported to work, the threatened factory lock-out was carried into effect on the 30th of March, and the workshops of joiners, carpenters and tanners were closed down. The moral effect which this closure had on the Geneva workers is best illustrated by the fact that a number of unions which had previously stood aloof from the International Association, formed sections and asked it for admission. Thus the coach-makers, farriers, saddlers, upholsterers, file-cutters, curriers, and others. During these few days the Association won many more than a thousand new members.

Workmen employed in the jewellery trade, such as goldsmiths, watchmakers, bowl-makers, and engravers, who with only few exceptions are all citizens of Geneva, held a meeting attended by more than 2,000 persons on the 30th of March, and resolved as one man to apply all moral and material means to help bring the cause of the building workers to victory. In reference to the International Association, the assembly declared itself quite firmly against the false and malicious statement that the Geneva workers were being subjected to tyrannical pressure by a foreign society.

If until then the International Association had applied itself diligently to settling the conflict, it was now, since all attempts at reaching an understanding had failed, a matter of obtaining means for a longer duration of the strike. The Geneva Central Committee of the International Association had to support some 3,000 workers and their families, which was a burden the Geneva workers could not conceivably cope with on their own.

But contributions were already pouring in from all sides. First of all, most appreciative acknowledgements are due to the Geneva working men and their unions for their spirit of self-sacrifice. It

may be said without exaggeration that the employed workers of Geneva shared their bread with those who were out of work. And not just each and everyone gave willingly part of his wage; the unions' savings banks and relief funds contributed sums ranging from 500 to 5,000 francs. The unions of other Swiss cities and the German workers' societies in Switzerland were not found wanting either. Contributions arrived from Germany—Hanover (Workers' Union), Hamburg (Workers' Educational Society), Schwerin (building workers), Rostock, Kaukehmen, Solingen, Mannheim (Tailors' Union), Esslingen (Workers' Educational Society), Munich (Workers' Educational Society), and other towns. Especially active, however, were the General Council of the International Association in London and its administrative committees in Brussels and Paris. At the beginning of April the General Council was already able, despite the formal difficulties that it had had to overcome in order to obtain larger sums, to promise the Geneva Central Committee at least 40,000 francs monthly from England alone until the victorious culmination of the strike, partly as a loan and partly as a grant. And by the good offices of the Brussels and Paris administrative committees considerable contributions came from unions in those two cities, e.g. 2,000 francs from the printers, 1,500 francs from the tanners of Paris, and so on.

The masters saw then that their plan of starving out the workers had failed. But since *they* had vowed that they would not deal with the Central Council of the International Association, this was done on their behalf by M. *Camperio*, President of the State Council and Chief of the Justice and Police Department of Geneva. He notified the Central Committee of the Association on the 8th of April to send delegates of all building trades to his office with a view to reaching an understanding. An agreement came about already on the third day of the negotiations. The masters conceded the workers a reduction of the working time by 1 and in some cases 2 hours, and a wage increase of 10 per cent.

In the evening of the same day (11th of April) M. *Camperio* let it be known in wall notices that the conflict between the workmen and the employers had been settled through his mediation, that the strike was to be considered over, and that work would be resumed on Monday (13th of April).

The International Working Men's Association, too, lost no time in announcing the happy end of the strike in wall posters and, while thanking the workmen for their brave conduct during the weeks of the struggle, it called on them to forget all that had happened and go to work on Monday in good cheer.

For the International Working Men's Association the conflict resulted in a mass adherence of workmen in Switzerland.

### *3. The Bloody Conflict Between the Belgian Government and the Miners of Charleroi (March 1868)*

Belgium is a paradise for the bourgeoisie. Its Constitution is the ideal of a model bourgeois state. Its government is the agent of the bourgeoisie, representative of the domination of capital. Nothing is more natural there than that the least collision between the interests of capital and labour should precipitate a conflict which culminates in a bloody solution by powder and lead.<sup>424</sup>

The more resolutely the International Working Men's Association concerns itself there with the cause of the oppressed and persecuted, the more necessary it appears to present an exhaustive account of the causes of the labour disturbances in the coal basin of Charleroi.

Among the national industries of various countries, coal and iron stand at the head of the list. The two industries form an organic whole. No ironworks and no furnace can operate without coal, and for the collieries, too, the furnaces and ironworks are the most important consumer. Any upheaval in one of the industries, therefore, makes itself instantly felt in the other, and a metallurgical crisis, which recurs periodically like all crises, has an immediate and direct bearing on the price of coal.

The country that nature has favoured the most in respect of coal and iron is England. There, both coal and iron lie fairly close to the surface and can be extracted with little effort. France, on the other hand, is the most disinherited, for it produces practically no coal of its own and its ironworks are dependent on English or Prussian coal. But though for France importation of foreign coal is an economic necessity, it subjects coal-producing Belgium to highly disagreeable competition because England and Prussia (with a waterway along the Rhine and its tributaries) are in a more favourable position as regards transport, and because transportation costs have a bearing on the local price of coal.

The general price of coal in each country, on the other hand, depends on the wages that are paid for working it. Indeed, the international relevance of this factor strikes the eye owing to the difference in the amount of labour time consumed in different countries to produce the same quantity of coal. Wages, too, are as



different as the working time, and in England they are at least  $26\frac{2}{3}$  per cent higher than on the Continent.\*

The implications for colliery workers of different countries are the following:

Whenever an iron and steel crisis or some other unfavourable commercial factor depresses the price of coal, the mine-owners try to lower wages. Knowing, however, that wages are already so low that any further reduction is a hardship that may in certain circumstances, such as a time of shortages, drive the worker to desperation, they are compelled to look for a plausible excuse.

As a rule, there are only two such excuses, one applicable only to England, and the other only to the Continent.

The plausible excuse of the English mine-owner is the *low wages on the Continent*.

The plausible excuse of the continental mine-owner is the *low price and competition of English coal*.

To what social straits the Belgian coalminers have been reduced in these circumstances is vividly described in the following article<sup>a</sup> in the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*\*\*:

“A sadder plight than that of the Belgian coalminer is hardly conceivable. Reduced to the condition of an industrial machine, he has been stripped of all social rights and duties. He is nothing more than a chattel which figures in the mine-owner’s inventory alongside horses, donkeys, implements, and other working material. That is a fact. A mining company considers itself richer when it has a greater number of workers in its hands. When it establishes a workers’ town for ‘humanitarian reasons’ the *direct* gain is at most 2 to 3 per cent. But the *indirect* gain is immeasurably greater, for the company *acquires* an additional number of workers utterly dependent on the mine for their subsistence, thus *ensuring* the operation of the *mine under any circumstances*. It would be more appropriate to call the coalminer a serf or slave

\* According to estimates by *Richard Whiting*. To determine how much worse off the workers were in France than their colleagues in England, he assumed that, considering the difference in the price of the most important necessities in the two countries, the worker got just as far with 5 francs in France as he did with 5 shillings (that is, 6 francs) in England. This made a difference of  $16\frac{2}{3}$  per cent by reason of just the price discrepancies. Having in this simple way identified francs and shillings as equal values for both countries, *Whiting* found in addition that wages in France were at least 10 per cent lower than those in England, while wages in France, Belgium, and Rhenish Prussia were approximately the same. [Note by *Eichhoff*.]

\*\* *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, organ of the German People’s Party, Leipzig, printed and published by C. W. Vollrath. Its editor-in-chief is *Wilhelm Liebknecht*. [Note by *Eichhoff*.]

<sup>a</sup> “Die Lage der belgischen Kohlenarbeiter”, *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, Nos. 20 and 21, May 16 and 23, 1868.—*Ed.*

rather than a *free man*, which is a title that bourgeois economists so generously apply to him.

"Among all the labouring classes the Belgian coalminers wear the badge of slavery more distinctly than the others. Ignorance, brutishness, physical and moral degradation—those are the sad effects of the unrestricted domination of capital in an industry that is in itself probably more demeaning to man than any other. To be sure, the bourgeoisie indulges itself in ascribing the coalminer's misery to his own ingrained faults and vices, his lack of foresight, frivolity and dissipation. Wisely, it avoids tracing the case to its sources, lest it reveal the causes and circumstances that inevitably produce a condition which cannot find succour in vain pity but which it is in the general interest to remedy, and as quickly as possible.

"Among the specific reasons that make the coalminer a machine of flesh and bone, the main one is the nature and condition of the work itself, and then also the extraordinary length of working time. And it is an economic law of the present social system that working hours tend to increase in much the same proportion as the labour continuously tends to grow harder.

"The coalminer's labour is purely physical; it calls for no mental effort at all. His brain is almost completely idle. Deprived of any stimulus, his mental aptitudes remain in an elementary, inert, dormant state. Consequently, his mentality is narrow-minded to the extreme. Just as his activity is purely physical, so his needs and tastes are also of a purely physical and brutish nature. The coalminer's intellectual and moral degradation is not at all surprising if you look at the nature of his trade. Considering the ruinous effects of the physical exertion that disfigures his body, it is indeed quite impossible for his habits and morals not to conflict with reason.

"The coalminer's worth is measured exclusively by his muscles; intelligence counts for nothing, for it is not needed. It takes neither skill nor talent nor education to work in a mine; physical strength alone is enough. A brief description of the various operations in a coalmine will show the reader that *under the present economic system it is impossible for the miner to improve himself either physically or mentally or morally.*

"Work in a mine is generally divided as follows: the *ouvriers à veine* cut the coal from the seam, the *bouteurs* take it to the gallery, and the *chargeurs à la taille* load it into carts or tubs. The *selôneurs* pull the tubs to the shafts where the coal is raised to the surface. The *coupers de voies*, the *releveurs* and the *meneurs de terres* dig shafts and galleries, and take out the earth and stones. All these jobs are done in the dim light of a little lamp, in an unhealthy, dust-laden atmosphere. To do his job, the coalminer must assume unnatural poses, either lying on his side or kneeling, crouching or bending laboriously, and often he can only crawl in order to move forward or backward. All this makes his condition worse, more painful, than that of an excavator or field labourer, whose jobs are also admittedly of an entirely manual nature, but at least performed in open air and daylight.

"Is it any wonder, therefore, that the coalminer should be mentally and morally at so low a level? How can a man who labours *daily for 15 to 18 hours* in a murky, unaired hole, retain even a trace of the qualities that distinguish a human being from a beast? The best organised creature with the happiest spiritual aptitudes is bound to degenerate swiftly in such a regime, which seeks to destroy the individual's abilities. Nowadays, one can no longer deny the influence of the body on the spirit, of the physical on the moral. The physical state of the individual is usually an indication of the mental. The report of the Mons Chamber of Commerce for 1844, an official paper, portrays the coalminer in the following terms: 'These workers are pale of face in their young years, their frame is bent, they are bow-legged, and their walk is slow.

Almost without exceptions, they bear the stamp of premature senility at the age of 40 to 50.'

"*Bidaut*, a mining engineer, wrote in an official report in 1843: 'It is quite indisputable that this occupation (that of the coalminer), which deprives one of sunlight, subjects one to inhaling gases other than plain air, makes the body assume unnatural postures, exposes one to constant dangers, and so on, is of a kind that removes man the farthest from the normal conditions of life and should therefore be an object of special regulations. For me this is beyond any doubt.'

"What was true in 1843 is still true in 1868. The physical and moral condition of the coalminer, even though it may not have deteriorated, has certainly not improved. Far from having been reduced, the working time has since been lengthened, and wages, even if we disregard the current decline of business, are still the same while the price of victuals has gone up. Though considerable improvements have been introduced in mining, the workers have derived no benefit therefrom. If, for example, the miner no longer goes down into the mine and up again by ladder, the time and energy saved thereby benefit the master because more work is done. The effect of all this is that the miner lacks mental flexibility, that he scorns schooling and education as being the pursuit of 'idlers', that he does not send his children to school, and indulges in the coarsest of pleasures and amusements. While the mine-owner has an interest in keeping the miner in this brutish state, he is helped by a profusion of lesser businesses which profit exclusively off the workers and would, therefore, cease to be profitable if the worker were sober, prudent, and provident. They set traps for the miner at every step to part him from his last penny. And how easy is it to seduce people who lack the least schooling and whose mental capacity is in hibernation!

"This state of affairs cannot and must not continue. It is futile to appeal to the obligations of humanity; they are impotent against the laws of bourgeois economics. But the bourgeoisie is badly mistaken if it thinks it can reduce the workers to serfs and beasts without being itself affected by the moral consequences thereof. Suffice it to look at the bourgeoisie of the coal regions and factory towns. Whence the contempt for culture, for learning, and the lack of independent thinking outside the limits of its enterprises, and whence the crude lust for pleasure that distinguishes the bourgeois? It is quite the same as it was with the planters and slave-owners of the United States. There it was slavery and slave labour that caused the demoralisation. Here, too, similar effects would seem to justify the conclusion that the causes are the same. The lower the worker is pushed the lower his master sinks in his wake; he becomes morally corrupted as surely as the one whom he has ceased to regard as a human being.

"The workers have themselves found a remedy against the evils they suffer from private industry and which retroactively cover the body of society with festering sores. This remedy is *education* and *cooperation*. Nothing but a reduction of working time can put the benefits of enlightenment and education within reach of the worker. Nothing but participation in the benefits of capital can deliver him from the misery to which he is now helplessly exposed.

"The moral and material improvement of the worker is a question of social justice and of the public weal. There is no way to solve this question other than *public education* and the establishment of *cooperative societies*. It is up to the state to set these remedies in motion, to encourage and to support them. It will destroy itself if it looks on idly while the effects of the bourgeois economic system corrupt and erode society."

---

In February 1867 there had already been disturbances among the miners of Marchienne, which could only be quelled by armed force. The cause was the prevailing shortages, notably the high price of bread due to the crop failure of 1866. Calling on the English workers for contributions to support the families of the unfortunate victims of the massacre, the General Council of the International Association issued the following appeal at the beginning of March 1867<sup>a25</sup>:

CENTRAL COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

18, Bouverie Street, E.C., London

To the Miners and Iron-Workers of Great Britain

Fellow working men, it is but a few days since *The Times*<sup>a</sup> presaged the ruin and destruction of the British iron trade if the Unionists persisted in not working under a certain price. The Belgians, it was said, with cheap coals and low wages, would engross the trade, both in the home and the foreign market. Two men, *Creed* and *Williams*, expatiated in *The Times* on the felicity of the Belgian coal and iron-masters not being bothered with vexatious factory laws and Trades Unions; the Belgian miners and iron-workers worked contentedly, with their wives and children, from 12 to 14 hours a day, for less than their British equals received for ten hours' work a day.<sup>b</sup> However, hardly was the ink of the print dry, when tidings arrived that these contented beings had revolted. The iron trade, says the *Economiste belge*,<sup>c</sup> has been queer for some time on account of the high price of coal and an indifferent yield of the mines. The same journal says: "The ignorance of the mining population is so profound, their brutality so great, their way of spending their money so disorderly and so improvident that the highest wages would be insufficient." This is no wonder. The responsibility rests with those who keep them in a worse than brutish drudgery from the cradle to the grave.

At the beginning of February, three furnaces stopped in the neighbourhood of Marchienne; the other iron-masters forthwith announced a reduction of wages of ten per cent; the coal-masters of Charleroi followed suit, yet the *Economiste belge* says that coals were never more in demand, nor at a higher price than at present.<sup>d</sup> The outrage<sup>e</sup> was aggravated by a simultaneous rise in the price of flour, the coal and iron-masters being also the proprietors of the flour mills of the district. A great many of the work-people became exasperated, and not being organised and in the habit of deliberating upon their common affairs, they had no plan of action for their guidance.

They gathered upon the high roads and went from place to place to prevent such as might be disposed to work under reduction. The colliers of Charleroi arrived by a flour mill guarded by a hundred soldiers whose guns were loaded with

<sup>a</sup> The English original has "the thunderer of Printing House Square".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See *The Times*, Nos. 25678, 25689, 25692, 25695, December 11, 24, 29 and 31, 1866; No. 25708, January 15, 1867.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> "La grève de Marchienne-au-Pont", *L'Économiste belge*, No. 3, February 9, 1867.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.*—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The English original has "the affair".—*Ed.*

ball cartridges. This provoked an attack, the result is: killed, wounded, and prisoners. These poor provoked and ill-used victims have left families outside the graves and the prison walls who are in dire want. Nobody ventures in Belgium to say a word in their behalf. Mistaken and misguided as these men were as to their course of action, they yet fell in labour's cause, and those they have left behind deserve sympathy and support. Some pecuniary help to the widows and orphans, and the moral influence it would produce, if coming from abroad, would raise the drooping spirits of the whole class, and might lead to communications and interchanges of opinion which would give our Continental brethren a better idea of how labour's battles must be fought, and what organisation and education the fighting army requires.

The Central Council of the International Working Men's Association appeals to you to take the case into your consideration, for the cause of the labourers of one country is that of the labourers of all countries.

*George Odger, President*

*J. George Eccarius, Vice-President*

*R. Shaw, Secretary*

Despite their own sad plight, Britain's miners and iron-workers responded willingly and warmly to the appeal that was addressed to them. That was the reason why the influence of the International Association on the labouring population of Belgium kept rising steadily, until events occurred in the district of Charleroi in March 1868 which laid the way open for it all over Belgium and decided its social superiority.<sup>a</sup>

The reason for this year's labour disturbances was the following.

There had been a considerable over-production of coal. In Belgium coal consumption had declined, partly due to the general monetary and financial crisis of 1866 which occasioned an iron and steel crisis, affecting mainly the iron-works and blast-furnace industry of France and Belgium, and partly because of the competition of Prussian against Belgian coal. The Belgian mine-owners had, in fact, formed a coalition to push up the price of their coal. But then the owners of the iron-works and furnaces found it more profitable to bring their coal from abroad. And to protect themselves against price increases they concluded contracts for several years in advance. For the mine-owners it was now a question of making good the damage they had brought down on themselves by their greed, and, above all, a question of reducing production. It might be mentioned in passing that a large proportion of the Belgian coalmines are run by public companies which have great assets and distributed enormous dividends among their shareholders in the previous few years. The owners and directors of the mines now decided to reduce the working

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 14-15.—*Ed.*

week to four days, which meant a loss of  $33\frac{1}{3}$  per cent of their regular wage for the workers. When this, too, failed to restore the balance between supply and demand, the coal-masters decided to reduce the price of coal. But to avoid having to lower the dividends of their shareholders, they reduced by another 10 per cent the wages that were already down to  $66\frac{2}{3}$  per cent of normal. Yet at this very time the price of the most indispensable victuals was higher than ever owing to the two crop failures of 1866 and 1867. The half-starved coalminers, already painfully affected by their days of involuntary idleness, remonstrated against the wage cut, which doomed them to hunger. The strike became universal and spread throughout the district of Charleroi. Hunger and misery drove the wretches to rebellion and pillage, for otherwise the women would surely not have in a manner of speaking put themselves at the head of the crowds of workers, marching in front and holding poles to which they had nailed some miserable rags.

Now the capitalists let the government and military forces intervene and most deliberately provoked bloody conflicts in which many workers were killed, wounded or thrown behind bars. The first clash occurred on the 25th of March in the vicinity of Charleroi. The workers were about to comply with the well-meaning entreaties of an officer who pleaded with them to disperse, when a stone was flung and hit the major in command, giving the latter an excuse to open fire. Seven killed and 13 wounded was the outcome of that first collision, followed by others with the gendarmerie and cavalry. In Arsimont, gendarmes and the public prosecutor came to the scene even before any acts of violence had occurred, making arrests among workers, who had only just announced a strike. Directly in the wake of the police came the soldiers, who pounced without ado on the lot of workers returning home from the mine.

In modern history only the scenes of carnage and bloodshed during the Negro uprising in Jamaica<sup>426</sup> can compare with these atrocities. Here, as in Jamaica, the capitalists celebrated bloody orgies. Here, as in Jamaica, they hoped to break what was left of the workers' spirit of resistance and self-esteem by acts of extreme brutality. The cheerful, insolent and humorous tone affected by them as they revelled in their *terreur blanche*<sup>a</sup> may be seen, among others, from the following passage in their organ, *Indépendance belge*, of the 1st of April 1868:

---

<sup>a</sup> White terror.—Ed.

“The land is inundated with troops, and as these withdraw all individuals named as the leaders, as well as all those generally known to be dangerous, will be under lock and key. That is a prudent measure necessitated by the circumstances.... The arrests are accompanied with a military show of pomp and force, partly to create a crushing impression on the spirits of the populace and partly to be ready for any surprise attack that may be tried to snatch the prisoners from under the armed custody of the authorities.... Considering such organised pressure on the masses, it is easy to see that the rising cannot conceivably break out again. The bloody drama has also had a profoundly intimidating effect.... The restless but not in the least dangerous mass of rioters will be reduced to a state of complete impotence before nightfall. All leaders whom they had listened to in the past few days are being thrown behind bars, and even those *whose voice they might perhaps be minded to heed* are likewise being imprisoned.... It is in fact no longer the military but the police who are dealing with an iron hand.... One seeks advice from burgomasters, police officials and gendarmerie brigadiers in the rural communities, and has all those in one's own area indicated in reports as trouble-makers arrested.”

In the midst of the stupefaction to which these brutalities reduced the afflicted part of the workers, the Brussels Central Committee of the International Association for Belgium raised its voice in the press, called public meetings, stigmatised the industrialists and their accomplice, the government, galvanised the Belgian working class to joint resistance, supplied the persecuted with legal counsel and defence lawyers, and declared the cause of the Charleroi coalminers the common cause of the International Working Men's Association. The General Council in London, like the two committees in Paris and Geneva, supported the committee at Brussels.<sup>427</sup>

After having suppressed the coalminers' movement in the district of Charleroi by force of arms, the employers did nothing at all to conciliate the unemployed and starving workers. They were perfectly happy to be able to close down their mines for some time. The government, too, did nothing. The workers, who received no support from any quarter but the International Working Men's Association, which was already badly taxed by the simultaneous events in Geneva and whose aid committees were only being organised, were on the edge of death from starvation. But at this time the townsmen of Charleroi, who saw the daily increasing misery, began to have misgivings. The Liberal association of Charleroi threatened the government that if no work was immediately provided to the jobless workers, it would dissolve its election committee and leave the field free for the Catholics. The threat had the desired effect. It was fear of losing votes in the next elections, *not* the crying distress of the starving workers, that drove the liberal government to initiating considerable public works in May 1868.

In the meantime, the proceedings against the men arrested in March are following their course. Whatever the outcome may be, whether the judges convict or acquit them, the government will have suffered a setback. The workers know that they can expect nothing but powder and lead or imprisonment from the government. They cannot expect the government to redress their legitimate grievances or to protect and help them against the abuses of their employers. The government has itself opened their eyes to where help can come from and to whom they must turn: not the government but rather the International Working Men's Association.

---

#### 9. THE POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

Faithful to the programme<sup>a</sup> in which it called on working men to lay the ground for their social emancipation by seizing political power, the General Council did not in the least allow its social activity prevent it from taking political action in propitious circumstances. The most important steps in this field were the following.

1. Even before the Association was founded some of the members of the General Council had worked among their men for the cause of the North American Union. To the extent to which the government and the ruling classes had favoured the Confederates, making the most of the distress caused in England by the blockade of American harbours as a lever and employing all possible means to instigate demonstrations of English workers in favour of the Secessionists<sup>428</sup>—to that same extent labour leaders had foiled these intrigues, informed the government and people of the United States in their addresses of the true feelings of the masses in Britain, and organised mass demonstrations of London workers in favour of the Union. *Lincoln's* re-election on November 8, 1864 was an occasion for the General Council to send him an address with its best wishes.<sup>b</sup> At the same time, it called mass meetings in support of the Union. That was why *Lincoln*, in his

---

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> K. Marx, "To Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America".—*Ed.*



message of reply, expressly acknowledged the services of the International Working Men's Association for the good cause.<sup>a</sup>

2. The General Council also convened public meetings from time to time to keep up the English workers' sympathy for Poland and to expose Russia's abuses in Europe.

3. When following the 1866 events in Germany<sup>429</sup> a war between France and Prussia appeared imminent and the government papers in France did their utmost to fan the flames, to fire the national ambitions of the French, and to excite national hatred between France and Germany, the Paris Central Committee of the International Working Men's Association organised workers' demonstrations all over France against the war party, sent messages of sympathy to German working men and workers' unions, and prevented the French workers from falling into the trap that had been set for them. Time will show how much the anti-chauvinist attitude of the French labouring classes moulded by this vigorous action helped to prevent a war for which there had then been a suitable pretext.

4. The General Council of the International Working Men's Association took a conspicuous part in the establishment and consolidation of the English Reform League, whose agitation brought about the parliamentary reform of 1867. Members of the General Council are still the most active members of the Executive of the Reform League. The public demonstrations in London that forced the resignation of Mr. *Walpole*, the Tory Home Secretary, and the indignation meetings in all the leading cities of the land were, indeed, initiated by them.

5. The murder trial of the Fenians in Manchester\* was branded by the General Council as a travesty of justice. When the

\* On September 18, 1867, armed Fenians attacked a police van in Manchester and freed two political prisoners (Fenian officers). A police sergeant was killed during the attack. *Contrary* to English law, which provides for periodical assizes to be held in all counties, the case was put before a special commission, an extraordinary tribunal, at which the Fenians who are accused of having taken part in the attack were charged with the murder of the police sergeant. Mr. *Blackburn* was named judge and contrived to prevail on the jury by all sorts of stratagems that each of the defendants proved to have taken part in the attempt to free the prisoners had thereby incurred guilt for murder. Thereupon, Mr. *Blackburn* passed down five convictions and five death sentences. Of the convicted men two were reprieved and three were hanged. On June 2, 1868, the selfsame Mr. *Blackburn* conducted the proceedings against Mr. *Eyre*, the ex-governor of Jamaica, and prevailed on the Grand Jury, with references to an alleged judgement of Lord

<sup>a</sup> "Mr. Lincoln and the International Working Men's Association. London, Jan. 31", *The Times*, No. 25101, February 6, 1865.—Ed.

executions drew close in November 1867, the General Council sent a petition to the English government,<sup>a</sup> warning it against the bloodshed. Besides, at the height of the panic created in London by the Manchester events, the Council held a public session in support of the rights of Ireland and the Irish. This was the first of the actions in favour of the unfortunate victims of that miscarriage of justice. *The Times* and the rest of the daily press reported the event.<sup>b</sup> The mood among the London workers was so strongly altered thereby and the plan of the English aristocracy to exploit English national prejudices and split the working class with its strong Irish element into two hostile factions, was so effectively balked that the organs of the English aristocracy, such as the *Saturday Review*, began denouncing the International Working Men's Association as being dangerous to the state.

---

## 10. CONFLICTS WITH GOVERNMENTS

### 1. *Conflict with the French Government*

It is commonly known that in France there exists a law that no society of more than 20 persons may be constituted without authorisation of the government.<sup>431</sup> To judge from the wording of the law, most of the industrial and commercial companies in France are unlawful and exist on sufferance only. For by decision of the Court of Appeal the authorisation is tacit<sup>c</sup> if the society in question is public and is not dissolved by the government for some length of time. Whether authorised or not, one may assume that the government may at the very most dissolve societies to whose establishment it had tacitly acquiesced, but that it has no right to punish its members.

As for the organisation of the International Working Men's Association in France, the case is as follows. All branch societies in

Chief Justice Sir *A. Cockburn*, that Mr. *Eyre* had *not* exceeded the administrative powers vested in him, thus saving Mr. *Eyre* from being convicted. On June 8, *Blackburn* was accused by Lord Chief Justice Sir *A. Cockburn* in public session at Queen's Bench<sup>430</sup> of having falsified the facts, and pleaded commission of a legal mistake. [*Note by Eichhoff.*]

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 3-4.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "London Meetings", *The Times*, No. 25974, November 21, 1867.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> In the German original the French word "tacite" is given in Latin in brackets after its German equivalent.—*Ed.*

France exist merely as members of the English society, on whose General Council they are represented by *Eugène Dupont*. (In addition, there is in London a French group and a German one.) Though they act in common in certain cases, the French sections are not connected with one another, and have intercourse only with the General Council in London. Each of the societies forms a separate body with an executive committee at its head which corresponds with the General Council in London. The establishment of the society in France was initiated by the Paris Administrative Committee of the Paris group. The Committee had notified the Interior Minister<sup>a</sup> and the Prefect of the Paris police of its inauguration and existence as long ago as 1864. Since that date the Paris Committee, like the committees in the other cities of France, had functioned *publicly*. *Open* meetings of members of the Association were held from week to week, and reports about them were published in *public* newspapers. Indeed, in clear contrast to the secret societies of past decades, the society is by nature a *public* one, and the meetings of the General Council in London are reported *each week* in London newspapers.

*The first conflict* between the International Working Men's Association and the French government occurred in September 1867, after the Congress at Lausanne.<sup>b</sup> A part of the documents of the Congress had been entrusted to the care of *Jules Gottraux*, one of the French delegates, who was to despatch them from France to England.<sup>432</sup> The moment he crossed the French border, the papers were seized.<sup>433</sup> The General Secretary of the London General Council<sup>c</sup> addressed himself in writing to the French Minister of the Interior<sup>d</sup> and demanded the return of the confiscated papers because they were British property. He received no reply. Thereupon, the General Council of the Association turned to *Lord Stanley*, the British Foreign Secretary. The latter instructed *Lord Cowley*, the British Ambassador in Paris, to demand that the papers be returned, and the French government complied.

*The second conflict* occurred at about the same time. No printer in Paris had dared to print a memorandum<sup>e</sup> which the Paris delegates had read out at the Geneva Congress and in which they set forth their standpoint and defended their principles—which were,

<sup>a</sup> Paul Boudet.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Eichhoff is mistaken: the conflict occurred in September 1866, after the congress in Geneva (see Note 13).—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> John George Eccarius.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Charles La Vallette.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> *Congrès de Genève. Mémoire des délégués français*, Brussels, 1866.—*Ed.*

by the way, one-sidedly *Proudhonistic*, specifically French, and decidedly not accepted by the Association. For this reason, the Paris Committee had the memorandum printed in Brussels. But it was seized on the border as it was being brought into France. On March 3, 1867, the Paris Central Committee of the Association wrote to *Rouher*, the Minister of State and the Emperor's<sup>a</sup> *alter ego*, demanding the reasons for the seizure.<sup>b</sup> In his reply,<sup>c</sup> addressed to the offices of the Paris Bureau of the Association at Rue de Gravilliers 44, *Rouher* invited a member of the Committee to an interview. The Committee appointed a delegate,<sup>d</sup> who went to see the Minister. *Rouher* demanded altering and modifying a few objectionable places. The delegate refused to do so because any modifications would rob the document of its meaning. Thereupon, *Rouher* made the following characteristic pronouncement: "Still if you would introduce some words of gratitude to the Emperor, who has done so much for the working classes, one might see what could be done." (Pourtant, si vous faisiez entrer quelques remerciements à l'adresse de l'empereur qui a tant fait pour les classes ouvrières, l'on pourrait voir.)<sup>e</sup> The delegate replied that the Association did not deal in politics and that neither flattery nor defamation, whether of an individual or a political party, came within its competence. Thereupon *Rouher* broke off the conversation and left the seizure of the memorandum in force.<sup>f</sup>

The French government imagined that it could use the International Working Men's Association as a tool. It was in for a disappointment. On the other hand, it was aware of the growing strength and increasing influence of the Society on the occasion of the strikes at Amiens, Roubaix and Paris. Finally, a few weeks after the above conversation, it became aware with the greatest displeasure of the Society's agitation against imperialist chauvinism. It decided to take action. Whence arose

---

<sup>a</sup> Napoleon III.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Eichhoff is mistaken: the letter was dated March the 9th (see "A M. le ministre de l'intérieur. Vendredi, 9 mars 1867", *Le Courrier français*, No. 112, May 1, 1868).—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Antoine Marie Bourdon, keeper of the archives of the Paris section of the First International.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> In the German original the French sentence is given in brackets after its German equivalent. An account of the interview, which took place on March 10, 1867, was published in *Le Courrier français*, No. 112, May 1, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> *Ibid.*—*Ed.*

*The third conflict.*<sup>a</sup> In the beginning of 1868,<sup>a</sup> one night the Paris police raided the homes of the members of the Paris Central Committee. All letters and papers that they found there were confiscated. The police deduced therefrom that the *registered* members of the Paris group numbered some 2,000. (Since then this number has risen considerably.) The charge preferred was participation in a *secret society*, but it was dropped after two months' investigation. Instead, charges of breaching police regulations were presented, namely, of forming a society of more than 20 persons in the absence of the government's authorisation.

On March 20, 1868, the case came before the penal court of the Seine department. Engraver *Tolain*, a co-defendant, spoke on behalf of the 15 defendants. The hearing yielded the following picture<sup>435</sup>:

*President.*<sup>b</sup> Do you admit that the International Working Men's Association, whose member you and your co-defendants have become, has never been authorised?

*Tolain.* I think this is not the proper time to reply to this question. In our common plea we intend to prove that the overt activity of our society presupposes a tacit acknowledgement of its existence.

*President.* But you do admit that the authorisation was never received?

*Tolain.* It was never even required of us. To what government, indeed, should an international association turn for authorisation? Should it be the French, the Belgian, the British or any of the German governments? It could not have known, and no one could have told it. What would a French authorisation count for in England, for example, or vice versa?

*President.* Did you discuss political matters at your gatherings?

*Tolain.* Never, nowhere.

*President.* A manifesto printed in Brussels in 1866<sup>c</sup> has been confiscated from you, whose content consists of politics, even of effusive politics (*politique transcendente*).<sup>d</sup>

*Tolain.* The manifesto is my personal property, and I believe that in France I am the only one to own a copy of it. It was drawn up and published by English workers because, may it be known to the court, every group in every country has the right to set forth its particular opinion without thereby obligating the groups of other nations to solidarity. It is therefore not unusual for an English or German branch society to discuss questions of politics that *we* ourselves would not venture to touch. I declare that *we* have always kept our distance from politics at our meetings.

<sup>a</sup> On New Year's Eve 1867.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Delesvaux.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The reference is to the *Manifeste de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs suivi du Règlement provisoire*, Brussels, 1866. It was translated into French by Charles Longuet at Marx's request. Longuet rectified the mistranslations that occurred in the first French translation of the Provisional Rules.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In the German original the French words are given in brackets after their German equivalent.—*Ed.*

*President.* How is your Association organised, where is its seat, what are its purposes, and what are the functions of the General Council and the Paris Bureau?

*Tolain.* The General Council was constituted in London in 1864. No permanent seat was ever fixed for it. The fact that it has had its seat in London for three years is due to difficulties that we have been unable to overcome. To inform you of its purposes I could hardly do better than to read you its Rules. (He reads the Rules).<sup>a</sup>

*President.* Tell me something about the organisation of the Paris Bureau.

*Tolain.* The Paris Bureau was formed following an appeal to all workers published in the newspapers. The object of creating the Bureau was to have a centre of activity for the Paris group, to send delegates to international congresses, and to transact other business on behalf of the Society. All this was done in broad daylight and quite openly. The Statutes of the Paris Bureau were set forth in a printed booklet,<sup>b</sup> and the weekly dues of every member were fixed at 10 centimes.

*President.* Has this Bureau engaged in direct propaganda to expand the Society?

*Tolain.* Now and then we were asked for advice as to how a bureau is formed. In most cases we referred to the General Council in London.

*President.* Has the Paris Bureau interfered in any strikes, such as that of the Paris bronze-workers, or at Roubaix, Amiens, and elsewhere?

*Tolain.* The Association has indeed taken a most active part in the above-mentioned events in the belief that by studying the causes of the strikes it was doing a good service to the employers as well as the workers.

Public prosecutor *Lepelletier's* speech began as follows:

"Gentlemen, the defendants who stand before you are hard-working, intelligent and upright workers. They have never been convicted of anything, nothing has tainted their morality, and in substantiating the charge brought against them I, gentlemen, can say nothing that would prejudice their honour."

Thereupon the public prosecutor endeavoured to prove that the law had been breached and that there were grounds for conviction. Referring to the defendants' arguments invalidating the charge, he observed:

"What reproaches are being cast upon the prosecution? Gentlemen, if you have read the *Siècle*, the *Opinion nationale*, and the *Courrier français* of the past few days, you will have found expressions of regret in them by that portion of the press which sympathises with the International Association. Their reasoning is as follows. For three years, the Association has existed in broad and blessed daylight. It may not have been allowed by the authorities, but tolerated. Its aim was the material and moral emancipation of the workers, its means to this end being the study of economic questions and their solution according to the principles of truth, morality, and justice.... And such long sufferance was suddenly followed by ruthless criminal prosecution for no reason at all other than the plain arbitrariness of power and a whim of violence. If the members of the Association had at least gone back on their programme and had applied themselves to problems involving danger to the state, if they had at least engaged in politics! But, on the contrary, they had steered clear of them at their sittings, had not touched them at their congresses, and had restricted

<sup>a</sup> The passages from the Rules read by Tolain are cited in *Procès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Bureau de Paris*, Paris, 1868, pp. 14-15.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "Règlement du Bureau de Paris." In: *Procès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs...*, pp. 22-24.—*Ed.*

their activity to the narrow limits of their statutes, which were well known to the authorities and, at least indirectly, tacitly, acknowledged by them.

"This, gentlemen, is the reproach that is cast upon us. I have neither understated nor exaggerated it. Is it a justified reproach? Is it true that the Association did not engage in politics? Is it true that it confined itself to the study of economic questions as provided for in its programme?"<sup>a</sup>

Thereupon the public prosecutor endeavoured to prove the Paris Bureau's involvement in political matters, which was not hard to do considering the Association's general attitude in the Luxembourg affair,<sup>436</sup> and demanded that the defendants be convicted in the interests of the law.

Here defendant *Tolain* rose to his feet and placed before the court the following petition<sup>b</sup>:

"Considering that the illegality of a society derives from the absence of authorisation from the authorities; that no formal procedure has been established to obtain such authorisation; that the said authorisation can also be dispensed tacitly; that demanding a special form of authorisation means tightening a law which even the legislator himself has recognised as exceptional; that public confidence is shaken thereby; furthermore, that it follows from the discussions concerning the law of 1834 and from utterances of government representatives that the said authorisation may be granted tacitly; that such tacit permission or sufferance is the form in which all industrial and commercial companies of more than 20 members exist; that conceding the power to persecute such societies without first revoking this practice is an infringement upon the public consciousness, since it is self-evident that the government considers them lawfully authorised by virtue of their obvious existence; considering that the tacit authorisation of the Association follows 1) from the continuous publicity of its existence and actions, truly far more pronounced than in the case of commercial companies; 2) from the two letters of the International Association to the Minister of the Interior and the Prefect of the Police, in which the establishment and existence of the Association were recorded as long ago as 1864; considering that definitive and formal authorisation of the administration is contained in a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Society by the office of the Minister of the Interior<sup>c</sup> or, more precisely, by the Minister of State who was his temporary deputy; that the legitimacy of the Association was in no way questioned during an interview with the Minister; that the prosecution cannot demonstrate that the Association has in the interval changed either its theories or its aims; considering that actually the Secretary of the Association, who had been invited to explain the memorial of the French delegates to the Congress of 1866,<sup>d</sup> set forth the very same theories and aims which are now being reproved and prosecuted; that at that time even the prosecutor's office regarded the Society as amply legalised because it had known of its existence and nevertheless stated at the public proceedings of January 4, 1867 that no prosecution was being contemplated; for all these reasons we plead with the court to dismiss the prosecution's indictment."

<sup>a</sup> See *Procès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Bureau de Paris*, pp. 16, 20.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 32-35.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Paul Boudet.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *Congrès de Genève. Mémoire des délégués français*, Brussels, 1866.—*Ed.*

Upon submitting this petition, *Tolain* took the floor on behalf of the other defendants. His speech was a passionate protest against the lack of rights of the labouring classes. He described the dangers which the workman incurred when he endeavoured to clarify his social status by mutual instruction, by learning the relations that affect his most vital interests, and when he tried to secure improvements. Whatever he may do, whatever caution he may exercise, however pure and harmless his intentions may be, he was always threatened, persecuted, and subject to prosecution. In the past 20 years countless industrial innovations had created new requirements and completely reconstructed the social economy. Deliberately or not, the government itself had followed the movement and collaborated assiduously in this reconstruction.

"We workers," *Tolain* went on to say, "were deeply interested to know what was to become of us, and this was the reason for our uniting in the International Association. Working men wanted to see for themselves, and not through the eyes of the official bourgeois economics. English workers gathered to receive the French workers; they and we were moved by one and the same concern, the social question. The perfection of machines, the English workers said, changed the social situation of working men each passing day, so let us enlighten each other, let us find the means to safeguard our subsistence. We had the same interests and were inspired by the same ideas. Since then the common slogan says that the workman cannot expect any improvement of his social condition unless he achieves it by his own efforts. This slogan was proclaimed at a public meeting in London in 1864."

Thereupon *Tolain* described the establishment, organisation and activity of the General Council in London and the Paris Bureau. Having again declared that the government had granted them tacit authorisation, he said that *they, on the other hand, had not applied for official authorisation out of principle* because they would not concede to the government the power to permit or forbid rights that were the natural endowment of workers and all citizens. And he concluded with the following significant declaration:

"I must add that the position in which we have been put should be properly considered. Whatever your sentence may be, we shall do the same tomorrow as we did the day before; this is neither hatred nor pigheadedness on our part; it is the consciousness of our right. From now on we lay claim to dealing ourselves with all matters of concern to us; we have only one means of putting an end to our present situation, and that is to overstep the law in order to show how bad it is. So far, we have not wished to breach the law because, let me repeat, the police, the government, the municipal authorities and the public at large, have known everything, seen everything, and accepted everything on sufferance."

The sentence of the court read<sup>a</sup>:

---

<sup>a</sup> See *Procès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Bureau de Paris*, pp. 39-40.—*Ed.*



“Considering that, as follows from the investigations and proceedings, the defendants have for three years been Paris members of a society known by the name of the International Working Men’s Association, that the aforementioned society consisted of more than 20 persons, and that it was not authorised;

“considering that the associated workers were bound among themselves by the purposes of the Association and worked together for the achievement of these purposes, that the said purposes were to improve the situation of the workers by cooperation, production and credit, and that they gathered at regular intervals and constituted themselves into a permanent corporation;

“considering that Articles 291 and 292 of the *Code pénal*<sup>a</sup> and the Law of April 10, 1834<sup>b</sup> are police and general security laws applicable to anyone who breaches them on French territory, that it is irrelevant that the seat of the Society is located in London, and that it is perfectly sufficient to establish that the Paris Bureau has committed a breach of the aforementioned laws;

“considering that notice of the existence of the aforementioned Society in newspapers or its sufferance by the authorities does not relieve it of the need for an explicit authorisation of the government;

“considering that the defendants, by acting in this way, have committed offences covered by and punishable under Articles 291 and 292 of the *Code pénal* and § 2 of the Law of April 10, 1834;

“the Court hereby dissolves the International Working Men’s Association established in Paris under the name of Paris Bureau, and sentences each of the defendants to a fine of 100 francs which, in the event of insolvency, shall be replaced by 30 days’ imprisonment.”

The convicted filed an appeal against this sentence. In the meantime, the Paris group acted precisely as *Tolain* had told the court. In place of the prosecuted 15, a new Bureau, consisting of nine members of the Association, was elected. Their election was announced in the newspapers.<sup>c</sup> In a signed appeal they called publicly on the Paris workmen to contribute funds in support of the strike in Geneva.<sup>d</sup>

The case of the 15 was heard in the second instance on April 22, 1868.

The main points of the indictment were the Bureau’s *open refusal* to abide by the imperial penal law banning societies of more than 20 persons; the *political* nature of the Society, which subjected all pillars of the existing order to criticism; the *power* of the Society, which no government could withstand if it were allowed to embrace all countries as it has been doing so far; by

<sup>a</sup> *Code pénal, ou code des délits et des peines*, Cologne, 1810.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Loi sur les associations*, 10-11 avril 1834.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> “Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Bureau de Paris”, *Le Courrier français*, No. 71, March 14, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The appeal was printed in *Le Courrier français*, No. 101, April 20, 1868.—*Ed.*

now, it was alleged, it has become a sort of universal intermediary for workers' strikes.

As in all other cases, the accused defended themselves on their own, without legal counsel. Referring to the lack of an official authorisation, they declared:

"If we, the Paris correspondents of the London General Council, had been notified, after informing the police and the competent authorities of the constitution of our Bureau, that an explicit authorisation was required, we would have thought of some other organisation for we are making it quite clear that *it would never have occurred to us to submit to the humiliation of seeking authorisation*. The very first principle of our Rules would have forbidden us to do so. For it says that emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves. Those, however, who accept authorisation also accept submission, subordination and the right of patronage or, in short, serfdom, from which, indeed, in all its forms, the International Association aims to liberate the working classes."

The Court of Appeal confirmed the sentence of the penal court and, besides, sentenced the appellants to paying the costs of the hearing. The grounds of the sentence were in substance the same as those of the sentence of the first instance; only the following phrase was new:

"That the danger was aggravated *by the enormous power of the organisation and by the broad expansion of its activity*."

---

In the meantime legal proceedings were also instituted against the nine members of the new Bureau elected in March, and the latter appeared before the penal court on May 22, 1868.

The hearings of the case were similar to those of March the 20th.<sup>437</sup>

The defence was presented by co-defendant bookbinder *Varlin*. After this workman, too, had dismissed the legal arguments of the prosecution with a logic and insight that would have done credit to any jurist, he went on to portray the moral-political and social-economic side of the case, and here rose to such power of expression and conviction as could only have come from someone who knew the rightness of the cause and its profound moral justice. He said<sup>a</sup>:

"In our eyes a strike is only a crude means to establish the wage; we use it much against our will for it subjects the workman and his family to weeks and months of most severe privations without the assurance of finally winning a fair wage. The International Association has set itself the task of gaining a peaceful

<sup>a</sup> *Procès...*, pp. 123-26.— *Ed.*

settlement to the labour question by studying the economic conditions; but as obstacles are being raised to our studies and the solution of the social question is thereby delayed, we shall frequently have to resort to strikes so as to protect our livelihood.

“But I must touch on yet another point.

“Before the law you are the judges and we are the accused; but before the principles we are two parties—you the party of order at any price, the party of stability, and we the party of reform, the party of socialism. Let us take an impartial look: what is the social order whose perfections it has been our crime to question? It is eroded to the marrow by inequality, its life is menaced by selfishness, it is being strangled by the iron claws of anti-social prejudices. Despite the declaration of human rights and the short-lived victories of the people’s will, it depends on a handful of rulers whether or not streams of the people’s blood shall be shed in fratricidal battles of nation against nation, of people who languish under the same burdens and who long for the same emancipation.

“Enjoyments exist for but a small minority, which, indeed, indulges in them to the fullest measure and in the most refined manner. The great mass of the people, on the other hand, suffer in misery and ignorance—here groaning under unbearable burdens, there racked by hunger, and languishing everywhere in the darkness of prejudices and in the superstitious belief that their slavery can never end.

“If you want particulars, see how the gambling on the stock exchange plays havoc and mischief, how both abundance and hunger are at the will of powerful financiers beside whose mountains of gold there abide ruin and malicious bankruptcy. In industry unbridled competition holds down the working man and destroys any sensible relationship between production and consumption. A shortage of hands for the necessary, but an abundance of the unnecessary; while millions of poor children go about without a stitch to cover their bodies, shawls of a preposterous price, costing more than 10,000 working days, are displayed at world exhibitions. The working man does not earn enough even for the bare necessities, while the world teems with over-satiated idlers.

“The old world went under because the thorn of slavery stuck in its flesh; if the modern age cares as little for the suffering of the masses, if it forces them to work without respite, to suffer, if it denies them the necessities so that a few may live in luxury and pleasure, if the modern age refuses to see that such a state of society is altogether outrageous, its end, too, will not be far distant.

“Dr. W. Palley, from Oxford University, says in the newspaper, *La Coopération*, of this May<sup>a</sup>:

“Think of a flock of pigeons in a cornfield. Instead of picking away, ninety-nine of them consume nothing but the straw and chaff, while gathering the corn in a large heap expressly for just one pigeon, often the weakest and the most pitiful of all; this one struts clucking, gorging itself, stamping and spoiling, while the hard-working ones stand in a ring and look on good-naturedly; suddenly one of their number, possibly braver or perhaps hungrier than its brethren, ventures to snap away a grain; now all the rest throw themselves upon the malefactor out of blind submissiveness to pull it about, to recover the plunder, to drive it out of their community.’

“Glance at this picture. You will, of course, find that this cannot occur in nature, but is repeated a hundredfold every day among human beings who are endowed with reason. The conclusion, however, is twofold. You will conclude

<sup>a</sup> “Correspondance. Travail et Coopération, Londres, 27 avril 1868”, *La Coopération*, No. 18, May 3, 1868.—Ed.

therefrom that man stands above animals by virtue of his reason. *I* say to you, however, that *despite* his reason man can learn a thing or two from animals!

"Does he not belong to those 99, the creature who is born in misery, who hardly ever sees his mother because she must go to her work, who suffers hunger and cold, is exposed to every possible harm, who grows up in filth and from early childhood contracts the germ of the disease that follows him to his grave? He is barely eight, has barely gained a minimum of strength, and off he goes to work—to work in thin, unhealthy air, mistreated, doomed to ignorance, and laid open by bad examples to every possible vice. So it proceeds until the child is older. Now, at 20, the lad must leave his parents, who need him, so as to be robbed of his humanity in some soldiers' barracks or to be shot dead on some battlefield. If he escapes with his life, he may marry (provided he is allowed to do so by the English philanthropist *Malthus* or the French minister *Duchâtel*, who happen to think that a workman needs neither wife nor family, that no one forces him to stay alive if he cannot provide for himself). So he marries, and soon poverty, privation, unemployment, disease, and children move into his house. And when now, seeing the misery of his own, he ventures to demand a fair wage, he is tied hand and foot by hunger as in Preston, shot down as in Charleroi, put behind bars as in Bologna, subjected to a state of siege as in Catalonia, or bundled before a court as in Paris....

"So the wretch trudges on along the road of suffering and humiliation. At a mature age, without a comforting memory of his youth, he is startled to find that old age is creeping up; should he have no family or only a poor one, he will finally die like an evil-doer in an institution for beggars.

"Yet the man produced four times as much as he consumed. What has society done with the surplus? Ask the hundredth pigeon—the one that does nothing at all and lives off the labour of the other 99.

"History shows us that any nation or social organisation that strays off the path of strict justice and follows that of injustice, falls prey to decay and dissolution; and precisely this is the solace we can derive with certainty from the lessons of the past at this time of luxury and misery, coercion and slavery, ignorance and stultification, demoralisation and degeneracy, for so long as a human being can starve to death on the threshold of a palace crammed with treasure, the state institutions remain unstable.

"Feel the pulse of our time: you will discover a muted resentment between the class that wants to hang on to everything and the class that wants to regain the fruit of its industry. The crass superstitions which, we thought, had been erased by the 18th century, are coming back to the surface; wanton egoism and dissolution everywhere. Those are signs of decay. The ground is reeling and slipping from under your feet: Beware!

"The class that has so far only appeared on and off on the world stage to perform some great act of justice, suppressed at all times and under all governments, the class of labour, now offers you a means of revival. Be wise and acknowledge its legitimacy; do not interfere with its cause, which is beneficial for all. Only the breath of absolute freedom can clear the air and drive away the clouds that threaten us....

"Once a class forfeits the moral superiority that put it in power, it must step off the stage if it wants to avoid the atrocities that are the last resort of all perishing regimes. Let the bourgeoisie comprehend that its strivings are not great enough to meet all the needs of the times and that it can therefore do nothing but dissolve itself in the younger class that is ringing in a powerful political rebirth, equality, and solidarity through freedom."

The sentence of the court for each of the nine accused was 3 months in prison and a fine of 100 francs; the convicted filed an appeal, which was eventually dismissed.

---

Apart from its social significance, the French government's persecution of the International Working Men's Association has political implications, too. For the first time since the coup d'état of 1852,<sup>438</sup> a society existing in France has dared to offer resistance under civil law to criminal prosecution and to claim civil rights for itself which the one who was elected by universal suffrage could not very well deny it through his organs without bringing his many years of flirting with the working class to a sudden end. It is safe to assume that the prosecution originated with Minister of State *Rouher*. But so great was his embarrassment over the imaginary need for action on political grounds that, while prosecuting the Paris Bureau, he has not dared to dissolve groups of the Association in Lyons, Rouen, Roubaix, Bordeaux, Marseilles, and so on.

The Paris newspaper *Le Réveil*, organ of *Ledru Rollin's* party, refers most approvingly to the behaviour of the members of the Paris Committee.<sup>a</sup> It contrasts the political insight and moral superiority of the working class to the intrigues and narrow-mindedness of the ruling classes. It makes the following noteworthy observation:

"It is to the union of ideas and sentiments that prevails amongst the working men of the different countries of Europe that we trust for the maintenance of peace. In a few days the Congress of the International Association is going to assemble. All the countries of Europe will be represented there, perhaps with the exception of France, and will it be too much to say that by the wisdom of its resolutions this assembly of all the European delegates of labour may become the Amphitryonite council of Europe? Yes; if to-morrow, by mastering the immortal principles of the French revolution, and taking in hand the sacred interests of labour, which comprehend order, security, and liberty, this Congress decreed peace, the word would be received with enthusiasm by all Europe."

## 2. Conflict with the Belgian Government

Spurred by the newspapers of the Belgian bourgeoisie, with *Indépendance belge* at their head, the Belgian government tried to

<sup>a</sup> Ch. Delescluze, "Le droit d'Association. Devant la justice", *Le Réveil*, No. 2, July 9, 1868.—Ed.

portray the International Working Men's Association as the *instigator* of the disturbances in the district of Charleroi.<sup>a</sup> The court investigation of the Belgian workers arrested in March soon showed, however, that this charge was groundless and that from the outset it had been nothing but a deliberate and malicious lie.

Nevertheless, in May 1868, *Jules Bara*, the Belgian Minister of Justice and Police, took advantage of the debate concerning the *renewal of the law on the expulsion of foreigners*<sup>439</sup> in the Belgian Chamber of Deputies viciously to attack the International Working Men's Association,<sup>b</sup> to make of its existence the principal pretext for the proposed renewal of the foreigners' law, and to go so far as to declare that *he would not tolerate the convocation of the next general congress of the Association*, which had at its congress in Lausanne appointed it for Brussels on September 7, 1868.<sup>c</sup>

Thereupon, the administrative committees of the Brussels and all the other groups of the International Association in Belgium wrote a joint letter to *M. le Ministre*, dated May the 22nd, which was printed and made public.<sup>d</sup> The letter made clear to the Minister that he had absolutely no say in the matter, and that *the Congress would be held in Brussels*. The opening passages of this irreverent letter read:

"M. le Ministre, the undersigned send you their thanks for the great service you have rendered their cause by taking it up at a sitting of the Chamber and thereby allowing the parliamentary records to be used for the dissemination of our principles.

"It appears that you scorn us no longer. For a long time your newspapers glossed over in silence the successes of the Association in this country; like the ostrich, you shut your eyes to escape the danger. Yet today you have to consider us a power. You have given us official consecration, and recognise by your attitude that we oppose you as a power....

"But you are reluctant to admit that you and your like are unpopular in Belgium, and when a foreigner comes to assist our Association you hasten to lay the blame for everything done here at his door."

Then, having firmly denied the Minister's insinuations that the movement of the Belgian workers was inspired and led from abroad, the letter went on to say:

"You should be aware, M. le Ministre, that we will not be run by a man any more than by a cask of gin. We are perfectly capable of acting on our own, and our

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 14.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See Jules Bara's speech in the Chamber of Deputies on May 16, 1868, *La Voix de l'Avenir*, No. 23, June 7, 1868; *La Liberté*, No. 47, May 17, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The Brussels Congress took place from September 6th to 13th, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> "À Monsieur Bara, ministre de la justice", *La Tribune du peuple*, No. 5, May 24, 1868.—*Ed.*

activity is guided exclusively by the striving for justice, which exists in every honourable consciousness. Having barely come into the world, our league already numbers thousands of followers in our country; all of us are of the same opinion, and all of us are firmly determined to go forward to the common goal—the *emancipation of labour*.

“These ideas seem incredible to you, M. le Ministre; listen to a few others.”

Here the Minister was informed in detail of the aspirations of the International Working Men’s Association, and advised to obtain further particulars from the documents of its Congresses. Then the transgressions of the government were put before him; he was reminded of the workers needlessly killed in the Charleroi district, who were dealt death instead of bread. It was recognised that strikes were an insufficient means of improving the working men’s situation; but they were the only legitimate means labour still had to protest against the abuses of capital. In conclusion, the letter said:

“Yes, M. le Ministre of ‘justice’, we want to achieve the triumph of justice which you have betrayed. Yes, we will do so without you, despite you, and against you....

“You have said you would not tolerate our Congress. Surely, you must have been most aroused, M. le Ministre, when you spoke those absurd words.... For example, you have proclaimed the ‘right of assembly’, and we are eager to see what measures you will employ to breach it with impunity.... Despite all your big talk, the Congress is going to take place in Brussels in September.... One last word: you speak of the flash of lightning that we loosen upon Belgium. But it is you yourself who have called it forth by your rigid authoritarian government. The real thunderstorm is there beside you, yet you fail to notice it.”

At its meeting on June 16, 1868, the General Council of the International Association in London confirmed the decision of the Belgian Committee to hold the Congress in Brussels at the appointed time despite the announced opposition of the government.<sup>440</sup>

The administrative committees in France have also sent messages of agreement, declaring their determination to take part in the Congress at Brussels and to defy the consequences.

The *Courrier français* of Paris commented as follows on the simultaneous attacks on the International Working Men’s Association in Switzerland, France, and Belgium:

“These happenings are very interesting because at this moment the Association is gaining ground on a remarkable scale on the whole of the European continent. Everywhere, reaction is using it as a bit of a scapegoat, and this proves that *everywhere it is considered the vanguard of social reformation.*”

---

## 11. GROWTH OF THE ASSOCIATION

In *England*, some fifty trades unions with their branch societies in the United Kingdom have joined the International Working Men's Association since the resolution of the Trades Union Congress at Sheffield in 1866. Among the new members are workmen's groups, such as the 30,000 railway excavators, which never before participated either in trades unions or in any other movements.

In *Ireland*, a section exists in Dublin.

In the *United States of North America*, the National Labour Congress which met in Chicago resolved on August 20, 1867<sup>a</sup> to establish relations with the International Association for joint action. Since then, the General Council at London has been corresponding with the General National Labour Union of the United States. It will be represented by a special delegate at this year's Congress in Brussels.<sup>441</sup>

In *France* the groups that correspond directly and exclusively with London are great in number. Sections exist in Paris, Rouen, Lyons, Marseilles, Bordeaux, Lille, Roubaix, Argentan (Orne), Caen, Digne (Basses-Alpes), Fleurieux (sur Saône), Fuveau (Bouches-du-Rhône), Flers (Orne), Granville (Manche), Harcourt, Thierry (Calvados), Havre, Lisieux, Neuville (sur Saône), Nantes, Neufchâteau (Vosges), Orléans, Crets (Bouches-du-Rhône), Villefranche (Rhône), Vienne (Isère), and other places. It is noteworthy that several French rural communities have also adhered to the Association. In the French *colonies*, a group exists in Algiers and another in Guadeloupe.

In *Belgium* the main seats of the Association are in Brussels, Liège, Verviers, and Louvain. Mass adherence to the Association has been witnessed among coalminers and ironworkers this year.

In *Holland* two sections exist, in Rotterdam and in Amsterdam.

In *Spain* a section in Barcelona.

In *Italy*, the general association of labour with its main seat in Naples and Milan, consisting of 600 workmen's societies, has the same kind of cartel with the International Association as the trades unions in England and the National Labour Union in the United States. Besides, special groups of the International Association exist in Genoa and Bologna.

In *Switzerland* working men have been seeking admission *en masse* since the Geneva strike. The main groups are in the towns

---

<sup>a</sup> In Eichhoff's pamphlet mistakenly: "1866".—*Ed.*



of the Basle and Berne cantons, where communities in the *villages de la montagne des Bois* have also adhered; Geneva, where the society in the city alone numbers more than 6,000 members, and the cantons Neuchâtel, Vaud, and Zurich. The Swiss Grütli Union<sup>442</sup> and the various German workers' educational societies in Switzerland are affiliated to the Association.

In *Germany* there are several groups. But most of these have declared that despite their sympathies they are unable to join officially owing to *the absence of legal authorisation*.<sup>443</sup> The connections with Germany are therefore still deficient. The special Central Bureau for Germany is the same as that for the German-speaking Swiss, and is located at Geneva under *Joh. Phil. Becker* at Pré-l'Évêque 33. In the General Council at London, Germany is represented by *Karl Marx*, Secretary for Germany, resident at 1 Modena Villas, Maitland Park, Haverstock Hill, London N. W., and by *George Eccarius*, General Secretary of the Association.

The periodicals of the Association are:

*The Bee-Hive Newspaper* in London.

*The Workmen's Advocate* in Chicago.

*Le Courrier Français* in Paris. *Le Siècle*, *La Liberté*, and *L'Opinion Publique* also publish the resolutions and other material of the Association.

The *democratic* organs in Lyons, Rouen, Bordeaux, and other cities.

*La Voix de l'Avenir* in Lausanne.

*Der Vorbote* in Geneva.

The *Demokratische Wochenblatt* in Leipzig, which, though not an organ of the Association, voices its principles.

*La Tribune du peuple*, *La Liberté*, *L'Espègle*, *Le Devoir*, *Le Mirabeau*, *La Cigale*, *l'Ingenu*, *Le Peuple Belge*, all in Belgium (Brussels, Verviers, and elsewhere).

Finally, the labour newspapers in Italy.

---

## CONCLUSION

The author has one more pleasant duty to perform before he takes leave of the German workers, to whom this book is dedicated.

Under the heading, "The Eight Hours Movement", the *Kölnische Zeitung* of July 19, 1868, carried the following heartening report:

"Agitation that was being conducted in the United States in the past few years has suddenly been crowned with complete success, due less to its own intrinsic merit than to the coincidence of external circumstances which influenced the legislature. Once before, the working time in governmental workshops and factories was reduced from twelve to ten hours a day. Not content, the workers demanded a further reduction, to eight hours (and, mind you, without any reduction in the existing wages, whence the name, "THE EIGHT HOURS MOVEMENT"). Congress repeatedly dismissed this demand, but has not dared to consign a renewed motion to the same fate. For both parties need the workers' votes in the coming presidential elections, and neither of them, probably against its innermost conviction to the contrary, wishes to affront the movement and incur the discontent of those numerous voters. In England, too, a part of the workers have written a slogan on their banner that smacks of a play on words: 'Eight hours' work, eight hours' rest, eight hours' sleep, and eight shillings' wage.' As long as the said movement keeps within the pale of the law and as long as no intimidation and no illicit pressure are applied against the workers who think for themselves and want their labour power to be used as they themselves deem right, the authorities will have to, and will prefer to, allow the agitation to follow its natural course. The all-powerful unwritten law that regulates supply and demand will eventually make itself felt here as well."

That the *Kölnische Zeitung*, an organ of the German bourgeoisie, is not particularly delighted over the unexpected success of the eight hours movement in America, should surprise no one who, like that paper, believes in the "omnipotence" of the "unwritten" law of supply and demand.

The *New-Yorker Handelszeitung*, too, is right from the standpoint of "supply and demand" when it testily declares:

"We can only deplore this decision, which reeks of demagoguery. Both Houses of Congress have fixed the working time in governmental workshops at eight hours without changing the wages, and the President has promptly signed the Act. In other words, the national authorities have introduced the eight-hour system. They are entitled to do so: the master can set the working time in his establishments. But by doing so they have sanctioned agitation that is without rhyme or reason. And they know it. Generally speaking, legislation has as little to do with regulating the relationship between the working man and the employer as it has with how often the noble and free citizen of this Republic should put on a fresh shirt or if he should go through life in whole or torn stockings; and if the attempt to immobilise one-fifth of the productive forces is really timely, is surely also open to question. A man who wanted to win the favour of the blind part of the labouring masses threw in a firebrand, and within sight of the coming national elections no one wanted to run the danger of burning his fingers on it. The price of labour as that of any other commodity is regulated by the relationship between supply and demand. If the legislature wishes to deal with the matter, it is bound to make a fool of itself. That the gentlemen Representatives and Senators fail to see this cannot be possible. To our great surprise, even a man like Senator *Sumner* has given vent to a lot of fine words about the workers' educational needs allegedly being served in

this way—words of whose total lack of meaning he himself must have been profoundly aware. Only he is a friend of the people who does not shrink from telling them the truth even in peril of doing himself damage. Once the elections are over, the workers will notice that they have been deceived.”

The immediate future will show if the eight hours movement is “without rhyme or reason” and if the American workers will notice that they “have been deceived” once the presidential elections are over.

For Europe that question is secondary compared to the great event that the legislature of the United States has sanctioned the eight hours movement.<sup>444</sup>

The consequences will not be long in coming. From the workshops and factories of the United States government the eight-hour principle will make its way forward and gain recognition as a moral and legitimate demand of the working class everywhere in America, England and the European continent—wherever to this day the belief in the “omnipotence” of supply and demand has raised the duration of the working day to the limits of human endurance and pressed down wages to the lowest limits of the worker’s needs.

Now we are beginning to witness what *Karl Marx*, that painstaking explorer of and authority on social conditions, prophesied on July 25, 1867:

“As in the 18th century, the American War of Independence sounded the tocsin for the European middle class, so in the 19th century, the American Civil War sounded it for the European working class.”<sup>a</sup>

Written in July 1868

First published as a separate pamphlet in August 1868 under the title, *Die Internationale Arbeiterassoziation. Ihre Gründung, Organisation, politisch-soziale Thätigkeit und Ausbreitung*

Printed according to the text of the pamphlet

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, Preface to the First Edition of the First Volume of *Capital*.—Ed.

## RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECH ON THE SUCCESSES OF THE INTERNATIONAL IN GERMANY AND FRANCE<sup>445</sup>

FROM THE NEWSPAPER REPORT  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF JULY 21, 1868

A letter from Germany announced that the Working-Men's Unions of the Southern States of Germany<sup>446</sup> are going to hold a Congress at Nürnberg in the first week of September. The first question to be decided by that Congress is the adhesion of the whole federation to the International Working-Men's Association.

Attention was called to an article in *Le Réveil*, a new paper, published by the friends of Ledru-Rollin at Paris, in which the attitude of the members of the Paris Committee is approvingly commented upon, and the political sagacity and the superior moral conduct of the working classes of Europe, contrasted with the intriguing stupidity of the ruling classes. The article contains the following remarkable passage:

"It is to the union of ideas and sentiments that prevails amongst the working men of the different countries of Europe that we trust for the maintenance of peace. In a few days the Congress of the International Association is going to assemble. All the countries of Europe will be represented there, perhaps with the exception of France, and will it be too much to say that by the wisdom of its resolutions this assembly of all the European delegates of labour may become the Amphitryonite council of Europe? Yes; if to-morrow, by mastering the immortal principles of the French revolution, and taking in hand the sacred interests of labour, which comprehend order, security, and liberty, this Congress decreed peace, the word would be received with enthusiasm by all Europe."<sup>a</sup>

First published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 353, July 25, 1868

Reproduced from the newspaper

---

<sup>a</sup> Ch. Delescluze, "Le droit d'Association. Devant la justice", *Le Réveil*, No. 2, July 9, 1868.—*Ed.*

## RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECH ON THE CONSEQUENCES OF USING MACHINERY UNDER CAPITALISM<sup>447</sup>

FROM THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF JULY 28, 1868

The discussion of the proposition, "The influence of machinery in the hands of capitalists", was opened by Citizen Marx. He said what strikes us most is that all the consequences which were expected as the inevitable result of machinery have been reversed. Instead of diminishing the hours of labour, the working day was prolonged to sixteen and eighteen hours. Formerly, the normal working day was ten hours, during the last century the hours of labour were increased by law here as well as on the Continent. The whole of the trade legislation of the last century turns upon compelling the working people by law to work longer hours.

It was not until 1833 that the hours of labour for children were limited to twelve.<sup>a</sup> In consequence of overwork there was no time left whatever for mental culture. They also became physically deteriorated; contagious fevers broke out amongst them, and this induced a portion of the upper class to take the matter up. The first Sir Robert Peel was one of the foremost in calling attention to the crying evil, and Robert Owen was the first mill-owner who limited the hours of labour in his factory. The ten hours' bill was the first law which limited the hours of labour to ten and a half per day for women and children, but it applied only to certain factories.<sup>448</sup>

This was a step of progress, in so far as it afforded more leisure time to the work-people. With regard to production, the limitation has long since been overtaken. By improved machinery and increased intensity of the labour of individuals there is now more

---

<sup>a</sup> By "An Act to Regulate the Labour of Children and Young Persons in the Mills and Factories of the United Kingdom. August 29, 1833".—*Ed.*

work done in the short day than formerly in the long day. People are again overworked, and it will soon become necessary to limit the working day to eight hours.

Another consequence of the use of machinery was to force women and children into the factory. The woman has thus become an active agent in our social production. Formerly female and children's labour was carried on within the family circle. I do not say that it is wrong that women and children should participate in our social production. I think every child above the age of nine ought to be employed at productive labour a portion of its time, but the way in which they are made to work under existing circumstances is abominable.

Another consequence of the use of machinery was that it entirely changed the relations of the capital of the country. Formerly there were wealthy employers of labour, and poor labourers who worked with their own tools. They were to a certain extent free agents, who had it in their power effectually to resist their employers. For the modern factory operative, for the women and children, such freedom does not exist, they are slaves of capital.

There was a constant cry for some invention that might render the capitalist independent of the working man; the spinning machine and power-loom has rendered him independent, it has transferred the motive power of production into his hands. By this the power of the capitalist has been immensely increased. The factory lord has become a penal legislator within his own establishment, inflicting fines at will, frequently for his own aggrandisement. The feudal baron in his dealings with his serfs was bound by traditions and subject to certain definite rules; the factory lord is subject to no controlling agency of any kind.

One of the great results of machinery is organised labour which must bear fruit sooner or later. The influence of machinery upon those with whose labour it enters into competition is directly hostile. Many hand-loom weavers were positively killed by the introduction of the power-loom both here and in India.

We are frequently told that the hardships resulting from machinery are only temporary, but the development of machinery is constant, and if it attracts and gives employment to large numbers at one time it constantly throws large numbers out of employment. There is a continual surplus of displaced population, not as the Malthusian asserts a surplus population in relation to the produce of the country, but a surplus whose labour has been superseded by more productive agencies.

Employed on land machinery produces a constantly increasing surplus population whose employment is not fluctuating. This surplus flocks to the towns and exercises a constant pressure, a wage lowering pressure upon the labour market. The state of the East of London is one of the phenomena it produces.<sup>449</sup>

The real consequences are best seen in those branches of labour in which the machine is not employed.

To conclude for the present, machinery leads on one hand to associated organised labour, on the other to the disintegration of all formerly existing social and family relations.

First published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 354,  
August 1, 1868

Reproduced from the news-  
paper text pasted into the Minute  
Book of the General Council

APPEAL TO THE GERMAN WORKERS IN LONDON<sup>450</sup>

Workers!

On September 7 of this year the third international workers' congress will meet in Brussels.

The congress will discuss the best means of expanding and strengthening the international workers' association and of raising the effectiveness of its joint activities; it will also discuss questions that immediately affect the interests of the working class and call for urgent solution. Finally, mutual agreement should be reached on the methods of propaganda.

The following questions will be put to the congress by the General Council:

1. Reduction and regulation of the working day;
2. The influence of machinery in the hands of the capitalists;
3. The nature of landed property;
4. The education of the working class;
5. Setting up credit institutions to promote the social emancipation of the working class;
6. The best ways of establishing cooperative producers' societies.

We call on you to do everything in your power as associations and individuals to help in this undertaking made imperative by the times and circumstances. It is necessary through voluntary contributions to collect what is needed to allow the German workers in London to be represented by one or more delegates. It would be a disgrace, if, in the present turbulent times, there were not sufficient understanding of their own class interests among the thousands of German workers in London to ensure their representation at the Brussels Congress.



So, to work! It is high time that the workers of all countries unite and understand that a mighty association of all sections of the working class is necessary for a successful struggle against the arbitrary rule of the capitalists.

Let us not forget that in the United States of North America the *eight-hour* working day has already been proclaimed *law* for all government workshops.

Let us also recall those historic meaningful words which Karl Marx wrote in 1867 in the preface to his work *Capital. A Critique of Political Economy*: "As in the 18th century, the American War of Independence sounded the tocsin for the European middle-class, so in the 19th century, the American Civil War sounded it for the European working-class."

Contributions will be received in the German Workers' Educational Society on Mondays, Wednesdays and Saturdays, in the evening from 9 o'clock onwards by the secretary and treasurer. Windsor Castle, 27 Long Acre, W. C.

On behalf of the German Workers' Educational Society,  
German branch of the International Working Men's Association:

*The Executive Committee*

Drawn up on about August 11, 1868  
First published in the *Hermann*, No. 502,  
August 15, 1868

Printed according to the newspaper, checked with Marx's manuscript

## RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECH ON THE REDUCTION OF THE WORKING DAY<sup>451</sup>

FROM THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF AUGUST 11, 1868

Citizen *Marx* could not coincide with Milner,<sup>452</sup> that it [the reduction of the hours of labour] would lead to a diminished production,<sup>a</sup> because where the restrictions had been introduced, the instruments of production had been vastly more developed than in other trades. It had the effect of introducing more machinery, and made production on a small scale more and more impossible, which, however, was necessary to arrive at social production. The sanitary question was settled.<sup>453</sup> But a reduction of the hours of labour was also indispensable to give the working class more time for mental culture. Legislative restrictions were the first step towards the mental and physical elevation and the ultimate emancipation of the working classes. Nobody denied, nowadays, that the State must interfere on behalf of the women and children; and a restriction of their hours led, in most instances, to a reduction of the working time of the men. England had taken the lead, other countries had been obliged to follow to some extent. The agitation had seriously commenced in Germany, and the London Council was looked to for taking the lead. The principle had been decided at former congresses; the time for action had arrived.

First published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 358,  
August 22, 1868

Reproduced from the newspaper  
with corrections introduced into  
the Minute Book

---

<sup>a</sup> The words "diminished production" are inserted in Eccarius' hand in place of the crossed-out words "an increased demand for labour".—*Ed.*

RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECH ON THE INFLUENCE  
OF COMPETITION IN COTTON INDUSTRY  
ON THE CONDITION OF THE WORKING MEN  
IN FRANCE <sup>454</sup>

FROM THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF JANUARY 5, 1869

It appears that the cotton yarns and goods manufacturers of France are forming an alliance with a view of underselling the English manufacturers in their own markets; the French manufacturers admit that although the English manufacturers have better machinery and larger capitals than the French, they have been enabled to hold their own owing to the low wages paid to the men in France and they hope by lowering the wages still more to be able to produce their goods cheaper than the English manufacturers can.

Mr. Bertel, mayor of Sotteville-lès-Rouen and one of the largest manufacturers of the place, was the first to inaugurate this new crusade against the working classes; he offered a reduction of 3<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> pence per day; on the men refusing these terms they were locked out and they have now appealed to the International Working Men's Association for help.

First published in full in Marx and Engels, *Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16, Moscow, 1960

Reproduced from the Minute Book of the General Council

RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECH ON THE CONDITION  
OF THE COALMINERS IN THE COALFIELDS  
OF SAXONY

FROM THE NEWSPAPER REPORT  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF FEBRUARY 23, 1869 <sup>155</sup>

The German secretary<sup>a</sup> read a report on the condition of the coalminers in the kingdom of Saxony. Their wages vary from 6s. to 10s. 3d. a week, for twelve hours labour a day; boys' from 4s. to 5s. a week. Each colliery has a benefit club, to which the men are compelled to contribute, but they have no voice in the administration of the funds; the funds are the lawful property of the coal owners, and the benefits are, without exception, dispensed by the head-managers of the collieries. Sick, relief and superannuation allowances rise in proportion to length of service, but any one leaving his employment, no matter for what reason, loses all claims upon the fund. Thus a man may have contributed to the fund for 30 or 40 years without receiving a farthing in his old age.

An agitation among the miners for better terms has led to the publication of a draft of rules for a united club for all the Saxon collieries. The draft is the work of a committee of colliers presided over by Mr. J. G. Dinter. The chief distinctive features are—

1. All clubs to be consolidated into one.
2. Members not to lose their rights so long as they reside anywhere in Germany and continue to pay their contributions.
3. A general meeting of all adult members to be the supreme authority to elect a general and an executive committee.
4. Masters' contributions to be equal to one-half of those of the men.

This draft, which does not represent the views of the most intelligent colliers, but rather of a section, which would fain to carry out reforms with the consent of the masters, carries on its

---

<sup>a</sup> Marx.—*Ed.*

face the stamp of impracticability. It is really too *naive* to suppose that the masters, who now have complete control of the clubs, will consent to hand the whole management over to a democratic general meeting of working men, and yet continue paying their contributions. To open the eyes of such of the colliers as may still believe in the possibility of reforming the clubs upon the basis of joint contributions of masters and men, the indignant refusal on the part of the masters will be the best means.

First published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 385, February 27, 1869

Reproduced from the newspaper

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
ON THE PROGRAMME OF THE BASLE CONGRESS <sup>456</sup>

Upon the report of the Standing Committee the following was agreed to as the programme of the next Congress:

1. The question of landed property;
2. The right to inheritance;
3. To what extent can credit be immediately utilised by the working class;
4. The question of general education;
5. The influence of trades unions upon the emancipation of the working class.

It was further agreed that the order of proceedings be as follows:

1. Verification of Credentials;
2. Election of Congress officers;
3. Report of the General Council and reports of branches and sections;
4. Discussion of the questions on the programme;
5. Appointment of the seat of the General Council for the ensuing year;
6. Election of the members of the General Council;
7. Appointment of time and place of meeting of the next Congress.

It was further agreed that a notice be appended to the programme stating that the statistical inquiry is still proceeding.

A resolution that the discussion of the questions of the programme commence at the next meeting closed the proceedings.

Adopted by the General Council on June 22, 1869

First published as a leaflet in London

Reproduced from the Minute Book of the General Council, checked against the leaflet text

RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECHES ON LANDED PROPERTY<sup>457</sup>

FROM THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF JULY 6, 1869

## [I]

Cit. *Marx* was of opinion that Milner had not quite understood the nature of the controversy. There was no opposition to the mines and woods being made common property. The injury caused by the accumulation of land in the hands of the few was granted; it was only with regard to arable land that there was any dispute, the opposition came from the partisans of small farming; small property was the point in dispute.

The plea of social necessity was superior to the claim of abstract right. Every thing, every possible form of oppression had been justified by abstract right; it was high time to abandon this mode of agitation. The question was, under what form this right should be realised. There was a social necessity to transform feudal property into peasant property. In England the proprietor has ceased to be a necessity in agriculture.

As for natural right, the animal had a natural right to the soil since it cannot live without it. To push this natural right to its logical consequences would land us at the assertion of every individual to cultivate his own share.

Social right and social necessity determined in what manner the means of subsistence must be procured. Social necessity enforced itself in the course of which factory had arrived, where co-operation was compulsory. The fact that no one could produce anything by himself gave the social necessity for co-operation.

He was not against giving a more emphatic form to the resolutions.

## [II]

The small peasantry is not at the Congresses, but their idealistic representatives are there. The Proudhonists are very strong upon the point and they were at Brussels. The Council is responsible for the resolutions; they were shaped by the Brussels Committee,<sup>458</sup> by men who well knew the opposition they had to deal with. I am not against recasting them. Cit. Weston has only spoken of social necessity. We see that both forms of private property in land have led to bad results. The small man is only a nominal proprietor, but he is the more dangerous because he still fancies that he is a proprietor. In England the land could be transformed into common property by act of Parliament in the course of a fortnight. In France it must be accomplished by means of the proprietors' indebtedness and liability to taxation.

First published in full in Marx and Engels, *Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16, Moscow, 1960

Reproduced from the Minute Book of the General Council



## RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECH ON THE RIGHT TO INHERITANCE <sup>459</sup>

FROM THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF JULY 20, 1869

### I

Cit. *Marx* opened the discussion on the question: The Right to Inheritance. He said the question had been put by the Alliance of Socialist Democrats of Geneva and the Council had accepted it for discussion.<sup>a</sup> The Alliance of Geneva demanded above all the entire abolition of the Right to Inheritance.

There were two forms of inheritance. The testamentary right, or inheritance by will, had come from Rome and had been peculiar to Rome. The father of the Roman family had exercised absolute authority over everything belonging to his household. The Roman family-father must not be compared with the father of a family of the present day. The Roman household had included slaves and clients whose affairs and interests<sup>b</sup> the head had been obliged to defend and maintain in public. There had been a superstition that when this man died his ghost remained as a watch in the house to see that things were done right or to torment if things were managed wrong. In the early times of Rome people had sacrificed to this house-god; even blood-feasts had been celebrated in his honour and to appease his wrath.<sup>c</sup> By and by it had become fashionable to compromise with this spirit by an heir-at-will. It had been the Roman immortality of the soul.<sup>d</sup> The will of the deceased had been perpetuated by a testament, but this testament had not necessarily brought a fortune to the

---

<sup>a</sup> Further the word "because" is crossed out in the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The words "and interests" were inserted between the lines in the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The words "and to appease his wrath" were inserted later.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> This sentence was inserted later. The following words are crossed out: "This contrivance had perpetuated."—*Ed.*

successor who inherited, but the will of the deceased had been looked upon as a religious duty. In course of time these heirs-at-will had laid claim to the fortune too, but even in imperial time had never been allowed more than a fourth by law.<sup>a</sup> That pagan superstition had been transmitted to Christian countries and<sup>b</sup> was the foundation of the right of will as at present existing in England and the United States.

The German right to inheritance was the intestate right, the family right, which treated an estate as a sort of co-proprietorship of which the father of the family was the manager. When this manager died the property fell to all the children. The Germans had known of no other hereditary rights; the Church of Rome had introduced the Roman right and the feudal system had falsified the German right, because feudal property bearing a military charge could not have been divided. The French Revolution had returned to the German right of inheritance. In England we had all sorts of nonsensical things; the individual had the most absolute right to will away his property, even to disinherit his own offspring, and by this rule long after he had ceased to exist.<sup>c</sup> This right of will might be left for the middle class to deal with as it was a point which would work against the aristocracy. In Prussia only a little of a man's property could be willed away.

The working class who had nothing to inherit had no interest in the question.

The Democratic Alliance was going to commence the social revolution with the abolition of the right to inheritance. He asked would it be policy to do so?

The proposition was not new. St. Simon had proposed it in 1830.<sup>460</sup>

As an economical measure it would avail nothing. It would cause so much irritation that it would be sure to raise an almost insurmountable opposition which would inevitably lead to reaction. If at the time of a revolution it was proclaimed, he did not believe that the general state of intelligence would warrant its being sustained. Besides, if the working class had sufficient power to abolish the right to inheritance, it would be powerful enough to

---

<sup>a</sup> The words "by law" were inserted later. The following words are then crossed out: "Upon this superstition was the right of will founded."—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The words "pagan" and "had been transmitted to Christian countries and" were inserted later.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Further the following sentence is crossed out: "It was what kept the aristocracy in its present position and could be left to the middle class."—*Ed.*

proceed to expropriation which would be a much simpler and more efficient process.

To abolish the right to the inheritance of land in England would involve the hereditary functions connected with the land, the House of Lords, etc., and 15,000 lords and 15,000 ladies would have to die before it became available. If, on the contrary, a working men's parliament decreed that the rent should be paid into the treasury instead of to the landlord, the Government would obtain a fund at once<sup>a</sup> without any social disturbance, while by abolishing the right to inheritance everything would be disturbed and nothing got.

Our efforts must be directed to the end that no instruments of production should be private property. The private property in these things was a fiction, since the proprietors could not use them themselves; they only gave them dominion over them, by which they compelled other people to work for them. In a semi-barbarous state this might have been necessary, but it was no longer so. All the means of labour must be socialised, so that every man had a right and the means to exercise his labour power. If we had such a state of things the right to inheritance would be of no use. As long as we had not, the family right to inheritance could not be abolished. The chief aim of people in saving for their children was to ensure them the means of subsistence. If a man's children were provided for after his death he would not care about leaving them wherewith to get a living, but as long as this was not the case it would only result in hardships, it would irritate and frighten people and do no good. Instead of the beginning it could only be the end of a social revolution. The beginning must be to get the means to socialise the means of labour.

The testamentary right to inheritance was obnoxious to the middle class; with this the state could safely interfere any time. We had legacy-duties already, all we had to do was to increase them and make them progressive, as well as the income-tax, leaving the smaller amounts, £50 for instance, free. Insofar only it was a working-class question.

All that was connected with the present state of things would have to be transformed, but if testaments were suppressed they would be avoided by gifts during life, therefore it would be better to tolerate them on certain conditions than do worse. First the

---

<sup>a</sup> Further the words "by abolishing" are crossed out in the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

means for a transformed state of things must be got, then the right would disappear of itself.<sup>a</sup>

## II

Cit. *Marx* replied: if the state had the power to appropriate the land, inheritance was gone. To declare the abolition of inheritance would be foolish. If a revolution occurred, expropriation could be carried; if there was no power to do that, the right to inheritance would not be abolished.

First published in Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16,  
Moscow, 1960

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

---

<sup>a</sup> Further, in the Minute Book, comes the record of speeches by Milner and Lucraft (the Chairman); after them Marx again took the floor.—*Ed.*

RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECHES  
ON GENERAL EDUCATION<sup>461</sup>FROM THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETINGS  
OF AUGUST 10 AND 17, 1869

## [I]

Cit. *Marx* said there was a peculiar difficulty connected with this question. On the one hand a change of social circumstances was required to establish a proper system of education, on the other hand a proper system of education was required to bring about a change of social circumstances; we must therefore commence where we were.

The question treated at the congresses was whether education was to be national or private.<sup>462</sup> National education had been looked upon as governmental, but that was not necessarily the case. In Massachusetts every township was bound to provide schools for primary education for all the children. In towns of more than 5,000 inhabitants higher schools for technical education had to be provided, in larger towns still higher. The state contributed something but not much. In Massachusetts one-eighth of the local taxes went for education, in New York one-fifth. The school committees who administered the schools were local, they appointed the schoolmasters and selected the books. The fault of the American system was that it was too much localised, the education given depended upon the state of culture prevailing in each district. There was a cry for a central supervision. The taxation for schools was compulsory, but the attendance of children was not. Property had to pay the taxes and the people who paid the taxes wanted that the money was usefully applied.

Education might be national without being governmental. Government might appoint inspectors whose duty it was to see that the laws were obeyed, just as the factory inspectors looked after the observance of the factory acts, without any power of interfering with the course of education itself.

The Congress might without hesitation adopt that education was to be compulsory. As to children being prevented from working, one thing was certain: it would not reduce wages and people would get used to it.

The Proudhonists maintained that gratuitous education was nonsense, because the state had to pay for it; of course somebody had to pay, but not those who could least afford it. Was not in favour of gratuitous college education.

As Prussian education had been talked so much of he would conclude by observing that the Prussian system was only calculated to make good soldiers.

## [II]

Cit. *Marx* said: upon certain points we were unanimous.

The discussion had started with the proposition to reaffirm the Geneva resolution which demanded that mental education should be combined with bodily labour, with gymnastics and technological training<sup>a</sup>; nothing had been said against that.

The technological training advocated by proletarian writers was meant to compensate for the deficiencies occasioned by the division [of] labour which prevented apprentices from acquiring a thorough knowledge of their business. This had been taken hold of and misconstrued into what the middle class understood by technical education.

As to Mrs. Law's Church budget<sup>463</sup> it would be good policy for the Congress to declare against the Church.

Cit. Milner's proposition<sup>464</sup> was not suitable to be introduced in connection with the schools; it was a kind of education that the young must get from the adults in the everyday struggle of life. He could not accept Warren as a bible, it was a question upon which few could agree. We might add that such education cannot be given at school, but must be given by adults.

Nothing could be introduced either in primary or higher schools that admitted of party and class interpretation. Only subjects such as the physical sciences, grammar, etc., were fit matter for schools. The rules of grammar, for instance, could not differ, whether explained by a religious Tory or a free thinker. Subjects that admitted of different conclusions must be excluded and left for

---

<sup>a</sup> *The International Working Men's Association. Resolutions of the Congress of Geneva, 1866, and the Congress of Brussels, 1868*, London [1869], pp. 5-7.—Ed.

the adults to such teachers as Mrs. Law, who gave instruction in religion.<sup>a</sup>

The abolition of the army<sup>465</sup> had been resolved by the Brussels Congress.<sup>b</sup>

It was not advisable to bring it on again.

First published in full in Marx and Engels, *Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16, Moscow, 1960

Reproduced from the Minute Book of the General Council

---

<sup>a</sup> In the report of the General Council meeting of August 17, 1869 published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 410, August 21, 1869 this part of Marx's speech is given as follows: "As to political economy, religion and other questions, they could not be admitted into the primary, nor even the higher schools; that was a kind of education which must rest with the adult, and must be left to the lecture room, to such schoolmasters as Mrs. Law."—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *The International Working Men's Association. Resolutions of the Congress of Geneva, 1866, and the Congress of Brussels, 1868*, London [1869], p. 14.—*Ed.*

ADDRESS OF THE LAND AND LABOUR LEAGUE  
TO THE WORKING MEN AND WOMEN  
OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND<sup>466</sup>

Fellow-Workers,

The fond hopes held out to the toiling and suffering millions of this country thirty years ago have not been realised. They were told that the removal of fiscal restrictions would make the lot of the labouring poor easy; if it could not render them happy and contented it would at least banish starvation for ever from their midst.

They rose a terrible commotion for the big loaf,<sup>467</sup> the landlords became rampant, the money lords confounded, the factory lords rejoiced—their will was done—Protection received the *coup de grâce*. A period of the most marvellous prosperity followed. At first the Tories threatened to reverse the policy, but on mounting the ministerial benches, in 1852, instead of carrying out their threat, they joined the chorus in praise of unlimited competition. Prepared for a pecuniary loss they discovered to their utter astonishment that the rent-roll was swelling at the rate of more than £2,000,000 a year. Never in the history of the human race was there so much wealth—means to satisfy the wants of man—produced by so few hands, and in so short a time, as since the abolition of the Corn Laws. During the lapse of twenty years the declared value of the annual exports of British and Irish produce and manufactures—the fruits of your own labour—rose from £60,000,000 to £188,900,000. In twenty years the taxable income of the lords and ladies of the British soil increased, upon their own confession, from £98,000,000 to £140,000,000 a year; that of the chiefs of trades and professions from £60,000,000 to



£110,000,000 a year. Could human efforts accomplish more?

Alas! there are stepchildren in Britania's family. No Chancellor of the Exchequer has yet divulged the secret how the £140,000,000 are distributed amongst the territorial magnates, but we know all about the trades-folk. The special favourites increased from sixteen, in 1846, to one hundred and thirty-three, in 1866. Their average annual income rose from £74,300 to £100,600 each. They appropriated one-fourth of the twenty years' increase. The next of kin increased from three hundred and nineteen to nine hundred and fifty-nine individuals: their average annual income rose from £17,700 to £19,300 each: they appropriated another fourth. The remaining half was distributed amongst three hundred and forty-six thousand and forty-eight respectables, whose annual income ranged between £100 and £10,000 sterling. The toiling millions, the producers of that wealth—Britania's cinderellas—got cuffs and kicks instead of halfpence.

In the year 1864 the taxable income under schedule D<sup>468</sup> increased by £9,200,000. Of that increase the metropolis, with less than an eighth of the population, absorbed £4,266,000, nearly a half. £3,123,000 of that, more than a third of the increase of Great Britain, was absorbed by the City of London, by the favourites of the one hundred and seventy-ninth part of the British population: Mile End and the Tower, with a working population four times as numerous, got £175,000. The citizens of London are smothered with gold; the householders of the Tower Hamlets are overwhelmed by poor-rates. The citizens, of course, object to centralisation of poor-rates purely on the principle of local self-government.

During the ten years ending 1861 the operatives employed in the cotton trade increased 12 per cent; their produce 103 per cent. The iron miners increased 6 per cent; the produce of the mines 37 per cent. Twenty thousand iron miners worked for ten mine owners. During the same ten years the agricultural labourers of England and Wales diminished by eighty-eight thousand one hundred and forty-seven, and yet, during that period, several hundred thousand acres of common land were enclosed and transformed into private property to enlarge the estates of the nobility, and the same process is still going on.

In twelve years the rental liable to be rated to the poor in England and Wales rose from £86,700,000 to £118,300,000: the number of adult able-bodied paupers increased from one hundred and forty-four thousand five hundred to one hundred and eighty-five thousand six hundred.

These are no fancy pictures, originating in the wild speculations of hot brained incorrigibles; they are the confessions of landlords and money lords, recorded in their own blue books. One of their experts told the House of Lords the other day that the propertied classes, after faring sumptuously, laid by £150,000,000 a year out of the produce of your labour. A few weeks later the president of the Royal College of Surgeons related to a jury, assembled to inquire into the causes of eight untimely deaths, what he saw in the foul ward of St. Pancras.

Hibernia's favourites too have multiplied, and their income has risen, while a sixth of her toiling sons and daughters perished by famine, and its consequent diseases, and a third of the remainder were evicted, ejected and expatriated by tormenting felonious usurpers.

This period of unparalleled industrial prosperity has landed thousands of our fellow-toilers—honest, unsophisticated, hard-working men and women—in the stone yard and the oakum room<sup>469</sup>; the roast beef of their dreams has turned into skilly. Hundreds of thousands, men, women and children, are wandering about—homeless, degraded outcasts—in the land that gave them birth, crowding the cities and towns, and swarming the highroads in the country in search of work to obtain food and shelter, without being able to find any. Other thousands, more spirited than honest, are walking the treadmill to expiate little thefts, preferring prison discipline to workhouse fare, while the wholesale swindlers are at large, and felonious landlords preside at quarter sessions to administer the laws. Thousands of the young and strong cross the seas, flying from their native firesides, like from an exterminating plague; the old and feeble perish on the roadside of hunger and cold. The hospitals and infirmaries are overcrowded with fever and famine-stricken: death from starvation has become an ordinary every-day occurrence.

All parties are agreed that the sufferings of the labouring poor were never more intense, and misery so widespread, nor the means of satisfying the wants of man ever so abundant as at present. This proves above all that the moral foundation of all civil government, "*that the welfare of the entire community is the highest law, and ought to be the aim and end of all civil legislation*", has been utterly disregarded. Those who preside over the destinies of the nation have either wantonly neglected their primary duty while attending to the special interests of the rich to make them richer, or their social position, their education, their class prejudices have incapacitated them from doing their duty to the community at

large or applying the proper remedies; in either case they have betrayed their trust.

Class government is only possible on the condition that those who are held in subjection are secured against positive want. The ruling classes have failed to secure the industrious wages-labourer in the prime of his life against hunger and death from starvation. Their remedies have signally failed, their promises have not been fulfilled. They promised retrenchment, they have enormously increased the public expenditure instead. They promised to lift the burden of taxation from your shoulders, the rich pay but a fractional part of the increased expenses; the rest is levied upon your necessities—even your pawn tickets are taxed—to keep up a standing army, drawn from your own ranks, to shoot you down if you show signs of disaffection. They promised to minimise pauperism: they have made indigence and destitution your average condition—the big loaf has dwindled into no loaf. Every remedy they have applied has but aggravated the evil, and they have no other to suggest,—their rule is doomed. To continue is to involve all in a common ruin. There is but one,—and only one,—remedy. Help Yourselves! Determine that you will not endure this abominable state of things any longer; act up to your determination, and it will vanish.

A few weeks ago a score of London working men talked the matter over. They came to the conclusion that the present economical basis of society was the foundation of all the existing evils,—that nothing short of a transformation of the existing social and political arrangements could avail, and that such a transformation could only be effected by the toiling millions themselves. They embodied their conclusions in a series of resolutions, and called a conference of representative working men, to whom they were submitted for consideration. In three consecutive meetings those resolutions were discussed and unanimously adopted. To carry them out a new working men's organisation, under the title of the "*Land and Labour League*", was established. An executive council of upwards of forty well-known representative working men was appointed to draw up a platform of principles arising out of the preliminary resolutions adopted by the conference, to serve as the programme of agitation by means of which a radical change can be effected.

After mature consideration the Council agreed to the following:

1. Nationalisation of the Land.
2. Home Colonisation.
3. National, Secular, Gratuitous and Compulsory Education.

4. Suppression of Private Banks of Issue. The State Only to Issue Paper Money.

5. A Direct and Progressive Property Tax, in Lieu of All Other Taxes.

6. Liquidation of the National Debt.

7. Abolition of the Standing Army.

8. Reduction of the Number of the Hours of Labour.

9. Equal Electoral Rights, with Payment of Members.

The success of our efforts will depend upon the pressure that can be brought to bear upon the powers that be, and this requires numbers, union, organisation and combination. We therefore call upon you to unite, organise and combine, and raise the cry throughout Ireland, Scotland, Wales and England, "*The Land for the People*"—the rightful inheritors of nature's gifts. No rational state of society can leave the land, which is the source of life, under the control of, and subject to the whims and caprices of, a few private individuals. A government elected by, and as trustee for, the whole people is the only power that can manage it for the benefit of the entire community.

Insist upon the State reclaiming the unoccupied lands as a beginning of its nationalisation, and placing the unemployed upon it. Let not another acre of common land be enclosed for the private purposes of non-producers. Compel the Government to employ the army, until its final dissolution, as a pioneer force to weed, drain and level the wastes for cultivation, instead of forming encampments to prepare for the destruction of life. If green fields and kitchen gardens are incompatible with the noble sport of hunting let the hunters emigrate.

Make the Nine points of the League the Labour programme, the touchstone by which you test the quality of candidates for parliamentary honours, and if you find them spurious reject them like a counterfeit coin, for he who is not for them is against you.

You are swindled out of the fruits of your toil by land laws, money laws, and all sorts of laws. Out of the paltry pittance that is left you, you have to pay the interest of a debt that was incurred to keep your predecessors in subjection; you have to maintain a standing army that serves no other purpose in your generation, and you are systematically overworked when employed, and underfed at all times. Nothing but a series of such radical reforms as indicated on our programme will ever lift you out of the slough of despond in which you are at present sunk. The difficulty can be overcome by unity of purpose and action. We are many; our opponents are few. Then, working men and women of all creeds

and occupations, claim your rights as with one voice, and rally round, and unite your forces under, the banner of the "*Land and Labour League*" to conquer your own emancipation!

*John Weston*, Treasurer  
*Martin J. Boon* } Secretaries  
*J. George Eccarius*

Drawn up by Eccarius on about  
 November 14, 1869

Reproduced from the pamphlet

Published as a pamphlet, *Address of the  
 Land and Labour League to the Working  
 Men and Women of Great Britain and  
 Ireland*, London, 1869

RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECH ON THE POLICY  
OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT  
WITH RESPECT TO THE IRISH PRISONERS<sup>470</sup>

FROM THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF NOVEMBER 16, 1869

Cit. *Marx* then opened the debate on the attitude of the British Government on the Irish question. He said political amnesty proceeds from two sources: 1. When a government is strong enough by force of arms and public opinion, when the enemy accepts the defeat, as was the case in America,<sup>471</sup> then amnesty is given. 2. When misgovernment is the cause of quarrel and the opposition gains its point, as was the case in Austria and Hungary.<sup>472</sup> Such ought to have been the case in Ireland.

Both Disraeli and Gladstone have said that the government ought to do for Ireland what in other countries a revolution would do. Bright asserted repeatedly that Ireland would always be rife for revolution unless a radical change was made. During the election Gladstone justified the Fenian insurrection and said that every other nation would have revolted under similar circumstances.<sup>a</sup> When taunted in the House he equivocated his fiery declarations against the "policy of conquest"<sup>473</sup> implied that "Ireland ought to be ruled according to Irish ideas".<sup>b</sup> To put an end to the "policy of conquest" he ought to have begun like America and Austria by an amnesty as soon as he became minister. He did nothing. Then the amnesty movement in Ireland by the municipalities. When a deputation was about to start with a petition containing 200,000 signatures for the release of the prisoners he anticipated it by releasing some to prevent the appearance of giving way to Irish pressure. The petition came,<sup>c</sup> it was not got up by Fenians, but he gave no answer. Then it was mooted in the House that the prisoners were infamously treated.<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> See *The Irishman*, No. 4, July 24, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *The Irishman*, Nos. 7, 12 and 13, August 14, September 18 and 25, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 4, July 24, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See J. Gray's inquiry in the House of Commons concerning the treatment of the Irish prisoners, *The Irishman*, No. 3, July 17, 1869.—*Ed.*

In this at least the English Government is impartial; it treats Irish and English alike; there is no country in Europe where political prisoners are treated like in England and Russia. Bruce was obliged to admit the fact.<sup>a</sup> Moore wanted an inquiry<sup>b</sup>; it was refused. Then commenced the popular amnesty movement at Limerick. A meeting was held at which 30,000 people were present and a memorial for the unconditional release was adopted.<sup>c</sup> Meetings were held in all the towns in the North. Then the great meeting was announced in Dublin where 200,000 people attended. It was announced weeks beforehand for the 10th October. The trade societies wanted to go in procession. On the 8th proclamations were issued prohibiting the procession to go through certain streets. Isaac Butt interpreted it as a prohibition of the procession.<sup>d</sup> They went to Fortescue to ask but he was not at home, his Secretary Burke did not know. A letter was left to be replied to; he equivocated.<sup>e</sup> The government wanted a collision. The procession was abandoned and it was found afterwards that the soldiers had been supplied with 40 rounds of shot for the occasion.

After that Gladstone answered the Limerick memorial of August in a roundabout way.<sup>474</sup> He says the proceedings varied much. There were loyal people and others who used bad language demanding as a right what could only be an act of clemency.

It is an act of presumption on the part of a paid public servant to teach a public meeting how to speak.

The next objection is that the prisoners have not abandoned their designs which were cut short by their imprisonment.

How does Gladstone know what their designs were and that they still entertain them? Has he tortured them into a confession? He wants them to renounce their principles, to degrade them morally. Napoleon did [not] ask people to renounce their republican principles before he gave an amnesty and Prussia attached no such conditions.

Then he says the conspiracy still exists in England and America.

If it did, Scotland Yard would soon be down upon it. It is only "disaffection of 700 years' standing".<sup>475</sup> The Irish have declared they would receive unconditional freedom as an act of conciliation.

<sup>a</sup> H. A. Bruce, Speech in the House of Commons of June 4, 1869. *Ibid.*—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "Mr. G. H. Moore's Motion upon the Treatment by England of Irish Political Prisoners", *The Irishman*, No. 1, July 3, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 6, August 7, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 16, October 16, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 17, October 23, 1869.—*Ed.*

Gladstone cannot quell the Fenian conspiracy in America, his conduct promotes it, one paper<sup>a</sup> calls him the Head Centre.<sup>476</sup> He finds fault with the press. He has not the courage to prosecute the press; he wants to make the prisoners responsible. Does he want to keep them as hostages for the good behaviour of the people outside? He says "it has been our desire to carry leniency to the utmost point". This then is the utmost point.

When Mountjoy was crowded with untried prisoners, Dr. M'Donnell wrote letter after letter to Joseph Murray about their treatment. Lord Mayo said afterwards that Murray had suppressed them. M'Donnell then wrote to the inspector of prisons, to a higher official.<sup>b</sup> He was afterwards dismissed and Murray was promoted.<sup>c</sup>

He then says: we have advised the minor offenders to be released; the principal leaders and organisers we could not set free.

This is a positive lie. There were two Americans amongst them who had 15 years each. It was fear for America that made him set them free. Carey was sentenced in 1865 to 5 years, he is in the lunatic asylum, his family wanted him home,<sup>d</sup> he could not upset the government.

He further says: to rise in revolt against the public order has ever been a crime in this country. Only in this country. Jefferson Davis's revolt was right because it was not against the English, the government.<sup>477</sup> He continues, the administration can have no interest except the punishment of crimes.

The administration are the servants of the oppressors of Ireland. He wants the Irish to fall on their knees because an enlightened sovereign and Parliament have done a great act of justice.<sup>e</sup> They were the criminals before the Irish people. But the Irish was the only question upon which Gladstone and Bright could become ministers and catch the dissenters<sup>478</sup> and give the Irish place-hunters an excuse of selling themselves. The church was only the badge of conquest. The badge is removed, but the servitude remains. He states that the government is resolved to continue to remove any grievance, but that they are determined to

<sup>a</sup> *New-York Irish People*.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 7, August 14, 1869.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 19, November 6, 1869.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 20, November 13, 1869.—Ed.

<sup>e</sup> An allusion to Gladstone who said in his reply to the Limerick memorial that "amnesty could only be an act of clemency on the part of the sovereign" (*The Times*, No. 26579, October 23, 1869).—Ed.



give security to life and property and maintain the integrity of the empire.

Life and property are endangered by the English aristocracy. Canada makes her own laws<sup>479</sup> without impairing the integrity of the empire, but the Irish know nothing of their own affairs, they must leave them to Parliament, the same power that has landed them where they are. It is the greatest stupidity to think that the prisoners out of prison could be more dangerous than insulting a whole nation. The old English leaven of the conqueror comes out in the statement: we will grant but you must ask.

In his letter to Isaac Butt he says:

“You remind me that I once pleaded for foreigners.<sup>a</sup> Can the two cases correspond? The Fenians were tried according to lawful custom and found guilty by a jury of their countrymen. The prisoners of Naples were arrested and not tried and when they were tried they were tried by exceptional tribunals and sentenced by judges who depended upon the government for bread.”<sup>b</sup>

If a poacher is tried by a jury of country squires he is tried by his countrymen. It is notorious that the Irish juries are made up of purveyors to the castle whose bread depends upon their verdict. Oppression is always a lawful custom. In England the judges can be independent, in Ireland they cannot. Their promotion depends upon how they serve the government. Sullivan the prosecutor has been made master of the rolls.

To the Ancient Order of Foresters in Dublin he answered that he was not aware that he had given a pledge that Ireland was to be governed according to Irish ideas.<sup>480</sup> And after all this he comes to Guild-Hall and complains that he is inadequate for the task.<sup>c</sup>

The upshot is that all the tenant right meetings are broken up; they want the prisoners [released]. They have broken with the clerical party. They now demand that Ireland is to govern herself. Moore and Butt have declared for it.<sup>d</sup> They have resolved to liberate O'Donovan Rossa by electing him a member of Parliament.<sup>e 481</sup>

First published in full in Marx and Engels, *Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16, Moscow, 1960

Reproduced from the Minute Book of the General Council

<sup>a</sup> A reference to Gladstone's pamphlet *Two Letters to the Earl of Aberdeen on the State Persecutions of the Neapolitan Government*, published in London in 1851.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *The Times*, No. 26583, October 27, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 20, November 13, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> This sentence was inserted between the lines of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The next sentence in the Minutes reads: “Cit. Marx ended by proposing the following resolution” (see this volume, p. 83).—*Ed.*

RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECHES ON THE POLICY  
OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT WITH RESPECT  
TO THE IRISH PRISONERS

FROM THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETINGS  
OF NOVEMBER 23 AND 30, 1869

[1]

Cit. *Marx*. Cit. Mottershead has given a history of Gladstone. I could give another, but that has nothing to do with the question before us. The petitions which were adopted at the meetings were quite civil, but he found fault with the speeches by which they were supported. Castlereagh was as good a man as Gladstone and I found today in the *Political Register*<sup>482</sup> that he used the same words against the Irish as Gladstone, and Cobbett made the same reply as I have done.

When the electoral tour commenced all the Irish candidates spouted about amnesty, but Gladstone did nothing till the Irish municipalities moved.

I have not spoken of the people killed abroad, because you cannot compare the Hungarian war with the Fenian insurrection. We might compare it with 1798<sup>483</sup> and then the comparison would not be favourable to the English.

I repeat that political prisoners are not treated anywhere so bad as in England.

Cit. Mottershead is not going to tell us his opinion of the Irish; if he wants to know what other people think of the English let him read Ledru-Rollin<sup>a</sup> and other Continental writers. I have always defended the English and do so still.

These resolutions<sup>b</sup> are not to be passed to release the prisoners, the Irish themselves have abandoned that.

It is a resolution of sympathy with the Irish and a review of the conduct of the government, it may bring the English and the Irish

<sup>a</sup> A. A. Ledru-Rollin, *The Decline of England*, 2nd ed., London, 1850.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, p. 83.—*Ed.*

together. Gladstone has to contend with the opposition of *The Times*, the *Saturday Review*, etc., if we speak out boldly; on the other side, we may support him against an opposition to which he might otherwise have to succumb. He was in office during the Civil War and was responsible for what the government did and if the North was low when he made his declaration, so much the worse for his patriotism.

Cit. Odger is right; if we wanted the prisoners released, this would not be the way to do it, but it is more important to make a concession to the Irish people than to Gladstone....<sup>484</sup>

Cit. *Marx* had no objection to leave out the word "deliberately", as a prime minister must necessarily be considered to do everything deliberately.<sup>485</sup>

## [II]

Cit. *Marx* said if Odger's suggestions were followed the Council would put themselves on an English party standpoint.<sup>486</sup> They could not do that. The Council must show the Irish that they understood the question and the Continent that they showed no favour to the British Government. The Council must treat the Irish like the English would treat the Polish.

First published in full in Marx and Engels, *Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16, Moscow, 1960

Reproduced from the Minute Book of the General Council

## RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECH ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE IRISH QUESTION

FROM THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF DECEMBER 14, 1869

Cit. *Marx* proposed that the Council at its rising should adjourn to January 4th. He said it would not be advisable to discuss the Irish during the holiday weeks when the attendance of members might be small.<sup>487</sup> He considered the solution of the Irish question as the solution of the English, and the English as the solution of the European.

The proposition was agreed to....

First published, in Russian, in the book  
*Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala.*  
1868-1870. *Protokoly*, Moscow, 1964

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

ARTICLES BY JENNY MARX  
ON THE IRISH QUESTION <sup>488</sup>

I

London, February 27, 1870

The *Marseillaise* for February 18 quotes an article from *The Daily News*<sup>a</sup> in which the English paper gives information to the French press concerning the election of O'Donovan Rossa. Since this information is somewhat confused and since partial explanations only serve to throw a false light on the things which they are claiming to elucidate, I should be grateful if you would kindly publish my comments on the article in question.

Firstly, *The Daily News* states that O'Donovan was sentenced by a jury, but it omits to add that in Ireland the juries are composed of minions more or less directly nominated by the government.

Then, in speaking with righteous horror of the TREASON-FELONY, the false liberals of *The Daily News* omit to say that this new category in the English Penal Code was expressly invented to identify the Irish patriots with the vilest of criminals.

Let us take then the case of O'Donovan Rossa. He was one of the editors of *The Irish People*. Like most of the Fenians he was sentenced for having written so-called seditious articles. Consequently the *Marseillaise* was not wrong in drawing an analogy between Rochefort and Rossa.<sup>489</sup>

Why does *The Daily News*, which aims at keeping France informed about the Fenian prisoners, remain silent about the appalling treatment of them? I trust that you will allow me to make up for this prudent silence.

Some time ago O'Donovan was put in a dark cell with his hands chained behind his back. His handcuffs were not removed night

<sup>a</sup> *La Marseillaise*, No. 60, February 18, 1870.—*Ed.*

or day so that he was forced to crouch on the ground to lick his food, gruel made with water. Mr. Pigott, editor of *The Irishman*, learnt about these facts from Rossa who described them to him in the presence of the prison governor and another witness, and published the information in his newspaper,<sup>a</sup> encouraging Mr. Moore, one of the Irish members of the HOUSE OF COMMONS, to request a parliamentary enquiry into what goes on in the prisons.<sup>b</sup> The government strongly opposed this request. Thus, Moore's motion was rejected by 171 votes to 36—a worthy supplement to the voting which crushed the right to suffrage.<sup>c</sup>

And this took place during the ministry of the sanctimonious Gladstone. As you can see the great Liberal leader knows how to mock humanity and justice. There are also Judases who do not wear glasses.

Here is another case which also does England credit. O'Leary, a Fenian prisoner aged between sixty and seventy, was put on bread and water for three weeks because—the reader of the *Marseillaise* would never guess why—because Leary called himself a “pagan” and refused to say he was *Protestant, Presbyterian, Catholic* or *Quaker*. He was given the choice of one of these religions or bread and water. Of these five evils, O'Leary, or “pagan O'Leary” as he is called, chose the one that he considered the least—bread and water.<sup>d</sup>

A few days ago after examining the body of a Fenian who died at Spike Island Prison the CORONER<sup>e</sup> expressed his very strong disapproval of the manner in which the deceased man had been treated.<sup>f</sup>

Last Saturday a young Irishman called *Gunner Hood* left prison after four years in it. At the age of 19 he had joined the English army and served England in Canada. He was taken before a military tribunal in 1866 for having written seditious articles and sentenced to two years' hard labour. When the sentence was pronounced Hood took his cap and threw it into the air shouting,

<sup>a</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 49, June 12, 1869, “O'Donovan Rossa. To the Editor of *The Irishman*; The Press on the Treatment of the Political Prisoners: The Treatment of O'Donovan Rossa”.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> “Mr. G. H. Moore's Motion upon the Treatment by England of Irish Political Prisoners”, *The Irishman*, No. 1, July 3, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See this volume, pp. 442-43.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 102.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Jenny Marx uses the English term and gives the explanation of it in brackets.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> See the article “Inquest at Spike Island.—Condemnation of the Prison Treatment”, *The Irishman*, No. 34, February 19, 1870.—*Ed.*

“Long live the Irish republic!” This impassioned cry cost him dear. He was sentenced to an extra two years in prison and fifty strokes for good measure. This was carried out in the most atrocious manner. Hood was attached to a plough and two strapping blacksmiths were armed with CAT-O-NINE-TAILS. There is no equivalent term in French for the English KNOUT. Only the Russians and the English know what is meant by this. Like draws to like.

Mr. Carey, a journalist, is kept at present in the part of the prison intended for the insane, the silence and the other forms of torture to which he has been subjected having turned him into a mass of living flesh deprived of all reason.

The Fenian, Colonel Burke, a man who has distinguished himself not only by his military service in the American army but also as a writer and painter, has also been reduced to a pitiful state in which he can no longer recognise his closest relatives. I could add many more names to this list of Irish martyrs. Suffice it to say that since 1866, when there was a raid on *The Irish People's* offices,<sup>490</sup> *20 Fenians have died or gone mad* in the prisons of humanitarian England.

## II

London, March 5<sup>491</sup>

During the meeting of the House of Commons on March 3 Mr. *Stacpoole* questioned Mr. Gladstone on the treatment of Fenian prisoners. He said, among other things, that Dr. *Lyons* of Dublin had recently stated that

“the discipline, diet, personal restrictions and the other punishments were bound to cause permanent damage to the prisoners’ health”.<sup>a</sup>

After having expressed complete satisfaction with the way in which prisoners were treated, Mr. Gladstone crowned his little *SPEECH* with this brilliantly witty remark:

“As to the health of O’Donovan Rossa, I am glad to be able to say that during her *last* visit to her husband Mrs. O’Donovan Rossa congratulated him on *looking better*.”<sup>b</sup>

Whereupon a burst of Homeric laughter broke out from all sides of that noble assembly. *Her last visit!* Note that Mrs. O’Donovan Rossa had not only been separated from her husband for several years, but that she had travelled all over America earning money to feed her children by giving public lectures on English literature.

And bear in mind also that this same Mr. *Gladstone*, whose quips are so pointed, is the almost sacred author of *Prayers*, the *Propagation of the Gospel*, *The Functions of Laymen in the Church*<sup>c</sup> and the recently published homily *Ecce homo*.

Is the profound satisfaction of the head jailer shared by his prisoners? Read the following extracts from a letter written by

<sup>a</sup> W. Stacpoole, Speech in the House of Commons on March 3, 1870, *The Times*, No. 26689, March 4, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> W. E. Gladstone, Speech in the House of Commons on March 3, 1870, *The Times*, No. 26689, March 4, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The titles of Gladstone’s books are given in English in the newspaper, with the French translations in brackets.—*Ed.*



*O'Donovan Rossa*, which by some miracle was slipped out of the prison and arrived at its destination after an incredible delay:

LETTER FROM ROSSA

I have already told you about the hypocrisy of these English masters who, after placing me in a position which forced me to get down on my knees and elbows to eat, are now depriving me of food and light and giving me chains and a Bible. I am not complaining of the penalties which my masters inflict on me—it is my job to suffer—but I insist that I have the right to inform the world of the treatment to which I am subjected, and that it is illegal to hold back my letters describing this treatment. The minute precautions taken by the prison authorities to prevent me writing letters are as disgusting as they are absurd. The most insulting method was to strip me once a day for several months and then examine my arms, legs and all other parts of my body. This took place at *Millbank* daily from February to May 1867. One day I refused, whereupon five prison officers arrived, beat me mercilessly and tore off my clothes.

Once I succeeded in getting a letter to the outside, for which I was rewarded by a visit from Messrs. *Knox* and *Pollock*, two *POLICE MAGISTRATES*.<sup>a</sup>

How ironical to send two government employees to find out the truth about the English prisons. These gentlemen refused to take note of anything important which I had to tell them. When I touched upon a subject which was not to their liking, they stopped me by saying that prison discipline was not their concern. Isn't that so, Messrs. *Pollock* and *Knox*? When I told you that I had been forced to wash in water which had already been used by half a dozen English prisoners, did you not refuse to note my complaint?

At *Chatham* I was given a certain amount of tow to pull out and told that I would go without food if I did not finish the work by a certain time.

"Perhaps you'll still punish me even if I do the job in time," I shouted. "That's what happened to me at *Millbank*."

"How could it?" asked the jailer.

Then I told him that on July 4 I had finished my work ten minutes before the appointed time and picked up a book. The officer saw me do this, accused me of being lazy and I was put on bread and water and locked in a dark cell for forty-eight hours.

One day I caught sight of my friend *Edward Duffy*. He was extremely pale. A little later I heard that *Duffy* was seriously ill and that he had expressed the wish to see me (we had been very close in Ireland). I begged the governor to give me permission to visit him. He refused point-blank. This was round about Christmas '67—and a few weeks later a prisoner whispered to me through the bars of my cell: "*Duffy* is dead."

How movingly this would have been described by the English if it had happened in Russia!

If Mr. Gladstone had been present on such a sad occasion in Naples, what a touching picture he would have painted! Ah! Sweet Pharisees, trading in hypocrisy, with the Bible on their lips and the devil in their bellies.

I must say a word in memory of *John Lynch*. In March 1866 I found myself together with him in the exercise yard. We were being watched so closely that he only managed to say to me, "The cold is killing me." But then what did the English do to us? They took us to London on Christmas Eve. When we arrived at

<sup>a</sup> Jenny Marx uses the English term and gives its French equivalent in brackets.—*Ed.*

the prison they took away our flannels and left us shivering in our cells for several months. Yes, they cannot deny that it was they who killed *John Lynch*. But nevertheless they managed to produce officials at the enquiry who were ready to prove that *Lynch* and *Duffy* had been given very gentle treatment.

The lies of our English oppressors exceed one's wildest imagination.

If I am to die in prison I entreat my family and my friends not to believe a word of what these people say. Let me not be suspected of personal rancour against those who persecuted me with their lies. I accuse only tyranny which makes the use of such methods necessary.

Many a time the circumstances have reminded me of Machiavelli's words: "that tyrants have a special interest in circulating the Bible so that the people understand its precepts and offer no resistance to being robbed by brigands".

So long as an enslaved people follows the sermons on morality and obedience preached to them by the priests, the tyrants have nothing to fear.

If this letter reaches my fellow countrymen I have the right to demand that they raise their voices to insist that justice be done for their suffering brothers. Let these words whip up the blood that is moving sluggishly in their veins!

I was harnessed to a cart with a rope tied round my neck. This knot was fastened to a long shaft and two English prisoners received orders to prevent the cart from bouncing. But they refrained from doing this, the shaft rose up into the air and the knot came undone. If it had tightened I would be dead.

I insist that they do not possess the right to put me in a situation where my life depends on the acts of other people.

A ray of light is penetrating through the bolts and bars of my prison. This is reminder of the day in *Newtonwards* where I met *Orangemen* and *Ribbonmen*<sup>492</sup> who had forgotten their bigotry!

*O'Donovan Rossa*  
Political prisoner sentenced  
to hard labour<sup>a</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> "O'Donovan Rossa. Letter from the Member for Tipperary", *The Irishman*, No. 32, February 5, 1870.—*Ed.*

## III

London, March 16, 1870

The main event of the past week has been O'Donovan Rossa's letter which I communicated to you in my last report.<sup>a</sup>

*The Times*<sup>b</sup> printed the letter without comment, whereas *The Daily News* published a commentary without the letter.<sup>c</sup>

"As one might have expected," it says, "Mr. O'Donovan Rossa takes as his subject the prison rules to which he has been *subjected FOR A WHILE*."<sup>d</sup>

How atrocious this "*for a while*" is in speaking of a man who has already been imprisoned for five years and condemned to hard labour *for life!*

Mr. O'Donovan Rossa complains among other things "of being harnessed to a cart with a rope tied round his neck" in such a way that his life depended on the movements of English convicts, his fellow prisoners.

But, exclaims *The Daily News*, "Is it really unjust to put a man in a situation where his life depends on the acts of others? When a person is in a car or on a steamer does not his life also depend on the acts of others?"

After this brilliant piece of arguing, the pious casuist reproaches O'Donovan Rossa for not loving the *BIBLE* and preferring the *IRISH PEOPLE*, an opposition which is sure to delight its readers.

"Mr. O'Donovan," it continues, "seems to imagine that prisoners serving sentences for *seditious writing* should be supplied with cigars and daily newspapers,

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 418-19.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "The Fenian Convict O'Donovan Rossa", *The Times*, No. 26694, March 10, 1870.— *Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> "The *Marseillaise* of Tuesday last was...?", *The Daily News*, No. 7445, March 11, 1870.— *Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In *La Marseillaise* the English expression "for a while" is given in brackets after the French equivalent.— *Ed.*

and that they should above all have the right to correspond freely with their friends."

Ho, ho, virtuous Pharisee! At last you have admitted that O'Donovan Rossa has been sentenced to hard labour for life for *sedition writing* and not for an attempted *assassination* of Queen Victoria, as you vilely insinuated in your first address to the French press.

"After all," this shameless newspaper concludes, "O'Donovan Rossa is simply being treated for what he is, that is, an ordinary convict."

After Mr. Gladstone's special newspaper, here is a different angle from the "liberal" press, *The Daily Telegraph*, which generally adopts a rougher manner:<sup>a</sup>

"If we condescend," it says, "to take note of O'Donovan Rossa's letter, it is not because of the Fenians who are incorrigible, but exclusively for the well-being of France.

"Let it be known," it says, "that only a few days ago in the House of Commons Mr. Gladstone made a formal denunciation of all these outrageous lies, and there cannot be any intelligent Frenchmen of whatever party and class who would dare doubt the word of an English gentleman."

But if, contrary to expectation, there were parties or people in France perverse enough not to believe the word of an English gentleman such as Mr. Gladstone, France could not at least resist the well-meant advice of Mr. Levy who is not a gentleman and who addresses you in the following terms:

"We advise our neighbours, the Parisians, to treat all the stories of cruelties committed on political prisoners in England as so many insolent lies."

With Mr. Levy's permission, I will give you a new example of the value of the *words* of the gentlemen who make up Gladstone's Cabinet.

You will remember that in my first letter I mentioned Colonel *Richard Burke*, a Fenian prisoner who has gone insane thanks to the humanitarian methods of the English government.<sup>b</sup> *The Irishman* was the first to publish this news,<sup>c</sup> after which Mr. Underwood sent a letter to Mr. Bruce, the Home Secretary,<sup>d</sup> asking him for an enquiry into the treatment of political prisoners.

Mr. Bruce replied in a letter which was published in the English press and which contained the following sentence:

<sup>a</sup> *The Daily Telegraph*, No. 4598, March 11, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, p. 416.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> "More Prison Horrors. Irish Political Prisoners Being Done to Death in English Prisons"; *The Irishman*, No. 27, January 1, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The letter was published in *The Irishman*, No. 28, January 8, 1870.—*Ed.*

"With regard to Richard Burke at Woking Prison, Mr. Bruce is bound to refuse to make an enquiry on the grounds of *such ill-founded and extravagant insinuations* as those contained in the extracts from *The Irishman* which you have sent me."<sup>a</sup>

This statement by Mr. Bruce is dated January 11, 1870. Now in one of its recent issues *The Irishman* has published the same Minister's reply to a letter from Mrs. Barry, Richard Burke's sister, who asked for news, about her brother's "alarming" condition.<sup>b</sup> The ministerial reply of *February* 24 contains an official report dated January 11 in which the prison doctor and Burke's special guard state that he had become insane.<sup>c</sup> Thus, the very day when Mr. Bruce publicly declared the information published by *The Irishman* to be false and ill-founded, he was concealing the irrefutable official proof in his pocket! It should be mentioned incidentally that Mr. Moore, an Irish member in the House of Commons, is to question the Minister on the treatment of Colonel Burke.

*The Echo*, a recently founded newspaper, takes an even stronger liberal line than its companions. It has its own principle which consists of selling for one penny, whereas all the other newspapers cost twopence, fourpence or sixpence. This price of one penny forces it on the one hand to make pseudo-democratic professions of faith so as not to lose its proletarian subscribers, and on the other hand to make constant reservations in order to win over respectable subscribers from its competitors.

In its long tirade on O'Donovan Rossa's letter it finished up by saying that "perhaps even those Fenians who have received an amnesty will refuse to believe the exaggerations of their compatriots", as if Mr. Kickham, Mr. Costello and others had not already published information on their suffering in prison totally in accordance with Rossa's letter! But after all its subterfuge and senseless evasions *The Echo* touches on the sore point.

The "publications by the *Marseillaise*," it says, "will cause a scandal and this scandal will spread all round the world. The continental mind is perhaps too limited to be able to discern the difference between the crimes of a Bomba<sup>d</sup> and the severity of a Gladstone! So it would be better to hold an enquiry", and so on.<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 30, January 22, 1870. The reply to Underwood's enquiry was made on behalf of Bruce by A.F.O. Liddell on January 11, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Both Mrs. Barry's letter to Bruce of February 22, 1870 and Liddell's reply to it of February 24 were published in *The Irishman*, No. 37, March 12, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> J. Meyers, Official report on Richard Burke's state of health, dated January 11, 1870, *The Irishman*, No. 37, March 12, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> King Bomba, i. e. Ferdinand II.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> "O'Donovan Rossa's Woes", *The Echo*, No. 391, March 11, 1870.—*Ed.*

*The Spectator*, a "liberal" weekly which supports Gladstone, is governed by the principle that all genres are bad except the boring one.<sup>a</sup> This is why it is called in London the journal of the seven wise men. After giving a brief account of O'Donovan Rossa and scolding him for his aversion to the Bible, the journal of the seven wise men pronounces the following judgment:

"The Fenian O'Donovan Rossa does not appear to have suffered anything more than the ordinary sufferings of convicts, but we confess that we should like to see changes in this regime. It is very right and often most advisable to shoot rebels. It is also right to deprive them of their liberty as the most dangerous type of criminals. But it is neither right nor wise to degrade them."<sup>b</sup>

Well said, Solomon the Wise!

Finally we have *The Standard*, the main organ of the Tory party, the Conservatives. You will be aware that the English oligarchy is composed of two factions: the landed aristocracy and the plutocracy. If in their family quarrels one takes the side of the plutocrats against the aristocrats one is called a liberal or even radical. If, on the contrary, one sides with the aristocrats against the plutocrats one is called a Tory.

*The Standard* calls O'Donovan Rossa's letter an apocryphal story probably written by A. Dumas.

"Why," it says, "did the *Marseillaise* refrain from adding that Mr. Gladstone, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Lord Mayor were present each morning while O'Donovan Rossa was being tortured?"<sup>c</sup>

In the House of Commons a certain member once referred to the Tory party as the "STUPID PARTY".<sup>d</sup> Is it not a fact that *The Standard* well deserves its title as the main organ of the stupid party!

Before closing I must warn the French not to confuse the newspaper clamour with the voice of the English proletariat which, unfortunately for the two countries, Ireland and England, has no echo in the English press.

Let it suffice to say that more than 200,000 men, women and children of the English working class raised their voices in Hyde Park to demand freedom for their Irish brothers, and that the General Council of the *International Working Men's Association*,

<sup>a</sup> Jenny Marx paraphrases words from Voltaire's novel *L'Enfant prodigue*: Tous les genres sont bons, hors le genre ennuyeux" (*The Prodigal Son*: "All genres are good except the boring ones").—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *The Spectator*, No. 2176, March 12, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *The Evening Standard*, March 10, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Jenny Marx uses the English words "*stupid party*" and gives the French translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

which has its headquarters in London and includes well-known English working-class leaders among its members, has severely condemned the treatment of Fenian prisoners and come out in defence of the rights of the Irish people against the English government.<sup>493</sup>

P. S. As a result of the publicity given by the *Marseillaise* to O'Donovan Rossa's letter,<sup>a</sup> Gladstone is afraid that he may be forced by public opinion to hold a parliamentary public enquiry into the treatment of political prisoners. In order to avoid this again (we know how many times his corrupt conscience has opposed it already) this diplomat has just produced an official, but anonymous denial of the facts quoted by Rossa.<sup>494</sup>

Let it be known in France that this denial is nothing more than a copy of the statements made by the prison jailer, police magistrates Knox and Pollock, etc., etc.<sup>b</sup> These gentlemen know full well that Rossa cannot reply to them. He will be kept under stricter supervision than ever, but ... I shall reply to them in my next letter with *facts*, the verification of which does not depend on the goodwill of jailers.

---

<sup>a</sup> O'Donovan's letter of March 5, 1870, *La Marseillaise*, No. 79, March 9, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Report of the Commissioners on the Treatment of the Treason-Felony Convicts in the English Convict Prisons*, London, 1867.—*Ed.*

## IV

London, March 18, 1870

As I announced in my last letter Mr. Moore, an Irish member of the House of Commons, yesterday questioned the government on the treatment of Fenian prisoners.<sup>a</sup> He referred to the request about Richard Burke and four other prisoners held in Mountjoy Prison (in Dublin) and asked the government whether it considered it honourable to hold the bodies of these men after having deprived them of their senses. Finally, he insisted on a "full, free and public enquiry".<sup>b</sup>

So here was Mr. Gladstone with his back to the wall. In 1868 he gave an insolent, categorical refusal to a request to hold an enquiry made by the same Mr. Moore. Since then he has always replied in the same fashion to repeated demands for an enquiry.

Why give way now? Should he admit to being alarmed by the clamour on the other side of the Channel? Never. As to the charges levelled against our governors of prisons, we have asked them to give a full explanation in this connection.

The latter have unanimously replied that all this is sheer nonsense. Thus, our ministerial conscience is naturally satisfied. But after the explanations given by Mr. Moore—these are his exact words—it appears "that the point in question is not exactly satisfaction. That THE SATISFACTION OF THE MINDS OF THE GOVERNMENT<sup>c</sup> derives from its confidence in its subordinates and, 'THEREFORE',<sup>d</sup> it

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 422.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Moore's speech in the House of Commons on March 17, 1870, *The Times*, No. 26702, March 18, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The words in small caps are given in *La Marseillaise* in English in brackets after their French equivalent.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> This word is given in the newspaper in brackets after its French equivalent.—*Ed.*



would be both politic and just to conduct an enquiry into the truth of the jailers' statements".<sup>495</sup>

One day he says this, and the next day says that,  
His yesterday's views today he will shelve,  
He now wears a helmet, and now a top hat,  
A nuisance to others, a bore to himself.<sup>a</sup>

But if he does give way in the end, he does so with a further mental reservation.

Mr. Moore demands a "full, free and public enquiry". Mr. Gladstone replies that he is responsible for the "form" of the enquiry, and we already know that this will not be a "parliamentary enquiry", but one conducted by means of a Royal Commission. In other words, the judges in this great trial, in which Mr. Gladstone appears as the main defendant, are to be selected and appointed by Mr. Gladstone himself.

As for Richard Burke, Mr. Gladstone states that the government had learnt of his insanity as early as January 9. Consequently, his honourable colleague Mr. Bruce, the Home Secretary, lied outrageously by declaring in his open letter of January 11 that this information was untrue.<sup>b</sup> But, Mr. Gladstone continues, Mr. Burke's mental disturbance had not reached a sufficiently advanced stage to justify his release from prison. It must not be forgotten that this man was an accessory to the blowing up of Clerkenwell Prison.<sup>496</sup> Really? But Richard Burke was already detained in Clerkenwell Prison when a number of other people took it into their heads to blow up the prison in order to free him. Thus he was an accessory to this ridiculous attempt which, it is thought, was instigated by the English police and which, if it had succeeded, would have buried him under the ruins! Moreover, concludes Mr. Gladstone, we have already released two Fenians who went mad in our English prisons. But, interrupts Mr. Moore, I was talking about the four insane men detained in Mountjoy Prison in Dublin. Be that as it may, replies Mr. Gladstone. There are still two madmen less in our prisons.

Why is Mr. Gladstone so anxious to avoid all mention of Mountjoy Prison? We shall see in a moment. This time the facts are verified not by letters from the prisoners, but in a Blue Book published in 1868 by order of Parliament.<sup>497</sup>

After the Fenian skirmish<sup>498</sup> the English government declared a state of general emergency in Ireland. All guarantees of the freedom of the individual were suspended. Any person "suspected

<sup>a</sup> *Les satires de Nicolas Boileau-Despréaux*, Jena, 1834 (Satire VIII, 5).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Bruce's letter to Th. N. Underwood was published in *The Irishman*, No. 37, March 12, 1870.—*Ed.*

of being suspected of Fenianism” could thus be thrown into prison and kept there without being brought to court as long as it pleased the authorities. One of the prisons full of suspects was Mountjoy Convict Prison in Dublin, of which John Murray was the inspector and Mr. M'Donnell the doctor. Now what do we read in the *Blue Book* published in 1868 by order of Parliament?

For several months Mr. M'Donnell wrote first to Inspector Murray protesting against the cruel treatment of suspects. Since the inspector did not reply, Mr. M'Donnell sent three or four reports to the prison governor. In one of these letters he refers to

“certain persons”,—I am citing word for word—“who show unmistakable signs of insanity”. He goes on to add: “I have not the slightest doubt that this insanity is the consequence of the prison regime. Quite apart from all humane considerations, it would be a serious matter if one of these prisoners, who have not been sentenced by a court of law but are merely suspects, should commit suicide.”

All these letters addressed by Mr. M'Donnell to the governor were intercepted by John Murray. Finally, Mr. M'Donnell wrote direct to Lord Mayo, the First Secretary for Ireland. He told him for example:

“There is no one, my Lord, as well informed as you yourself are on the harsh discipline to which the ‘suspect’ prisoners have been subjected for a considerable time, a more severe form of solitary confinement than that imposed on the convicts.”

What was the result of these revelations published by order of Parliament? The doctor, Mr. M'Donnell, was dismissed!!! Murray kept his post.

All this took place during the Tory ministry. When Mr. Gladstone finally succeeded in unseating Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli by fiery speeches in which he denounced the English government as the true cause of Fenianism, he not only confirmed the savage Murray in his functions but also, as a sign of his special satisfaction, conferred a large sinecure, that of “REGISTRAR OF HABITUAL CRIMINALS”, on his post of inspector.

In my last letter I stated that the anonymous reply to Rossa's letter, circulated by the London newspapers, emanated directly from the Home Office.

It is now known to be the work of the Home Secretary, Mr. Bruce. Here is a sample of his “ministerial conscience!”

As to Rossa's complaint that he is obliged “to wash in water which has already been used for the convicts' ablutions, the police magistrates Knox and Pollock have declared that after their careful enquiry it would be superfluous to consider such nonsense”, says Mr. Bruce.

Luckily the report by police magistrates Knox and Pollock has been published by order of Parliament.<sup>a</sup> What do they say on page 23 of their report? That in accordance with the prison regime a certain number of convicts use the same bath one after the other and that "the guard cannot give priority to O'Donovan Rossa without offending the others". It would, therefore, be "superfluous to consider such nonsense".

Thus, according to the report by Knox and Pollock, it is not O'Donovan Rossa's allegation that he was forced to bathe in water which had been used by convicts that is nonsense, as Mr. Bruce would have them say. On the contrary, these gentlemen find it absurd that O'Donovan Rossa should have complained about such a disgrace.

During the same meeting in the House of Commons at which Mr. Gladstone declared himself ready to hold an enquiry into the treatment of Fenian prisoners, he introduced a new Coercion Bill for Ireland, that is to say, the suppression of constitutional freedoms and the proclamation of a state of emergency.

Theoretical fiction has it that constitutional liberty is the rule and its suspension an exception, but the whole history of English rule in Ireland shows that a state of emergency is the rule and that the application of the constitution is the exception. Gladstone is making agrarian crimes the pretext for putting Ireland once more in a state of siege. His true motive is the desire to suppress the independent newspapers in Dublin. From henceforth the life or death of any Irish newspaper will depend on the goodwill of Mr. Gladstone. Moreover, this Coercion Bill is a necessary complement to the Land Bill recently introduced by Mr. Gladstone which consolidates landlordism in Ireland whilst appearing to come to the aid of the tenant farmers.<sup>499</sup> It should suffice to say of this law that it bears the mark of Lord Dufferin, a member of the Cabinet and a large Irish landowner. It was only last year that this Dr. Sangrado published a large tome<sup>b</sup> to prove that the Irish population has not yet been sufficiently bled, and that it should be reduced by a third if Ireland is to accomplish its glorious mission to produce the highest possible rents for its landlords and the largest possible quantities of meat and wool for the English market.

---

<sup>a</sup> *Report of the Commissioners on the Treatment of the Treason-Felony Convicts in the English Convict Prisons*, London, 1867.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> F. T. H. Blackwood, *Mr. Mill's Plan for the Pacification of Ireland Examined*, London, 1868.— *Ed.*

## V

London, March 22

There is a London weekly with a wide circulation among the people which is called *Reynolds's Newspaper*. This is what it has to say about the Irish question:

“Now we are regarded by the other nations as the most hypocritical people on earth. We blew our own trumpets so loudly and so joyfully and exaggerated the excellence of our institutions so much, that now when our lies are being exposed one by one it is not at all surprising that other peoples should ridicule us and ask themselves whether it can be possible. It is not the people of England who have brought about such a state of affairs, because the people also have been tricked and deceived—the blame lies with the ruling classes and a venal, parasitic press....”<sup>a</sup>

The Coercion Bill for Ireland which was introduced on Thursday evening<sup>b</sup> is a detestable, abominable, execrable measure. This Bill extinguishes the last spark of national liberty in Ireland and silences the press of this unhappy country in order to prevent its newspapers from protesting against a policy which is the crying disgrace of our time. The government wants its revenge on all those newspapers which did not greet its wretched Land Bill with transports of delight, and will get it. In effect the *Habeas Corpus Act* will be suspended, because from now onwards it will be possible to imprison for six months or even for life any person who cannot explain his behaviour to the satisfaction of the authorities.

Ireland has been put at the mercy of a band of well-trained spies who are euphemistically referred to as “detectives”.

Not even Nicholas of Russia ever published a crueller ukase

<sup>a</sup> *Reynolds's Newspaper*, March 20, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> March 17.—*Ed.*

against the unfortunate Poles than this Bill of Mr. Gladstone's against the Irish. It is a measure which would have won Mr. Gladstone the good favour of the famous King of Dahomey.<sup>500</sup> Nevertheless, Mr. Gladstone had the colossal effrontery to boast in front of Parliament and the nation of the generous policy which his government is proposing to adopt with regard to Ireland. At the end of his speech on Thursday Gladstone even went as far as producing expressions of regret pronounced with a sanctimonious, lachrymose solemnity worthy of the reverend Mr. Stiggins. But snivel as he may, the Irish people will not be deceived.

We repeat that the Bill is a shameful measure, a measure worthy of *Castlereagh*, a measure which will invoke the condemnation of all free nations on the heads of those who invented it and those who sanction and approve it. Finally, it is a measure which will bring well-deserved opprobrium to Mr. Gladstone and, we sincerely hope, lead to his swift defeat. And how has the demagogic minister Mr. Bright been able to keep silent for forty-eight hours?

We state without hesitation that Mr. Gladstone has proved to be the most savage enemy and the most implacable master to have crushed Ireland since the days of the notorious *Castlereagh*.

As if the cup of ministerial shame were not already full to overflowing, it was announced in the House of Commons on Thursday evening, the same evening as the Coercion Bill was introduced, that Burke and other Fenian prisoners had been tortured to the point of insanity in the English prisons, and in the very face of this appalling evidence Gladstone and his jackal Bruce were protesting loudly that the political prisoners were treated with all possible care. When Mr. Moore made this sad announcement to the House he was constantly interrupted by hoots of bestial laughter. Had such a disgusting and revolting scene taken place in the American Congress, what a howl of indignation would have gone up from us!

Up till now the *Reynolds's Newspaper*, *The Times*, *The Daily News*, *Pall Mall*, *The Telegraph*, etc., etc., have greeted the Coercion Bill with shouts of wild joy, particularly the measure for the destruction of the Irish press. And all this is taking place in England, the acknowledged sanctuary of the press. But one should not, after all, be too angry with these new writers. You will agree that it was too hard to watch *The Irishman* each Saturday demolish the tissue of lies and calumny which these Penelopes worked on for six days of the week with sweat on their brows, and

that it is quite natural that they should give a frantic welcome to the police who come to tie the hands of their formidable enemy. At least these fine fellows realise their own collective worth.

A characteristic exchange of letters has taken place between Bruce and Mr. M'Carthy Downing concerning Colonel Richard Burke.<sup>a</sup> Before reproducing it I should like to remark in passing that Mr. Downing is an Irish member of the House of Commons. This ambitious advocate joined the ministerial phalanx with the noble aim of making a career. Thus, we are not dealing here with a suspect witness.

February 22, 1870

Sir,

If my information is correct, Richard Burke, one of the Fenian prisoners formerly held in Chatham Prison, has been transferred to Woking in a state of insanity. In March 1869 I took the liberty of bringing his state of apparent ill-health to your notice, and in the following July Mr. Blake, former member for Waterford, and I informed you of our opinion that if the system of his treatment were not changed, the worst consequences were to be feared. I received no reply to this letter. My object in writing to you is the cause of humanity and the hope of obtaining his release so that his family may have the consolation of seeing to his needs and mitigating his suffering. I have in my hand a letter from the prisoner to his brother dated December 3 in which he says that he has been systematically *poisoned*, this being, I imagine, one of the phases of his disease. I sincerely trust that the kind sentiments for which you are known will urge you to grant this request.

Yours, etc.,

*M'Carthy Downing*

Home Office,

February 25, 1870

Sir,

Richard Burke was transferred from Chatham as a result of his illusion that he was poisoned or cruelly treated by the prison medical officers. At the same time, without him being positively ill, his health deteriorated. Consequently, I gave orders for him to be moved to Woking and had him examined by Dr. Meyer from Broadmoor Asylum, who was of the opinion that his illusion would disappear when his health improved. His health did, in fact, improve rapidly and an ordinary observer would not have noted any signs of his mental weakness. I should very much like to be in a position to give you an assurance of his early release, but am not able to do so. His crime and the consequences of the attempt to free him are too serious for me to be able to give you such an assurance. Meanwhile all that

<sup>a</sup> "The Fenian Prisoner Burke", *The Irishman*, No. 38, March 19, 1870.—*Ed.*

medical science and good treatment can do to restore his mental and physical health will be done.

H. A. Bruce

February 28, 1870

Sir,

After receiving your letter of the 25th in reply to my request that Burke should be handed over to the care of his brother, I hoped to find an occasion to talk to you on this matter in the House of Commons, but you were so busy on Thursday and Friday that an interview was out of the question. I have received letters from a number of Burke's friends. They are waiting anxiously to hear whether my request has been successful. I have not yet informed them that it has not. Before disappointing them I felt "justified" in writing to you again on the matter. I thought that as a person who has invariably and at some risk denounced Fenianism, I could permit myself to give a word of impartial, friendly advice to the government.

I have no hesitation in saying that the release of a political prisoner who has become mentally unbalanced would not be criticised and certainly not condemned by the general public. In Ireland people would say: "Well, the government is not as cruel as we thought." Whereas if, on the other hand, Burke is kept in prison this will provide new material for the national press to attack it as being even crueller than the Neapolitan governors in their worst days. And I confess that I cannot see how men of moderate views could defend the act of refusal in such a case...

M'Carthy Downing

Sir,

I regret that I am unable to recommend Burke's release.

It is true that he has shown signs of insanity and that in ordinary cases I would be "justified" in recommending him to the mercy of the Crown. But his case is not an ordinary one, because he was not only a hardened conspirator, but his participation in the attempt to blow up Clerkenwell which, if it had succeeded, would have been even more disastrous than it was, makes him an IMPROPER RECIPIENT OF PARDON.<sup>a</sup>

H. A. Bruce

Could anything be more infamous! Bruce knows perfectly well that if there had been the slightest suspicion against Colonel Burke during the trial concerning the attempt to blow up Clerkenwell, Burke would have been hung next to Barrett who was sentenced to death on the testimony of a man who had previously given false testimony against three other men, and in spite of the evidence of eight citizens who made the journey from Glasgow to prove that Barrett had been there when the explosion had taken place. The English have no scruples (Mr. Bruce can confirm this) when it is a question of hanging a man — especially a Fenian.

<sup>a</sup> The words in small caps are given in *La Marseillaise* in brackets after their French equivalents.—*Ed.*

But all this spate of cruelty cannot break the iron spirit of the Irish. They have just celebrated their national holiday, St. Patrick's Day, more demonstratively than ever in Dublin. The houses were decorated with flags saying: "Ireland for the Irish!", "Liberty!" and "Long live the political prisoners!" and the air rang with the sound of their national songs and—the *Marseillaise*.



## VI

## AGRARIAN OUTRAGES IN IRELAND

London, April 2, 1870

In Ireland the plundering and even extermination of the tenant farmer and his family by the landlord is called the property right, whereas the desperate farmer's revolt against his ruthless executioner is called an agrarian outrage. These AGRARIAN OUTRAGES,<sup>a</sup> which are actually very few in number but are multiplied and exaggerated out of all proportion by the kaleidoscope of the English press in accordance with orders received, have, as you will know, provided the excuse for reviving the regime of white terror in Ireland. On the other hand, this regime of terror makes it possible for the landowners to redouble their oppression with impunity.

I have already mentioned that the Land Bill consolidates landlordism under the pretext of giving aid to the tenant farmers. Nevertheless, in order to pull the wool over people's eyes and clear his conscience, Gladstone was compelled to grant this new lease of life to landlord despotism subject to certain legal formalities. It should suffice to say that in the future, as in the past, the landlord's word will become law if he succeeds in imposing on his TENANTS AT WILL<sup>b</sup> the most fantastic rents which are impossible to pay or, in the case of land tenure agreements, makes his farmers sign contracts which will bind them to voluntary slavery.

And how the landlords are rejoicing! A Dublin newspaper, the *Freeman*, publishes a letter from Father P. Lavelle,<sup>c</sup> the author of *The Irish Landlord since the Revolution*, in which he says:

<sup>a</sup> These two words are given in the newspaper in brackets after their French equivalents.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> This term is given in the newspaper in brackets after its French equivalent.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> P. Lavelle, "To the Tenants and Tenant-Farmers of Ireland", *The Freeman's journal*, March 29, 1870.—*Ed.*

"I have seen piles of letters addressed to tenants by their landlord, the brave captain, and 'absentee' living in England, warning them that from now on their rents are to be raised by 25%. This is equivalent to an eviction notice! And this from a man who does nothing for the land except live off its produce!"

*The Irishman* on the other hand publishes the new tenure agreements dictated by Lord Dufferin,<sup>a</sup> the member of Gladstone's Cabinet who inspired the Land Bill and introduced the Coercion Bill in the House of Lords. Add the rapacious shrewdness of an expert moneylender and the despicable chicanery of the advocate to feudal insolence and you will have a rough idea of the new land tenure agreements invented by the noble Dufferin.

It is now easy to see that the rule of terror has arrived just in time to introduce the rule of the Land Bill! Let us suppose, for example, that in a certain Irish county the farmers refuse either to allow a 25% rent increase or to sign *Dufferin's* land tenure agreements! The county's landlords will then get their valets or the police to send them anonymous threatening letters, as they have in the past. This also counts as an "agrarian outrage". The landlords inform the Viceroy, Lord Spencer, accordingly. Lord Spencer then declares that the district is subject to the provisions of the Coercion Act which is then applied by the same landlords, in their capacity as magistrates, against their own tenants!

Journalists who are imprudent enough to protest will not only be prosecuted for sedition, but their printing presses will be confiscated without the semblance of legal proceedings!

It should, perhaps, now be obvious why the head of your executive<sup>b</sup> congratulated Gladstone on the improvements which he had introduced in Ireland, and why Gladstone returned the compliment by congratulating your executive on its constitutional concessions. "A Roland for an Olivier"<sup>c</sup> those of your readers who know Shakespeare will say. But others who are more versed in the *Moniteur* than in Shakespeare will remember the letter sent by the head of your executive to the late Lord Palmerston containing the words "Let us not act like knaves!"

Now I shall return to the question of political prisoners, not without good cause.

---

<sup>a</sup> "Lord Dufferin's Lease.—Landlord Confiscation", *The Irishman*, No. 37, March 12, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Napoleon III.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Jenny Marx paraphrases Shakespeare's words; see *King Henry the Sixth*, Part 1, Act I, Scene 2.—*Ed.*

The publication of Rossa's first letter in the *Marseillaise*<sup>a</sup> produced a great effect in England—the result is to be an enquiry.

The following dispatch was printed by all the newspapers in the United States:

“The *Marseillaise* says that O'Donovan Rossa was stripped naked once a day and examined, that he was starved, that he was locked in a dark cell, that he was harnessed to a cart, and that the death of his fellow prisoners was caused by the cold to which they were exposed.”

*The Irishman's New York* correspondent says:

“The Rochefort *Marseillaise* has placed the suffering of the Fenian prisoners before the eyes of the American people. We owe a debt of gratitude to the *Marseillaise* which, I trust, will be promptly paid.”<sup>b</sup>

Rossa's letter has also been published by the German press.<sup>c</sup>

From now onwards the English government will no longer be able to commit its outrages in silence. Mr. Gladstone will gain nothing from his attempt to silence the Irish press. Each journalist imprisoned in Ireland will be replaced by a hundred journalists in France, Germany and America.

What can Mr. Gladstone's narrow-minded, out-of-date policies do against the international spirit of the nineteenth century?

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 418-19.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> “The Irishman in New York”, *The Irishman*, No. 40, April 2, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Der Volksstaat*, No. 22, March 16, 1870.—*Ed.*

## VII

## THE DEATH OF JOHN LYNCH

Citizen Editor,

I am sending you extracts from a letter written to *The Irishman* by an Irish political prisoner during his detention (he is now at liberty) in a penal colony in Australia.

I shall limit myself to translating the episode concerning John Lynch.

LETTER FROM JOHN CASEY

The following is a brief, impartial report of the treatment to which my brother exiles (twenty-four in number) and I were subjected during our incarceration in that pit of horrors, that living tomb which is called Portland Prison.

Above all it is my duty to pay a tribute of respect and justice to the memory of my friend John Lynch who was sentenced by an extraordinary tribunal in December 1865 and died at Woking Prison in April 1866.

Whatever may be the cause to which the jury has attributed his death, I confirm, and am able to furnish proof, that his death was accelerated by the cruelty of the prison warders.

To be imprisoned in the heart of winter in a cold cell for twenty-three hours out of twenty-four, insufficiently clad, sleeping on a hard board with a log of wood as a pillow and two worn blankets weighing barely ten lbs. as one's only protection against the excessive cold, deprived through an inexpressibly fine stroke of cruelty of even covering our frozen limbs with our clothes which we were forced to put outside our cell door, given unhealthy, meagre nourishment, having no exercise apart from a daily walk lasting three-quarters of an hour in a cage about 20 ft. long by 6 ft. wide designed for the worst type of criminals: such privation and suffering would break even an iron constitution. So it is not surprising that a person as delicate as Lynch should succumb to it almost immediately.

On arrival at the prison Lynch asked for permission to keep his flannels on. His request was rudely refused. "If you refuse I shall be dead in three months," he replied on that occasion. Ah, little did I suspect that his words would come true. I could not imagine that Ireland was to lose one of her most devoted, ardent and noble sons so soon, and that I myself was to lose a tried and tested friend.

At the beginning of March I noticed that my friend was looking very ill and one day I took advantage of the jailer's brief absence to ask him about his health. He replied that he was dying, that he had consulted the doctor several times, but that the latter had not paid the slightest attention to his complaints. His cough was so violent that although my cell was a long distance from his, I could hear it day and night resounding along the empty corridors. One jailer even told me, "Number 7's time will soon be up—he should have been in hospital a month ago. I've often seen ordinary prisoners there looking a hundred times healthier than him."

One day in April I looked out of my cell and saw a skeleton-like figure dragging itself along with difficulty and leaning on the bars for support, with a deathly pale face, glazed eyes and hollow cheeks. It was Lynch. I could not believe it was him until he looked at me, smiled and pointed to the ground as if to say: "I'm finished."

This was the last time I saw Lynch.

This statement of Casey's corroborates Rossa's testimony about Lynch. And it should not be forgotten that Rossa wrote his letter in an English prison whilst Casey was writing in an Australian penal colony, making any communication between the two of them quite impossible. However, the government has just stated that Rossa's assertions are lies. Bruce, Pollock and Knox even declare "that Lynch was given flannels before he asked for them".<sup>a</sup>

On the other hand Mr. Casey insists as firmly as Mr. Bruce denies it that Lynch complained that "even when he was incapable of walking and was forced to remain in the terrible solitude of his cell his request was refused".

But as Mr. Laurier said in his beautiful speech:

"Let us leave aside human testimony and turn to the testimony that does not lie, the testimony that does not deceive, the *silent testimony*."<sup>501</sup>

The fact remains that Lynch entered Pentonville blooming with life, full of hope and, three months later, this young man was a corpse.

Until Messrs. Gladstone, Bruce and his cohort of police can prove that Lynch is not dead, they are wasting their time in vain oaths.

---

<sup>a</sup> *Report of the Commissioners on the Treatment of the Treason-Felony Convicts in the English Convict Prisons*, London, 1867.—Ed.

## VIII

## LETTER FROM ENGLAND

London, April 19, 1870

“No priests in politics” is the watchword which can be heard all over Ireland at the moment.

The large party which has been opposing with all its might the despotism of the Catholic Church, ever since the “*DISESTABLISHMENT*” of the Protestant Church, is growing daily with remarkable rapidity and has just dealt the clergy a crushing blow.

At the Longford election the clerical candidate, Mr. Greville-Nugent, beat the people’s candidate, John Martin, but the nationalists challenged the validity of his election because of the illegal means by which it had been won, and got the better of their opponents. The election of Nugent was annulled by Judge Fitzgerald who declared Nugent’s agents, that is to say the priests, guilty of having bribed the voters by flooding the country not with the Holy Spirit, but with spirits of a different kind. It appeared that in the single month from December 1 to January 1 alone the reverend fathers had spent £3,500 on whisky!

*The Standard* allows itself to make some most peculiar comments on the Longford election:

“With regard to their scorning of the intimidation by the clergy,” writes the mouthpiece of the “*STUPID party*”, “the nationalists deserve our praise.... The great victory which they have won will encourage them to put up new candidates against Mr. Gladstone and his ultramontane allies.”

*The Times* writes:

“From the Papal Bull issued in the eternal city to the intrigues of the country priests, all ecclesiastical power was lined up against Fenianism and the nationalists.

Unfortunately this ardour was not accompanied by prudence, and will result in a second battle at Longford."<sup>a</sup>

*The Times* is right. The battle of Longford will break out again and be followed by those of Waterford, Mallow and Tipperary, the nationalists in these three counties also having presented petitions requesting the annulment of the election of the official members. In Tipperary it was O'Donovan Rossa who first won the election, but since Parliament stated that he was incapable of representing Tipperary the nationalists proposed Kickham in his place, one of the Fenian patriots who has just finished a spell in English prisons. Kickham's supporters are now declaring that their candidate has been duly elected in spite of the fact that Heron, the government and clerical candidate, gained a majority of four votes.

Bear in mind, however, that one of these four voters for Heron is a wretched *maniac* who was taken to the poll by a reverend father—you know the weakness which priests have for the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.<sup>b</sup> And that the second voter is a *corpse*! Yes, the honest and moderate party actually dared to profane the name of a man who died a fortnight before the election by making him vote for a Gladstonian. Apart from this, patriotic voters say that eleven of their votes were discounted on the grounds that the first letter of Kickham's name was illegible, that their telegrams were not delivered, that the authorities were bribing electors right and left and that a base system of intimidation was practised.

The pressure which was brought to bear in Tipperary was unprecedented even in the history of Ireland. The bailiff and the policeman, who stand for eviction warrants, besieged the tenants' hovels in order to terrify wives and children first. The booths in which the voting took place were surrounded by police, soldiers, magistrates, landlords and priests.

The latter hurled stones at people who were putting up posters for Kickham. On top of all this, the moneylender was present in the booths, his eyes resting hungrily on his wretched debtor during the voting. But the government got nothing for all its pains. One thousand six hundred and sixty-eight small tenants braved it out and, unprotected by secret ballot, gave their votes openly for Kickham.

This brave act reminds us of the heroic struggle of the Poles.

<sup>a</sup> "House of Commons. London, Friday, April 8", *The Times*, No. 26723, April 8, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Cf. Matthew 5:3.—*Ed.*

Faced with the battles waged in Longford, Mallow, Waterford and Tipperary, will anyone still dare to say that the Irish are the abject slaves of the clergy.

Published in *La Marseillaise*, Nos. 71, 79, 89, 91, 99, 113, 118, 125 for March 1, 9, 19, 21 and 29, and April 12, 17 and 24, 1870

Printed according to the newspaper

Translated from the French

Signed: *J. Williams* (except for Article II which is not signed)



LETTER OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
TO ROBERT WILLIAM HUME IN NEW YORK <sup>502</sup>

London, April 23, 1870

Dear Sir, in answer to yours of the 26th ult. I am directed by the Council to state that the International Association recognises no special national interests among the working men who may happen to have been born in different countries.

One of our aims is to eliminate whatever may yet remain of national antipathies and, perhaps, animosities, from the minds of working men. The Council cannot, therefore, endorse the kind of representation implied in your memorial. General Cluseret had his feelings outraged by the French police, which was probably the reason why the trade societies gave him credentials which induced him to institute a comparison between himself and the French ambassador at Washington.<sup>503</sup> The French ambassador at Washington has to vindicate the personal interests of a dynasty, and the property interests of the French traders. The Paris workmen have no such interests to be taken care of on the other side of the Atlantic, against the probable encroachments of the American working men. We consider the interests of the French workmen resident in the United States strictly identical with the interests of all the other working men of the United States.

To facilitate the inter-communication of such as may be separated by difference of language, and perhaps manners, we have correspondents, who are conversant with these things, and to them we trust for managing the rest.

The communication with the United States is distributed among the secretaries of the different nationalities of the General Council. General Cluseret and Mr. Pelletier are our French correspondents in America. They correspond with our Secretary

for France.<sup>a</sup> Siegfried Meyer and Vogt are our German correspondents. They correspond with the German Secretary<sup>b</sup> here, and the General Secretary<sup>c</sup> manages the English correspondence; and beside such trade union officers as Mr. Jessup, we look to you as our correspondent in case any misunderstanding should arise between different nationalities, to endeavour to set matters right, but we cannot admit that either French or Germans have an opposite or special interest from any other workmen, and we always urge them on to take an active part in, and identify themselves with, the movement of the working men of the country, in which they reside, particularly in America.

Respecting the secret society movement, I am instructed to ask you to favour us at your convenience with your opinion as to the cause which has tended to bring about the necessity for secret action. We have been advised to persuade you and friend Jessup to publicly stand up against it, but we suppose there is a necessity for it, or else it would not have come into vogue and moreover it would be presumptuous on our part to offer advice in such a matter, but we wish to know the reasons, to bring them to the knowledge of the working men of the Old World, who have just emerged from conducting their agitation in secret.

Yours faithfully,

*J. George Eccarius*, General Secretary

Read at the General Council meeting of  
May 24, 1870

Reproduced from the newspaper  
clipping pasted into the Minute  
Book of the General Council

---

<sup>a</sup> Eugène Dupont.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Karl Marx.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Johann Georg Eccarius.—*Ed.*

RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECH ON *THE BEE-HIVE*<sup>504</sup>

FROM THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF APRIL 26, 1870

Cit. *Marx* proposed that the Council should cut off all connections with *The Bee-Hive*. He said it had suppressed our resolutions and mutilated our reports and delayed them so that the dates had been falsified, even the mention that certain questions respecting the Irish prisoners were being discussed had been suppressed.<sup>505</sup>

Next to that, the tone of *The Bee-Hive* was contrary to the Rules and platform of the Association. It preached harmony with the capitalists, and the Association had declared war against the capitalists' rule.

Besides this, our branches abroad complained that by sending our reports to *The Bee-Hive* we gave it a moral support and led people to believe that we endorsed its policy. We would be better without its publicity than with it.

On the Irish Coercion Bill<sup>506</sup> it had not said a word against the government.

First published in Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16,  
Moscow, 1960

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

ACCOUNT OF A LETTER BY KARL MARX  
TO THE COMMITTEE  
OF THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC WORKERS' PARTY <sup>507</sup>

[London, June 27, 1870]

The second<sup>a</sup> letter concerns business matters of the International Working Men's Association, the postponement of the congress in particular. Marx emphatically rejects Liebknecht's proposal to postpone the congress until October,<sup>508</sup> even though such a postponement would be very welcome to the General Council itself as the congress documents are not yet ready. But the French, Marx wrote, were already displeased about the congress being held in Mainz and not at least in Verviers, whereas the Parisians particularly wanted to have it in Paris. We must not provide any cause for unrest. Marx fears that if Liebknecht's plan for postponement is sanctioned there will be minority congress of the French and the French-speaking Swiss under Bakunin and he says: "National petty jealousies have penetrated too deeply into people's blood to be reasoned away in a day."

First published in *Leipziger Hochver-  
rathsprözeß*, Leipzig, 1872

Printed according to the 1872  
edition of the book, checked with  
the 1874 and 1894 editions

Published in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>a</sup> The first letter see on pp. 133-35 of this volume.—*Ed.*

RECORD OF MARX'S SPEECH ON THE SPLIT  
IN THE ROMANCE FEDERATION<sup>509</sup>FROM THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF JUNE 28, 1870

Cit. *Marx* thought the only thing the Council could do was to leave the Geneva Committee<sup>a</sup> that had helped from the foundation of the Association as it was. It had fulfilled its duty in every respect and had had a larger constituency though fewer delegates than [the] other party at the Swiss Congress.<sup>510</sup> The vote admitting the Alliance should also be communicated.<sup>b</sup> The new committee could choose some local name.

First published in Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16,  
Moscow, 1960

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

---

<sup>a</sup> The Federal Council of Romance Switzerland.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> A reference to the admission of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy to the International (see this volume, pp. 34-36, 45-46).— *Ed.*

NOTES  
AND  
INDEXES



## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> In the autumn of 1867 the General Council of the International Working Men's Association launched a widespread campaign among the English workers in support of the Irish national liberation movement led by the Fenians. The memorial written by Marx was an integral part of this campaign.

The *Fenians* were Irish revolutionaries who named themselves after the "Féne"—a name of the ancient population of 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 early 1860s, aimed at establishing an independent Irish republic by means of an armed uprising. The Fenians, who expressed the interests of the Irish peasantry, came chiefly from the urban petty bourgeoisie and intelligentsia and believed in conspiracy tactics. The British Government attempted to suppress the Fenian movement by severe police reprisals.

On September 18, 1867, the Fenians made an armed attack on a prison van in an attempt to liberate Kelly and Deasy, two of their leaders. The latter managed to escape but a policeman was killed during the clash. Five Irishmen (Maguire, Condon, Larkin, Allen and O'Brien) were charged with murder and brought to trial. Although there was no direct evidence, they were sentenced to death. Maguire was subsequently pardoned, and Condon, as an American citizen, had his sentence commuted to life imprisonment. The others were executed.

The Fenian trial in Manchester aroused a storm of protest in Ireland and England. On the insistence of Marx, the General Council of the International began, on November 19, a discussion on the Irish question during which the leaders of the international proletarian organisation expressed their solidarity with the struggle of the Irish people for independence and condemned the position of the reformist trade union leaders who, in the wake of the English bourgeois radicals, denied the right of the Fenians to resort to revolutionary methods in the struggle. The discussion was scheduled to continue on November 26 (see this volume, pp. 189-93), but when the news of the conviction was received, the General Council convened a special meeting on November 20 and addressed a memorial to the Home Secretary asking for the commutation of the death sentence. The British Government ignored the memorial.



Because of opposition from the trade union leaders, the English labour press did not publish the memorial in its original wording. A report on the special meeting of the General Council, published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 319, November 23, 1867, only summarised it, and named the General Council members who had signed it. The French translation was published by *Le Courrier français*, No. 163, November 24.

In English the memorial was first published in full in *The General Council of the First International. 1866-1868*, Moscow, 1964.

This document is also preserved in the form of the manuscript copy made by Mrs. Marx which fully coincides with the text entered into the Minute Book. Written as an article, this copy was apparently to be sent to the press. In this volume the memorial is reproduced from this copy. p. 3

<sup>2</sup> Marx means an extensive amnesty granted by President Lincoln in 1863 and President Johnson in 1865 to persons who had fought in the US Civil War on the side of the South. p. 3

<sup>3</sup> Marx wrote this item on the basis of a letter from Johann Baptist Schweitzer dated April 29, 1868. The item was included in the report of the General Council meeting of May 12, 1868 published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 344, May 16, 1868, but is not to be found in the Minute Book. Informing Engels of Schweitzer's letter, Marx wrote to him on May 4, 1868 that he intended "to use this question in the interests of the Party", and insisted on an inquiry into the condition of the workers employed in the iron trade of the Rhine Province (see this letter and Marx's letter to Engels of May 7 and the latter's reply of May 6-7, 1868, present edition, Vol. 43). p. 5

<sup>4</sup> The Lausanne Congress of the International in 1867 designated Brussels as the venue of the next general congress. On February 24, 1868, the General Council called on all sections to begin preparing the Congress agenda. However, the Belgian Minister of Justice, Jules Bara, declared in the Chamber of Deputies on May 16 that he would not permit the convocation of the Congress in Brussels and urged the deputies to renew the Aliens Law of 1835, under which any foreigner could be expelled from the country as politically unreliable. In view of this, at the General Council meeting of May 26, 1868, Marx raised the question of not meeting in Brussels (see *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 346, May 30, 1868). The resolution drawn up by Marx to this effect was read by Jung at the General Council meeting of June 2, since Marx had left for Manchester.

Bara's statement and the prolongation of the Aliens Law caused great discontent in Belgium. The Brussels Section of the International sent the Minister a protest letter which was published in *La Tribune du Peuple*, No. 5, May 24, 1868.

In their letters to the General Council, De Paep and Vandenhouten, the leaders of the Brussels Section, urged the Council not to yield to the government because this threatened the further existence of the International in Belgium. Consequently, on Marx's proposal, the General Council meeting of June 16 cancelled the resolution of June 2 and Brussels remained the venue for the next annual congress (see this volume, pp. 320-21 and also Marx's letter to Engels of June 20, 1868, present edition, Vol. 43).

The text of the June 2 resolution was included in the Minutes of the General Council meeting of June 2, 1868, and was also published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 347, June 6, 1868. p. 6

<sup>5</sup> This refers to the Aliens Law adopted in Belgium on September 22, 1835 and prolonged every three years. Despite the widespread protest campaign in the

press and at meetings, it was renewed at the end of June 1865. In May 1868, the Belgian Government, for fear of fresh mass action, prolonged it without discussion in the Chamber of Deputies. p. 6

- <sup>6</sup> The public meeting to celebrate the anniversary of the June 1848 insurrection of the Paris workers was held on June 29, 1868 in the Cleveland Hall, London. Such meetings were annually held by the German Workers' Educational Society in London jointly with other émigré organisations.

The French petty-bourgeois democrat Félix Pyat, who attended the meeting, delivered a speech and moved a provocative resolution urging terroristic acts against Napoleon III (the resolution was published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 351, July 4, 1868). The Brussels *Espiègle*, No. 25, July 5, 1868, published a report of the meeting which described it as a meeting of the International with Pyat as one of its leaders. This statement was repeated in other newspapers. The General Council held that this could discredit the International in the eyes of the workers and give the Bonapartist government a pretext for the persecution of its members in France and Belgium. Consequently, at its meeting on July 7 the Council resolved, on Marx's proposal, to disavow Pyat's behaviour in a resolution to this effect (see also Marx's letter to Engels of July 7, 1868, present edition, Vol. 43).

When the General Council's resolution against Pyat appeared in the press, a split took place in the French Section in London, of which he was a member. Eugène Dupont, Hermann Jung, Paul Lafargue and other proletarian members of the section expressed their disapproval of Pyat's adventurous and provocative tactics and withdrew from it. Pyat's group lost ties with the International but continued to act in its name and repeatedly supported anti-proletarian elements opposing Marx's line in the General Council. On May 10, 1870, the General Council officially dissociated itself from this group (see this volume, pp. 127-28).

The text of this resolution has been preserved in the Minutes of the General Council meeting of July 7, 1868. It was first published in *La Liberté*, No. 55, July 12, 1868 and reproduced in *La Cigale*, No. 29, July 19, *La Tribune du Peuple*, No. 7, July 26, 1868 (with the end of the resolution denying Pyat's connections with the International omitted), and in other newspapers.

This resolution was first published in English in *The General Council of the First International. 1866-1868*, Moscow, 1964. p. 7

- <sup>7</sup> In 1866-68, 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 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 (the State Council and others) were abolished, and different administrative departments (post, communications) were subordinated to the respective ministries in St. Petersburg. p. 8

- <sup>8</sup> The question of machinery and its effects under capitalism was raised by the General Council on January 28, 1868 and was to go on the agenda of the Brussels Congress. It was initially discussed by the General Council at its meetings of July 28 and August 4, 1868. The discussion was opened by Marx who put forward the basic ideas developed by him in Volume One of *Capital*, chapter "Machinery and Modern Industry" (for the record of Marx's speech see this volume, pp. 382-84).

Summing up the discussion on August 4, Marx proposed that the General Council should record its conclusion in the form of a resolution. The resolution was drawn up by Marx and adopted at the next Council meeting, on August 11.

At the Brussels Congress this resolution was moved by Georg Eccarius at the session of September 9, 1868, and became part of the preamble of the Congress resolution. At the same session, Friedrich Lessner read some extracts from *Capital* to substantiate Marx's stand on this question.

The resolution was published in English in *The Times*, No. 26229, September 14, 1868, in Eccarius' report of this Congress session; in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 362, September 19, 1868, and in a special pamphlet published in London in 1869: *The International Working Men's Association. Resolutions of the Congress of Geneva, 1866, and the Congress of Brussels, 1868*; in French it was printed in: a special supplement to *Le Peuple Belge*, No. 392, September 11, *La Liberté*, No. 64, September 13, *La Cigale*, No. 38, September 20, *La Tribune du Peuple*, No. 10, November 8, 1868 and *L'Égalité*, No. 14, April 24, 1869; in German the resolution appeared in the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 38, September 19, 1868 and in the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* (New York), No. 28, August 16, 1873. It was included in various other editions in English, German, French, Spanish and Italian. p. 9

<sup>9</sup> This is Marx's reply to an official invitation from the General Association of German Workers, of July 6 (see *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 95, August 14, 1868), to attend its annual congress (assembly) in Hamburg as guest of honour. The invitation was signed by Schweitzer, the President, and by more than twenty members of the Association's Executive, workers from various parts of Germany. (The text of the invitation is given in the Minutes of the General Council meeting of August 18, 1868, in the form of a pasted-in clipping from *The Bee-Hive*, No. 358, August 22, 1868.)

Marx's invitation to the congress of the General Association of German Workers and the programme of the congress both showed that its most progressive members, influenced by the labour movement, and particularly by the International and the ideas contained in Marx's *Capital*, had begun to dissociate themselves from the Lassallean dogmas, and that the leaders of the Association did not have a free hand.

In his reply to the invitation Marx gave his opinion of the programme of the Hamburg congress, and, as he remarked in a letter to Engels of August 26, 1868, congratulated the members of the Association on "their rejection of *Lassalle's programme*" (see present edition, Vol. 43).

The *Hamburg Congress* (August 22-26, 1868) adopted important decisions: it approved in principle of the strike movement, unanimously acknowledged that "Marx had rendered outstanding services to the working class with his work *Capital*", and pointed to the necessity for joint action by the workers of different countries.

In fact, however, the Association's leaders opposed the organisation of strikes and continued to obstruct the Association's affiliation to the International.

Marx's letter to the President and the Association's Executive was read at a closed sitting of the congress on August 24 and was applauded. It was published in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 100, August 28 and the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 35, August 29, 1868. In 1886, on the third anniversary of Marx's death, his letter was reprinted in the *Sozialdemokrat*, No. 11, March 11.

<sup>10</sup> A reference to the *Standing Committee* or *Sub-Committee*, the executive body of the General Council of the International. It generally assembled once a week and drafted many of the decisions which were later adopted by the Council. The Standing Committee evolved from a commission, elected when the IWMA was being set up, to draft its programme documents—the Rules and the Inaugural Address. The Committee included the President of the General Council (until this office was abolished in September 1867), the General Secretary and the corresponding secretaries for the different countries. Marx took an active part in the work of the Standing Committee as Corresponding Secretary for Germany. p. 10

<sup>11</sup> The text of this resolution, adopted by the General Council meeting of August 25, 1868 in connection with the preparations for the Brussels Congress, has been preserved in the minutes of this meeting; it was also published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 359, August 29, 1868 (for the record of Marx's speech in substantiating this resolution see this volume, p. 387).

At the Brussels Congress this resolution was moved by Eccarius and read in the report of the commission on reducing the working day on September 12, 1868.

It was published in English in the reports of the Congress sittings in *The Times*, No. 26232, September 17, 1868 and in the pamphlet *The International Working Men's Association. Resolutions of the Congress of Geneva, 1866, and the Congress of Brussels, 1868* published in London in 1869; in French it was published in a special supplement to *Le Peuple Belge*, No. 399, September 18, *La Cigale*, No. 38, September 20 and *La Tribune du Peuple*, No. 10, November 8, 1868. p. 11

<sup>12</sup> *The Fourth Annual Report of the General Council* (the first report was submitted to the London Conference of the International in September 1865) was written by Marx (approved by the General Council on September 1, 1868) for the Third Congress of the International held in Brussels on September 6-13, 1868.

The *Brussels Congress* was attended by nearly 100 delegates representing workers from Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy and Spain. Marx, who took an active part in the preparations for the Congress, was absent. However, he helped the General Council representatives there, since he was kept informed almost daily by Friedrich Lessner. The French text of the report drawn up by Marx was read at the Congress by Dupont on September 7.

The Congress adopted an important resolution on the necessity for transferring railways, mineral resources, collieries and mines, woods and arable land into public property. This resolution showed that most of the French and Belgian Proudhonists had become supporters of collectivism, and it marked the victory of proletarian socialism over petty-bourgeois reformism within the International. The Congress also adopted the resolutions (drawn up by Marx) on the eight-hour working day, on the use of machinery under capitalism and on the attitude towards the congress of the bourgeois-pacifist League of Peace and Freedom (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 204), and a resolution, moved by Lessner for the German delegates, recommending the workers of all countries to study Marx's *Capital* and secure its translation from German into other languages.

The fourth annual report was included in the official French edition of the minutes of the Brussels Congress—*Troisième congrès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Compte rendu officiel*. Supplement to *Le Peuple Belge*, September 8, 1868 and reprinted in *La Liberté*, No. 64, September 13, 1868. The English text, written by Marx, was published in Eccarius' correspondence

"International Working Men's Congress" in *The Times*, No. 26225, September 9, 1868 and reprinted in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 361, September 12, 1868. The German text of the report, also written by Marx, was printed in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 106, September 11, the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 38 (supplement), September 12 and *Hermann*, No. 506, September 12, 1868. The report was also published in a number of newspapers and books in Germany, Britain, Belgium, Switzerland and France. Abridged translations appeared in Russian and Flemish.

In this volume the annual report is reproduced from *The Times* and checked with the handwritten copy in German made by Mrs. Marx and slightly differing from the English text. The main discrepancies are indicated in foot-notes. p. 12

- <sup>13</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 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 documents seized included the preliminary report on the work of the Geneva Congress which had been drawn up by Council member Frederick Card and published in Geneva as a pamphlet in French. (Later, this gave rise to a 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 irregularity and demanded the return of the seized documents. When he refused to reply to the complaint, written by Fox on the Council's instructions, the General Council decided to use the fact publicly to expose the regime of the Second Empire (see also the record of Marx's speech at the General Council meeting of November 27, 1866, present edition, Vol. 20, p. 414). At the beginning of December the Council approached 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. 12

- <sup>14</sup> The strike of weavers and spinners in *Roubaix* in March 1867 was caused by the dismissal of a great number of workers following the introduction of machinery.

A strike of dyers in *Amiens* in July 1867 was supported by the workers in other trades.

In February 1867 the bronze-workers of *Paris* refused to dissolve their credit society on their employers' demand and went on strike. Thanks to the General Council (it discussed the matter at its meetings of March 5, 12, 19 and 26, and April 2 and 9, 1867), the Paris workers received financial aid from the British trade unions. The strike ended in the victory for the bronze-workers—they managed to save their organisation.

In March and April 1868, 3,000 building workers went on strike in *Geneva*. They demanded the reduction of the working day to 10 hours, higher wages and pay by the hour for pay by the day. They were joined by workers in other trades. The aid from the workers of Switzerland, Britain, France and Germany helped the Geneva builders to win the strike. p. 12

- <sup>15</sup> Marx refers to the *Mémoire* of the Paris Section for the Geneva Congress, containing a detailed exposition of Proudhonist views on the main issues of the workers' struggle. It was supported by the Lyons and Rouen sections and 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. 12
- <sup>16</sup> In December 1867 the homes of the Executive Committee members of the Paris Section of the International were searched. This was followed by an investigation and then the first trial against the International in France. The case was heard on March 6 and 20, 1868. Among the documents seized by the police during the searches was a letter of November 23, 1867 from Dupont, the Corresponding Secretary for France, to a member of the Paris Section, André Murat, in which the French members of the International were informed of the campaign organised in defence of the imprisoned Fenians (see Note 1). The French authorities tried to use this letter to incriminate the International in the organisation of the Fenian conspiracy.  
The court declared the Paris Section dissolved and fined the Committee members. p. 13
- <sup>17</sup> In France, according to Article 291 of the Criminal Code and the Law of April 10, 1834, any society with a membership exceeding 20 had to be sanctioned by the respective authorities. p. 14
- <sup>18</sup> In the spring of 1868, the workers of the Charleroi coalfield declared a strike, in reply to the mine-owners' reduction of production to four days a week and lowering of wages by ten per cent. In the bloody clashes between the miners and police troops, twenty-two people were arrested and put on trial.  
The Brussels Central Section launched a broad campaign in support of the strikers both in Belgium and abroad. It organised meetings of protest and gave wide coverage of the events in the columns of *La Tribune du Peuple*, *La Liberté* and other newspapers. On April 12, 1868 it issued a manifesto to the workers of Belgium and other countries (see *La Tribune du Peuple*, No. 4, April 19, 1868). The section maintained regular ties with the General Council of the International. The Council discussed the Charleroi events at its meetings of April 21, May 12 and June 2, 1868 and organised aid to the strikers. The Brussels Section set up a special committee to brief lawyers for the defence of the detainees. The lawyers managed to swing public opinion in favour of the accused, and on August 15 they were acquitted by the jury. This led to a rise in membership of the International in Belgium. p. 14
- <sup>19</sup> See Note 5. p. 14
- <sup>20</sup> At Mentana, on November 3, 1867, the French army, jointly with the Pope's hired guards, defeated Garibaldi, who had undertaken a new campaign against Rome to liberate the city from the French and annex it to the Italian state. p. 15
- <sup>21</sup> Marx refers to the reactionary Prussian law on associations adopted on March 11, 1850. p. 15
- <sup>22</sup> From November 1865 until the formation of the Eisenach Party in 1869, the Central Committee of German sections in Switzerland headed by Johann Philipp Becker was an organising centre for sections uniting German workers not only in Switzerland but also in Germany, Austria, the United States and countries where German émigré workers lived. Becker's activities, in particular

- his *Vorbote* (on the significance of this monthly see Mrs. Marx's letter to Becker of January 29, 1866, present edition, Vol. 42), did much to spread the ideas of the International among the German workers at a time when conditions for establishing an organisation in Germany itself were still lacking. p. 15
- <sup>23</sup> The reference is to the general congress of the General Association of German Workers held in Hamburg on August 22-26, 1868 (see Note 9). The resolution adopted was published in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 102, September 2, 1868. p. 15
- <sup>24</sup> Marx refers to the Nuremberg Congress of the Union of German Workers' Associations, led by Bebel, which was held from September 5 to 7, 1868. The General Council's official representative, Georg Eccarius, was present (see Marx's letter to Engels of July 29, 1868, present edition, Vol. 43). By 69 votes against 46 the Congress resolved to join the International Working Men's Association and elected a committee of 16 to carry out this resolution (see *Protokoll über den 5. Vereinstag der deutschen Arbeitervereine am 5. und 7. September 1868 zu Nürnberg*, Leipzig, 1868, S. 19). On September 22 the General Council approved this committee as the Executive Committee of the International Working Men's Association for Germany.
- The Nuremberg Congress also resolved to organise trade unions and heard Liebknecht's report on armament, in which he demanded the abolition of standing armies.
- The *Union of German Workers' Associations* was founded at a congress of German workers' educational societies in Frankfurt am Main on June 7, 1863, in opposition to the Lassallean General Association of German Workers. Wilhelm Liebknecht and August Bebel took an active part in its activity. p. 15
- <sup>25</sup> The decision to affiliate to the International adopted by the delegate meeting of 50 German workers' educational societies in Switzerland, held in Neuenburg (Neuchâtel) on August 9-10, 1868, was announced in *Der Vorbote*, No. 8, August 1868. p. 16
- <sup>26</sup> *The National Labour 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. In a letter to Ludwig Kugelmann on October 9, 1866, Marx wrote with satisfaction about the Baltimore congress: "...Most of the demands I had put up for Geneva were put up there too, by the correct instinct of the workers" (see present edition, Vol. 42). The Labour 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 sessions of the Basle Congress of the International (September 1869) Andrew Cameron was the National Labour Union delegate. At the Union's congress in Cincinnati in August 1870, Cameron reported on his participation in the International's Congress, and the Union adopted a resolution on its adherence to the principles of the International Association and its intention to join it. The resolution was not implemented, however. 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. p. 16
- <sup>27</sup> On June 25, 1868 the American Congress passed a law introducing an eight-hour working day for all government enterprises and federal institutions. p. 17

- <sup>28</sup> The *Schiller Institute*, founded in Manchester in November 1859 in connection with the centenary of Schiller's birth, was conceived as a cultural and social centre of the city's German colony. At first Engels was critical of the society, notorious for its tendency to formalism and pedantry, and kept aloof from it. But after certain amendments were made in the Rules, he became a member of its Directorate in 1864, and later President of the Institute, devoting much time to it and exercising a considerable influence on its activities.
- In September 1868, while Engels was away from Manchester, the Directorate invited Karl Vogt, who was connected with Bonapartist circles and cast aspersions on proletarian revolutionaries, to give a lecture in the society. In view of this Engels held that his political reputation would be compromised if he remained President and wrote this letter to the Directorate. On October 2 the secretary, Davisson, on behalf of the Directorate approached Engels asking him to revise his decision but Engels refused. In April 1870 Engels was again elected member of the Directorate, but he did not take an active part in its work. p. 18
- <sup>29</sup> Engels refers to the difficulties experienced by the Schiller Institute in building new premises. p. 18
- <sup>30</sup> Engels wrote this article on learning about the police ban, on September 16, 1868, on the General Association of German Workers centred in Leipzig, and on its local branch in Berlin. On October 10, however, a group of Lassalleans headed by Schweitzer restored the Association under the same name and transferred its seat to Berlin. The new Rules of the Association published in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 119, October 11, 1868, said that the Association would abide by Prussian laws and act in a peaceful, legal way. Adapting itself to Prussian law, the leaders of the Association dissolved its local branches. Marx and Engels sharply criticised Schweitzer's manoeuvres in the letters they exchanged in September and October. The same criticism is contained in Marx's letter to Schweitzer of October 13, 1868 (see present edition, Vol. 43) and in this article by Engels. In it Engels develops the views he set out in 1865 in "The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party" (see present edition, Vol. 20), which he quotes extensively. In his letter to Engels dated September 29, 1868, Marx wrote that this article helped to undermine the Lassallean positions (present edition, Vol. 43). p. 20
- <sup>31</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 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. 20
- <sup>32</sup> Engels means the general congress of the General Association of German Workers held in Hamburg (see Note 9). p. 23
- <sup>33</sup> Engels wrote this postscript on the advice of Marx who, in his letter to Engels of September 25, 1868 (see present edition, Vol. 43) drew his attention to Becker's pamphlet *Enthüllungen über das tragische Lebensende Ferdinand Lassalle's*, Schleiz, 1868. p. 24



- <sup>34</sup> In his will Lassalle recommended Bernhard Becker as his heir to the post of President of the General Association of German Workers. On the title page of his *Enthüllungen über das tragische Lebensende Ferdinand Lassalle's* (Schleiz, 1868), Becker calls himself "heir by Lassalle's will".

At a meeting of the Association's Hamburg branch on March 22, 1865, Becker slandered the International Working Men's Association and also Marx, Engels and Liebknecht (see *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 39, supplement, March 26, 1865). Marx exposed this slander in his article "The President of Mankind" (see present edition, Vol. 20). The Berlin branch, expressing the growing discontent of the rank-and-file members of the General Association 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.

p. 24

- <sup>35</sup> Under the influence of Sophie von Hatzfeldt a small group of Lassalleans split away from the General Association of German Workers and in 1867 formed the Lassallean General Association of German Workers. This Association, whose president was first Försterling and later Mende, had little impact on the workers and in 1872 virtually ceased to exist.

p. 24

- <sup>36</sup> At its meeting of September 29, 1868 the General Council of the International Working Men's Association discussed, among other things, Hirsch's statement that all the principal trade unions of England had withdrawn from the Association. To refute this slander Marx wrote this item for the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt* (see his letter to Engels of October 4, 1868, present edition, Vol. 43). The editors presumably made changes in the first paragraph.

This item was first published in English in *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966.

p. 25

- <sup>37</sup> The General Council of the International Working Men's Association jointly with the English trade unions organised financial support for the workers on strike.

During the strike of the Paris bronze-workers in February-March 1867 (see Note 14), the General Council published in *The International Courier*, March 13, 1867, an address to the English workers calling on them to give material help to the strikers. The trade unions of shoemakers, tailors, cabinet-makers and others sent several hundred pounds sterling to France through the General Council.

In connection with the shooting of the Belgian miners and iron-workers of Marchienne (February 1867), the General Council published an appeal "To the Miners and Iron-Workers of Great Britain" (*The International Courier*, March 13, 1867) urging them to support the victims of this brutal action. The bereaved families received financial assistance.

During the strike and lock-out of the Geneva building workers in March-April 1868 (see Note 14) the General Council guaranteed monthly aid from England amounting to 40,000 francs. The money was sent to Geneva by trade unions of carpenters and joiners, weavers, book-binders and others.

p. 25

- <sup>38</sup> This refers to the *London Trades Council* elected at a conference of trade union delegates held in London in May 1860. The Council headed the London trade unions numbering many thousand members, and was fairly influential among the British workers.

In the first half of the 1860s it headed the British workers' campaign against intervention in the USA, in defence of Poland and Italy, and later for the legalisation of the trade unions. The leaders of the following large trade unions played a major role in the Council: the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners (Robert Applegarth), the Shoemakers' Society (George Odger), the Operative Bricklayers' Society (Edwin Coulson and George Howell) and the Amalgamated Engineers (William Allan). All of them, except Allan, were members of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association.

The General Council did its best to draw into the International the broad mass of British workers and endeavoured, on the one hand, to get the local trade union organisations affiliated to it and, on the other, to induce the London Trades Council to join the International as a British section. "The London Council of the English Trade Unions (its secretary is our president, Odger) is deliberating at the present moment as to whether it should declare itself to be the British Section of the International Association. If it does so, government of the working-class here will in a certain sense pass into our hands, and we shall be able to give the movement a good 'push on'," wrote Marx to Ludwig Kugelmann on October 13, 1866 (see present edition, Vol. 42).

On the initiative of the English members of the General Council, the London Trades Council discussed the question of joining the International at its meetings in the autumn of 1866.

After the repeated deferment of the question, which was due to the struggle between the reformist leaders of the London Council who opposed affiliation and local trade unionists, it was finally decided at the Council meetings of January 9 and 14, 1867, to co-operate with the International Association "for the furtherance of all questions affecting the interests of labour; at the same time continuing the London Trades Council as a distinct and independent body as before" (*The Times*, No. 25708, January 15, 1867). This decision was discussed by the General Council of the International on January 15, 1867, after which the London Trades Council continued to maintain its contact with the International through those of its members who were also members of the General Council. p. 26

<sup>39</sup> In the spring of 1865 the Central (General) 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 for the second election reform. The League's leading bodies—the Council and Executive Committee—included the General Council members, mainly trade union leaders. The League's programme was drafted under Marx's influence. Unlike the bourgeois parties, which confined their demands to household suffrage, the League advanced the demand for manhood suffrage. This revived Chartist slogan won it the support of the trade unions, hitherto indifferent to politics. The League had branches in all big industrial cities. The vacillations of the radicals in its leadership, however, and the conciliation of the trade union leaders prevented the League from following the line charted by the 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. 26

<sup>40</sup> 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 became members of the General Council and took part in several congresses of the International.

p. 26

<sup>41</sup> In 1863 Edgar Bauer, a German journalist and former Young Hegelian, began working for the Prussian Press Department.

p. 27

<sup>42</sup> Marx wrote this item at the request of Collet Dobson Collet, the publisher of *The Diplomatic Review* (see Marx's letters to Engels of November 14 and 23, 1868, present edition, Vol. 43). The editor was David Urquhart, a journalist and former diplomat. In the early 1820s Urquhart published *The Portfolio*, a collection of diplomatic documents and papers relating to the diplomacy of European powers, including documents exposing the diplomatic activity of Palmerston, who virtually directed Britain's foreign policy for many years.

In 1853, in a series of articles entitled *Lord Palmerston* Marx used, along with other documents, some of those published by Urquhart. Later, some of Marx's articles were reprinted in Urquhart's journal *The Free Press*. At the same time, Marx sharply criticised Urquhart for his anti-democratic views and emphasised the principal difference between his own stand as a proletarian revolutionary and the Urquhartites' reactionary position.

When publishing this item by Marx, the editors of *The Diplomatic Review* prefaced it with a note recommending Marx as the author of *Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the 18th Century* (see present edition, Vol. 15) and of *Capital*.

p. 28

<sup>43</sup> The *Bank Charter Act* (An Act to Regulate the Issue of Banknotes, and for Giving to the Governor and Company of the Bank of England Certain Privileges for a Limited Period) was introduced by Robert Peel on July 19, 1844. It provided for the division of the Bank of England into two separate departments, each with its own cash account—the Banking Department, dealing exclusively with credit operations, and the Issue Department, issuing banknotes. The Act limited the number of banknotes in circulation and guaranteed them with definite gold and silver reserves which could not be used for the credit operations of the Banking Department. Further issues of banknotes were allowed only in the event of a corresponding increase in the precious metal reserves. The issue of banknotes by provincial banks was stopped. The Act was suspended several times by the government itself, in particular during the monetary crises of 1847 and 1857.

The crisis of 1866 in England was particularly manifest in the sphere of credit. In May 1866, when the financial panic reached its climax and the Bank of England was in danger of bankruptcy, its Board received a letter, signed by the Prime Minister Russel and the Chancellor of the Exchequer Gladstone, sanctioning the suspension of the 1844 Act (see *The Times*, No. 25497, May 14, 1866); this allowed the Bank to extend credit operations and somewhat mitigate the financial panic in the country.

Marx analysed the Act of 1844 and its significance in a number of articles for the *New-York Daily Tribune*: "The Vienna Note.—The United States and Europe.—Letters from Shumla.—Peel's Bank Act" (see present edition, Vol. 12), "The Bank Act of 1844 and the Monetary Crisis in England", "The British Revulsion" (Vol. 15), "The English Bank Act of 1844" (Vol. 16), etc. A detailed description of the Act was given by Marx in *Capital*, Vol. III (Chapter XXXIV).

p. 28

<sup>44</sup> Marx means the first two occasions when the Bank Act of 1844 was suspended—the letters from Prime Minister Russell and Chancellor of the

Exchequer Wood, dated October 25, 1847, to the Governor and Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England (in: *Report from the Secret Committee of the House of Lords appointed to inquire into the causes of the distress...*, London 1848), and from Prime Minister Palmerston and Chancellor of the Exchequer Lewis of November 12, 1857, to the Governor and Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England (in: *The Times*, No. 22837, November 13, 1857). p. 28

- <sup>45</sup> Marx refers to the congress of representatives of France, Britain, Austria, Russia, Sardinia, Prussia and Turkey in Paris, where a peace treaty was signed on March 30, 1856, putting an end to the Crimean War, 1853-56. Marx here alludes to the fact that Clarendon, the head of the British delegation, failed to carry out the plans of British diplomacy to the full because of Anglo-French contradictions and a noticeable *rapprochement* between France and Russia. p. 29
- <sup>46</sup> The articles headed "Money Market and City Intelligence" (*The Times*, Nos. 25539 and 25579, July 2 and August 17, 1866) voiced alarm about the flow of English capital abroad, mainly to France, and about the consequent fall in the discount rate of the Bank of England. p. 29
- <sup>47</sup> The agreement on another 5-per cent Anglo-Dutch loan to Russia was concluded on November 4, 1866, to cover her foreign payments, particularly her debts. p. 29
- <sup>48</sup> At its meeting of October 6, 1868, the General Council of the International Association decided to publish the resolutions of the Geneva Congress (1866), adopted after the Council's report (K. Marx, "Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council. The Different Questions", present edition, Vol. 20), as well as those of the Brussels Congress (1868). Eccarius did the preliminary work, while Marx prepared the text for the press and checked the translation. Marx wrote the preamble to this publication between the end of October and November 3, 1868 (see his letter to Engels of February 24, 1869, present edition, Vol. 43) and it was first published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 371, November 21, 1868. Section I of this publication, including Marx's preamble, was approved at the General Council meeting of November 3, 1868. Subsequently, the publication was incorporated into a pamphlet, *The International Working Men's Association. Resolutions of the Congress of Geneva, 1866, and the Congress of Brussels, 1868*, London [1869]. p. 31
- <sup>49</sup> The Geneva Congress resolutions, which Marx selected for inclusion in the publication of those of the Brussels Congress (1868), dealt with the role of the International in the proletariat's economic struggle, the eight-hour working day, protection of child and female labour, the organisation of co-operative production and the tasks of the trade unions (points 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the "Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council. The Different Questions"—see present edition, Vol. 20). p. 31
- <sup>50</sup> The reason for Marx's statement to the *German Workers' Educational Society in London* was the Society's attitude towards the Lassallean Berlin Congress of 1868 and towards the workers' organisation founded by Bebel and Liebknecht at the Nuremberg Congress (see Note 24). On November 23, 1868 Marx wrote to Engels: "Imported from Paris and Germany, the Lassalleans, who are in secret contact with Schweitzer, took advantage of the absence of Lessner because of his wife's illness to obtain a vote of confidence in *Schweitzer* against the Nuremberg people" (see present edition, Vol. 43). Subsequently, Marx supported Lessner in his struggle against the Lassallean elements in the Society.

The *German Workers' Educational Society in London* was founded in 1840 by German worker refugees, members of the League of the Just. After the founding 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, Karl Schapper, who had renounced 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 established, the Society became its German section in London. Many of its members—Eccarius, Kaub, Lessner, Lochner, Bolleter and others—were on the General (Central) Council of the International and played a prominent role in its activity. The Society existed until 1918, when it was closed by the British Government. p. 32

- <sup>51</sup> On September 26, 1868, a General Congress of German Workers took place in Berlin, convened by Schweitzer and Fritzsche, as Reichstag deputies, by consent of the Hamburg general congress of the General Association of German Workers (see Note 9). The congress was attended by 206 delegates representing over 142,000 workers, mainly from the towns of North Germany. The workers' associations affiliated to the Nuremberg organisation headed by Bebel and Liebknecht, were denied representation at this congress. The Berlin congress set up several trade unions on the pattern of the sectarian Lassalleian organisation. These unions formed a general union headed by Schweitzer which was completely subordinate to the General Association of German Workers.

Marx severely criticised Schweitzer for the organisation of the congress, which led to a split among workers' trade unions in Germany, and for the Rules it adopted (see *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 112, supplement, September 25, 1868) which ran counter to the aims and character of the trade union movement (see Engels' letter to Marx of October 22, 1868, present edition, Vol. 43). p. 32

- <sup>52</sup> Marx refers to the Nuremberg Congress of the Union of German Workers' Associations headed by Bebel (see Note 24). p. 32

- <sup>53</sup> Marx means his letter of October 13, 1868 (see present edition, Vol. 43) in reply to Schweitzer's letters of September 15 and October 8, 1868. p. 33

- <sup>54</sup> The *Democratic Workers' Association (Demokratischer Arbeiterverein)* was founded in October 1868 as a result of the split in the Berlin Workers' Association. Wilhelm Eichhoff, who was in constant contact with Marx and was the General Council's Berlin correspondent, played a great part in establishing the Democratic Association. On his proposal, the newly formed Association joined the Nuremberg organisation of workers' associations headed by Bebel and Liebknecht and adopted its programme, which was based on the principles of the International. It maintained ties with the Berlin Section of the International, and almost all its members were also members of the International. To emphasise its proletarian character, two workers—Wilcke and Kämmerer—were elected its Presidents.

The Democratic Workers' Association actively opposed the Lassalleans. Wilhelm Liebknecht used to speak at its meetings. In 1869 it joined the Social-Democratic Workers' Party set up at the Eisenach Congress. p. 33

- <sup>55</sup> This circular letter was written by Marx on December 22, 1868, in connection with the discussion of the admission of the Alliance to the International at the General Council on December 15 and 22.

The *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy (L'Alliance internationale de la démocratie socialiste)* was founded by Mikhail Bakunin in Geneva in October 1868. Besides Bakunin, members of its Provisional Committee were Brosset, Duval, Guétat, Perron, Zagorsky and Johann Philipp Becker. In 1868 the Alliance published in Geneva leaflets in French and German containing its Programme and Rules. Becker, who shortly afterwards broke with Bakunin, sent the Alliance's Programme and Rules to the General Council on November 29. Both these documents were read out at its meeting on December 15, 1868, and the Council spoke against the admission of the Alliance to the International Working Men's Association. Marx thought that it was "against our Rules to admit another international association into our society" (this was written in the margin of the Minute Book on December 22 when the Minutes of December 15 were confirmed). On the same day, December 15, Marx forwarded the Alliance's Programme with his own remarks (see this volume, pp. 207-11) to Engels asking for his comments. Engels wholly shared Marx's opinion and noted that the admission of the Alliance to the IWMA would create "a state within the state" (see Marx's letters to Engels of December 15 and 19 and the latter's answer of December 18, 1868, present edition, Vol. 43).

The draft reply to the Alliance was written by Marx, who took into account Engels' remarks, and adopted by the General Council meeting on December 22 as a circular letter.

This circular letter, sent out to all the sections of the International as a confidential communication, was first published in Geneva in 1872 in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Les prétendues scissions dans l'Internationale. Circulaire privée du Conseil Général de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs* (see present edition, Vol. 23), and reprinted in *Le Courrier de France*, June 1872 and *Le Radical*, No. 175, June 23, 1872. The text of the circular letter has been preserved in several manuscripts slightly differing in reading (two of them are Marx's manuscripts: one for December 22, 1868, and the other appended to his letter to Jung of August 6, 1870; two hand-written copies: one made by Jung, and the other by Dupont and Engels).

In English the circular letter was first published in *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966. p. 34

- <sup>56</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 disclose the social sources of wars and often confined anti-militarist activity to mere declarations. At the General Council meeting of August 13, 1867, Marx spoke against the International's official participation in the League's Inaugural 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 present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 426-27, and Marx's letter to Engels of September 4, 1867, Vol. 42).

Marx's tactics against the League of Peace and Freedom were fully approved by the Brussels Congress of the International in 1868, which opposed official affiliation to the League but was in favour of the united action of the working class with all the progressive anti-war forces. p. 35

- <sup>57</sup> At the General Council meeting of December 15, 1868 Dupont proposed that a short report on the activity of the IWMA since the Brussels Congress should be drawn up and published. Jung was instructed to draw up the resumé and Marx expressed his willingness to help. The resumé contains chiefly the material of the General Council meetings of November 3 and 24, December 22, 1868 and January 5, 1869 and includes Marx's reports. The resolution moved by Marx and Applegarth, probably on Marx's initiative, was not entered in the Minute Book. That is probably why Marx decided to include it in this resumé.  
p. 37
- <sup>58</sup> The reference is to a letter from the Saxon miners of Lugau, Nieder-Würschnitz and Oelsnitz, dated November 15, 1868, informing the General Council of their decision to join the International. The letter was read by Marx at the meeting of November 24, 1868.  
p. 37
- <sup>59</sup> Marx refers to the Democratic Workers' Association (see Note 54), the formation of which he had announced at the General Council meeting of November 3, 1868. The facts cited by Marx were mentioned in a letter from Liebknecht that was read out to the General Council on December 22, 1868.  
p. 37
- <sup>60</sup> These data were given by Vandenhouten in his letter to Bernard of December 19, 1868 and read at the General Council meeting of December 22, 1868.  
p. 37
- <sup>61</sup> The strike of the Basle ribbon weavers broke out on November 9, 1868. A detailed description of the Swiss workers' economic struggle in the winter of 1868-69 was given by Marx in the Report of the General Council to the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association (see this volume, pp. 68-70). The reports about this strike and the lockout in Rouen's cotton industry (Nord department) were made in the General Council on January 5, 1869.  
p. 37
- <sup>62</sup> In response to the General Council's resolution, the Paris bronze-workers, on Marx's proposal, sent the Rouen weavers the £20 advanced to them by the Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners of Britain. A letter from Rouen read out at the General Council meeting on January 26, 1869 thanked the Council for the support it had given the locked-out workers.  
p. 38
- <sup>63</sup> Engels made out this report at Marx's request on the basis of material sent in by the Saxon miners from Lugau, Nieder-Würschnitz and Oelsnitz. The miners informed the General Council and Marx personally of their desire to join the International (see Note 58). On February 13, 1869 Marx wrote to Engels that the Lugau miners were the first in Germany to enter into direct contact with the International Working Men's Association and that it was necessary to give them public support (see present edition, Vol. 43).  
Marx highly praised Engels' report, which was written in English. "Thanks a lot for the report. It is perfectly clear," he wrote to Engels on February 24. The report was read by Marx to the General Council on February 23, and it resolved to have it published in English and in German translation. An abridged version appeared in a report of the General Council meeting in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 385, February 27, 1869 (see this volume, pp. 389-90). Other English newspapers to which Marx applied, including *The Times*, *The Daily News* and *The Morning Advertiser*, refused to publish the document. Marx himself translated Engels' manuscript into German (see his letter to Engels of March 2, 1869), and it was published in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 33, March 17,

*Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 12 (supplement), March 20, and *Zukunft*, Nos. 67 and 68, March 20 and 21, 1869. The English original has not been preserved.

The report was published in English in full for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966. p. 39

- <sup>64</sup> This expression was used by the Prussian Minister of the Interior, von Rochow. In his letter of January 15, 1838 to the citizens of Elbing who had expressed their dissatisfaction at the expulsion of seven opposition professors from Göttingen University, Rochow wrote: "It behoves a loyal subject to exhibit due obedience to his King and Sovereign...; it does not behove him to apply the measure of his limited understanding to the actions of the head of the State." p. 43

- <sup>65</sup> Having received the General Council's letter of December 22, 1868 in which it refused to admit the Alliance of Socialist Democracy to the International as an independent international organisation (see this volume, pp. 34-36), the Alliance's Central Bureau again applied to the General Council on February 27, 1869, declaring its readiness to dissolve its international organisation provided the General Council approved its programme and admitted its individual local sections to the International (see Marx's letter to Engels of March 5 and Engels' reply of March 7, 1869, present edition, Vol. 43).

This letter is the General Council's reply to the second application of the Alliance. It was written by Marx who obtained Engels' agreement to it by quoting it almost verbatim in his letter of March 5, 1869. It was accepted unanimously by the General Council on March 9 and confidentially sent out to all sections of the International. The document was first published in the pamphlet by Marx and Engels, *Les prétendues scissions dans l'Internationale* (Geneva, 1872) and reprinted in *Le Courrier de France*, June 24, 1872 and *Le Radical*, No. 176, June 24, 1872. This letter has been preserved in several copies with minor differences in reading: two rough copies by Marx in English and French, Marx's fair copy in French, and a copy in French in an unknown hand with corrections made by Marx.

This document was first published in English in *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966.

In this volume the document is reproduced from Marx's rough copy in English checked with his fair copy in French. Major differences in reading are given in the footnotes. p. 45

- <sup>66</sup> Article 2 of the Alliance's Programme was already included in the Programme which Bakunin presented at the Berne Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom in September 1868. In compliance with the General Council's request, Article 2 of the Alliance's Programme was changed in April 1869 to read as follows: "It is above all working for the complete and final abolition of classes and of political, economic and social equalisation of persons of both sexes." At the General Council meeting of July 27, 1869 Marx proposed and the Council resolved that the Alliance should be admitted to the International. p. 46
- <sup>67</sup> Marx wrote this address to the workers of Europe and the United States following the bloody events in Belgium in April 1869. On April 20, the General Council heard the report of Eugen Hins, representative of the Belgian Federal Council of the International, who had been sent to the spot to investigate the details of the massacre in Seraing and Frameries. Marx was commissioned to draw up an address on behalf of the General Council to denounce the atrocities committed by the Belgian authorities. He wrote it in English and French and



- read it out at the General Council meeting of May 4. The Council approved the address and decided to have it printed and distributed. In English it was published as a leaflet, "The Belgian Massacres. To the Workmen of Europe and the United States", in London on May 12, 1869. A copy of the leaflet has been preserved in the Minute Book of the General Council. Part of the leaflet was reproduced in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 395, May 8, 1869. The French text was published in the Belgian newspapers *L'Internationale*, No. 18, May 15 and *La Liberté*, May 16, 1869. The German translation by Eccarius was printed in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 58, May 21, in the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 21, May 22, 1869 and in other newspapers in Germany, Switzerland and France. The address found a broad response among the people. Read at a mass protest meeting in Brussels on May 16, it was met with tumultuous applause. p. 47
- <sup>68</sup> De Paepé wrote to Marx on May 31, 1869 that, for reasons of censorship, when the French text of the address was published in the Belgian newspapers, the names of Kamp, Pirmez and the Prince of Flanders were replaced with the words "persons occupying high posts in Belgium". See "Moralites de l'affaire de Seraing" in *L'Internationale*, No. 14, April 18, 1869. p. 48
- <sup>69</sup> *Les sommations préalables* (reading the riot act)—in a number of bourgeois countries, the triple demand of the authorities, covered by law, that the crowd should disperse, after which armed force may be used. p. 48
- <sup>70</sup> The reference is to the Franco-Belgian negotiations (between February and July 1869) on railway concessions in view of the fact that the Belgian Parliament had passed a law by which the transfer of concessionary rights could be done only by the authorities' permission. The law, which was passed very quickly, was directed against the economic expansion of France which tried to seize the Belgian railways. p. 48
- <sup>71</sup> Eyre, the Governor of the British colony of Jamaica, organised the brutal suppression of a Negro uprising in October 1865. This massacre caused a public outrage in Britain, and the British Government was compelled to dismiss Eyre from his post. p. 49
- <sup>72</sup> Belgium was declared neutral by the protocol of the London conference of five countries (Britain, France, Russia, Austria and Prussia) in January 1831, soon after the Belgian bourgeois revolution of 1830 and Belgium's separation from Holland. (See: Onzième protocole de la Conférence tenue à Londres, le 20 janvier 1831. In: Martens, G. F., *Nouveau Recueil de Traités d'Alliance, de Paix, de Trêve, de Neutralité, de Commerce...* [Groupe II], T. 10, Goettingue, 1836; pp. 158-60.) p. 49
- <sup>73</sup> See Note 18. p. 50
- <sup>74</sup> Originally the name of a religious sect of cut-throats in India, the word "thug" came to be widely used in nineteenth-century European literature to denote professional ruffians and assassins. p. 50
- <sup>75</sup> These words were said by Delfosse, a deputy to the Belgian Parliament, at a sitting of the Chamber of Representatives on March 1, 1848, in reply to a remark that the ideas of the French revolution of 1848 would travel round the world (see *Les Annales Parlementaires 1847-1848. Chambre des Représentants. Séance du 1<sup>er</sup> Mars 1848*, p. 950). p. 51
- <sup>76</sup> The General Council's Address to the National Labour Union of the United States (see Note 26) was written by Marx, and read by him in the General

Council on May 11, 1869, in view of a threat of war between England and the United States in the spring of 1869. The reply from the Union's President, Sylvius, is cited by Marx in the General Council's report to the Basle Congress (see this volume, pp. 81-82). The English text of the address was published as a leaflet and in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 396, May 15, 1869. The German translation was printed in the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 21, May 22; *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 59, May 23; *Die Volksstimme*, No. 4, Supplement, May 23, and in *Der Vorbote*, No. 8, August 1869. In the USA, the address appeared in workers' periodicals: *Die Arbeiter Union* (New York), No. 10, June 2; *The Workingman's Advocate* (Chicago-Philadelphia), No. 45, June 5, and *Weekly American Workman* (Boston), No. 22, September 18, 1869. p. 53

<sup>77</sup> *Shoddy aristocrats*—people in America who got rich quick on the Civil War. p. 54

<sup>78</sup> The second edition of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, written by Marx between December 1851 and March 1852 (see present edition, Vol. 11), appeared in Hamburg in 1869.

The bourgeois press kept silent about the new edition of *The Eighteenth Brumaire*. Marx's preface to the 1869 edition of his work was first reprinted in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 117, Supplement, October 6, 1869. *Der Volksstaat* did not announce the second edition of the book until March 16, 1870 (in a supplement to No. 22); at the same time it published the text of the preface. This preface was also reproduced in the third edition that came out in 1885 under Engels' editorship. In 1889 the preface was translated into Polish. A French translation was published in January 1891 in *Le Socialiste*, organ of the Workers' Party of France, and in the same year in a separate edition of the book which came out in Lille. In Russian, the preface was published in the first Russian edition of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* that came out in Geneva in 1894. The first English translation of this work was published in *The People*, the weekly of the Socialist Labour Party of the United States, in September-November 1897. It was published in book form in New York in 1898. p. 56

<sup>79</sup> On Marx's advice Joseph Weydemeyer published *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* in May 1852 as the first issue of the "non-periodic journal" *Die Revolution*, and provided it with a short preface. In giving it the title *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*, Weydemeyer failed to take into account that throughout the book Marx referred to the chief initiator of the coup d'état as Louis Bonaparte, which he did deliberately (see his letter to Jenny Marx of June 11, 1852, present edition, Vol. 39). p. 56

<sup>80</sup> Marx presumably refers to a letter from the Leipzig publisher and bookseller Otto Wigand of March 20, 1852, in which he refused to publish Marx's *Eighteenth Brumaire*, since there was a "risk of being persecuted by the state". p. 56

<sup>81</sup> The *Vendôme Column* was erected in Paris between 1806 and 1810 in tribute to the military victories of Napoleon I. It was made of bronze from captured enemy guns and crowned by a statue of Napoleon; the statue was removed during the Restoration but re-erected in 1833. In the spring of 1871, by order of the Paris Commune, the Vendôme Column was destroyed as a symbol of militarism. p. 57

<sup>82</sup> This short biography of Karl Marx is based on Engels' original version written at the end of July 1868 for the German literary newspaper *Die Gartenlaube* (see

Engels' letter to Marx of July 20 and Marx's letter to Kugelmann of October 26, 1868, present edition, Vol. 43), but not printed by the editors. In July 1869 Engels rewrote it for the newspaper *Die Zukunft*, No. 185, August 11, 1869. This first biography of Marx, written by Engels, was also printed in the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 34 (supplement), August 21, 1869, by Wilhelm Liebknecht, who omitted a most important passage stating that Lassalle was not an original thinker but borrowed the content of his writings from Marx and vulgarised his works. p. 59

- <sup>83</sup> A reference to the *Communist League*, the first German and international communist organisation of the proletariat, formed under the leadership of Marx and Engels in London early in June 1847, as a result of the reorganisation of the League of the Just (a secret association of refugee workers and artisans that appeared in the 1830s and had communities in Germany, France, Switzerland and England). The programme and organisational principles of the Communist League were drawn up with the direct participation of Marx and Engels. The League's members took an active part in the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Germany of 1848-49. Though the defeat of the revolution dealt a blow to the League, it was reorganised in 1849-50 and continued its activities. In the summer of 1850, disagreement arose in the League between the supporters of Marx and Engels and the Willich-Schapper sectarian group which tried to impose on the League its adventurist tactics of immediately unleashing a revolution without taking into account the actual situation and the practical possibilities. The discord led to a split within the League in September 1850. Owing to police persecutions and arrests of League members in May 1851, the activities of the Communist League as an organisation practically ceased in Germany. On November 17, 1852, on a motion by Marx, the League's London District announced the dissolution of the League.

The Communist League played an important historical role as the first proletarian party guided by the principles of scientific communism, as a school of proletarian revolutionaries, and as the historical forerunner of the International Working Men's Association. p. 59

- <sup>84</sup> The *Cologne Communist Trial* (October 4-November 12, 1852) was organised and stage-managed by the Prussian Government. The defendants were members of the Communist League arrested in the spring of 1851 on charges of "treasonable plotting". The forged documents and false evidence presented by the police authorities were not only designed to secure the conviction of the defendants but also to compromise their London comrades and the proletarian organisation as a whole. The dishonest tactics resorted to by the Prussian police state in fighting the international working-class movement were exposed by Engels in his article "The Late Trial in Cologne" and, in greater detail, by Marx in his pamphlets *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* (see present edition, Vol. 11) and *Herr Vogt*, Chapter 3, Section 4 (see present edition, Vol. 17). p. 59
- <sup>85</sup> This sentence was omitted by Liebknecht in the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 34 (supplement), August 21, 1869, which Engels noted with displeasure in his letter to Marx on September 5, 1869 (see present edition, Vol. 43). p. 60
- <sup>86</sup> Engels refers to the beginning of the reign of Frederick William IV of Prussia (1840-57) on whom the liberal bourgeoisie pinned great hopes. But this short-lived "New Era" amounted to insignificant concessions to the liberal bourgeoisie. p. 60

<sup>87</sup> On January 19, 1843 the Prussian Government passed a decision banning the *Rheinische Zeitung* as from April 1, 1843 and imposing a rigorous censorship for the remaining period. The decree was promulgated on January 21 (see "Erlaß der drei Zensurminister betr. Unterdrückung der *Rheinischen Zeitung* zum 1. April 1843", Berlin, 1843, 21. Januar). After the publication of the rescript of January 21 Marx directed his efforts to secure its repeal. At the end of January 1843 he was already thinking of resigning the editorship (see letter to Ruge of January 25, 1843, present edition, Vol. 1, p. 397), but he did not consider it possible to carry out his intention at the height of the campaign for the repeal of the ban. In March, however, he believed that changes in the editorial board might make it possible to save the newspaper, and he made up his mind to resign officially from his post (the announcement of his resignation was published on March 17, 1843). Marx was probably prompted to do so also by his unwillingness to take upon himself the responsibility for a possible change of line of the newspaper by which the liberal shareholders wished to prolong its existence.

However the royal rescript was not repealed. The last issue of the newspaper appeared on March 31, 1843. p. 60

<sup>88</sup> Later, Marx wrote in the preface to his *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (1859): "In the year 1842-43, as editor of the *Rheinische Zeitung*, I first found myself in the embarrassing position of having to discuss what is known as material interests. Debates of the Rhine Province Assembly on the theft of wood and the division of landed property; the official polemic started by Herr von Schapper, then Oberpräsident of the Rhine Province, against the *Rheinische Zeitung* about the condition of the Mosel peasantry, and finally the debates on free trade and protective tariffs caused me in the first instance to turn my attention to economic questions" (see present edition, Vol. 29). p. 60

<sup>89</sup> This refers to the *German Democratic Society*, formed in Paris after the February revolution of 1848 and headed by petty-bourgeois democrats who campaigned to raise a volunteer legion of German refugees with the intention of marching into Germany. In this way they hoped to carry out a revolution in Germany and establish a republic there. Marx and Engels resolutely condemned this adventurist plan of "exporting revolution". Late in April 1848 the volunteer legion moved to Baden where it was dispersed by government troops. p. 61

<sup>90</sup> Engels refers to reports of the commissioners appointed to inquire into the situation in the various branches of English industry, published in the *Blue Books*.

*Blue Books*—collected documents of the British Parliament and Foreign Office published since the seventeenth century. p. 63

<sup>91</sup> The *Health and Morals of Apprentices Act* of 1802 limited the working time of child-apprentices to twelve hours and prohibited their employment at night. This law applied only to the cotton and wool industries; it made no provision for control by factory inspectors and was virtually disregarded by the mill-owners. p. 63

<sup>92</sup> A reference to the law of August 15, 1867, which brought new industries under the factory acts (including that of 1847) on the ten-hour working day, and the law of August 21, 1867 on the labour of children, adolescents and women in workshops. The first law covered mainly large factories while the second embraced small enterprises and workshops. p. 64

<sup>93</sup> Marx wrote this report after the General Council had discussed the problem of abolishing the right of inheritance at its meetings of July 20 and August 3, 1869 in view of the preparations for the Basle Congress. The question was put on the agenda at the insistence of the section founded by Bakunin in Geneva in May 1869 under the name of "The Alliance of Socialist Democracy, Central Section". This section guided the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy (see Note 55) which continued to exist secretly despite the announcement of its dissolution.

On July 20 Marx made a long speech in the General Council. A record of it has been preserved in the Council's Minute Book (see this volume, pp. 394-97). The text of Marx's report was endorsed by the General Council on August 3. It was read at the Basle Congress by Eccarius on September 11, 1869 and reproduced in full in the reports about the congress in English, French and German: *Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association, held at Basle, in Switzerland. From the 6th to the 11th September, 1869*, London [1869], pp. 26-27; *Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Compte rendu du IV-e Congrès International, tenu à Bâle en septembre, 1869*, Bruxelles, 1869, pp. 122-24; *Verhandlungen des IV. Congresses des internationalen Arbeiterbundes in Basel*, Nos. 1-7, Basel, 7-14. September 1869, S. 77-80; in *Der Vorbote*, No. 10, October 1869 and in *Arbeiter-Zeitung* (New York), No. 36, October 11, 1873. p. 65

<sup>94</sup> The demand to abolish the right of inheritance was put forward by Saint-Simon's followers (Enfantin, Bazard, Rodrigues, Buchez, etc.) who in the late 1820s set out to popularise and develop Saint-Simon's doctrine. In 1830 a book was published in Paris which, based as it was on Bazard's lectures, expressed the views of the followers of Saint-Simon on the right of inheritance: *Doctrine de Saint-Simon. Exposition. Première année. 1829*. Paris, 1830, pp. 143-69. p. 66

<sup>95</sup> Marx drew up this report, on the General Council's instructions, in late August and early September 1869 for the Basle Congress, which was to be held in September. (As can be seen from Dupont's letter to Marx of September 1, 1869, Marx's report was discussed at the General Council meeting on that day. The minutes of this meeting were not recorded in the Minute Book.) Marx did not attend the congress but took an active part in its preparations. The Minute Book contains records of his speeches in the General Council during the discussion of the following items on the congress agenda: the agrarian question (July 6, 1869), the right of inheritance (July 20) and public education (August 10 and 17) (see this volume, pp. 398-400).

Having discussed the land question for the second time, the Basle Congress decided by a majority vote in favour of abolishing private property in land and turning it into common property, thereby confirming the socialist platform of the International. It also resolved to unite trade unions on a national and international scale, to strengthen the International organisationally and to extend the General Council's powers. At this congress the supporters of Marx's scientific socialism clashed openly for the first time with the followers of Bakunin's anarchism over the abolition of the right of inheritance (see Note 93).

The text of the General Council's report, written by Marx in English, was read in German and French at the congress on September 7, and published in German in Marx's translation as a separate pamphlet, *Bericht des Generalraths der Internationalen Arbeiter-Association an den IV. allgemeinen Congress in Basel*, Basel, 1869. In English and French it was published together with the Minutes of the

Congress sittings in the following pamphlets: *Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association, held at Basle, in Switzerland*, London [1869], pp. 7-13; *Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Compte rendu du IV-e Congrès International, tenu à Bâle, en septembre 1869*, Bruxelles, 1869, pp. 9-23.

The report was also published in a number of newspapers and journals: *L'Internationale*, Nos. 37 and 38, September 26 and October 3, 1869; *Le Progrès*, Nos. 26, 27 and 28, December 11, 18 and 25, 1869 and Nos. 1, 2 and 3, January 1, 8 and 15, 1870; *Der Vorbote*, No. 9, September 1869; *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, Nos. 41, 42 and 43, September 18, 22 and 25, 1869; and in the Neapolitan newspaper *L'Eguaglianza*, Nos. 8 and 9, December 24 and 31, 1869. The first Russian translation appeared in the journal *Narodnoye Dyelo*, Nos. 7-10, November 1869. Extracts from the report or summaries of it were printed in *The Times*, No. 26543, September 15, 1869 (in Eccarius' report); *La Liberté* (Brussels), No. 116, September 12, 1869; *L'Égalité* (Geneva), No. 36, September 25, 1869, and in other periodicals. p. 68

<sup>96</sup> "*La Jeune Suisse*" ("Young Switzerland")—here, the chauvinistic youth organisation known as "*La Jeune Genève*" ("Young Geneva"). p. 71

<sup>97</sup> "*Les orgies infernales des casse-têtes*" ("Infernal orgies of the knuckle-dusters")—from a speech by Raspail, a deputy to the Legislative Corps, at a session of July 8, 1869, in which he lodged a protest against the violence of the Bonapartist police during the elections in Paris (see *Annales du Sénat et du Corps législatif. Session extraordinaire du 28 juin au 6 septembre 1869*, Paris, 1869, p. 205). p. 71

<sup>98</sup> The facts mentioned here were made public in *L'Égalité*, No. 19, May 29, 1869. During the strikes of Geneva builders and printers in spring 1869, the Romance Federal Committee and the International's sections in Geneva carried out a great deal of work. The Committee issued a number of addresses to the workers. They were published in March and April 1869 in *L'Égalité* and as leaflets: the address of the Committee to the sections of the International of March 17 ("*Le Comité Fédéral Romand. Aux Sections Internationales*"), the address of a meeting of Swiss citizens, members of the International, convened on April 2 on the Federal Committee's initiative, exposing the employers' slanders against the International Working Men's Association ("*Adresse au Conseil d'État et au Peuple de Genève*"), and other addresses.

The bulletins periodically put out by the builders' and printers' societies belonging to the International also played an important role in organising the strikes: "*Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Grève des Tailleurs de Pierre et Maçons*", "*La Société Typographique de Genève à l'opinion publique*". p. 71

<sup>99</sup> The *Crédit Mobilier (Société générale du Crédit Mobilier)* was a French joint-stock bank founded in 1852 by the Péreire brothers. Closely connected with and protected by the Government of Napoleon III, it engaged in large-scale speculation. The bank was involved, in particular, in the railway-building business. It went bankrupt in 1867 and was liquidated in 1871. p. 72

<sup>100</sup> The strike of Rouen weavers was discussed at the Sub-Committee's meeting of January 2, 1869 and at the General Council meetings of January 5, 12 and 19, 1869. The resolution adopted on January 5 and published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 379, January 16, sharply criticised the attempt of the employers of Rouen and other departments of France to expand trade "by reducing the wages of

work-people already underpaid". Various societies were invited to send delegates to the next Council meeting "to devise the best means to frustrate the unwarrantable attempts of the French manufacturer, and to render the workmen concerned such assistance as they may need".

On the General Council's aid to the Rouen weavers see Note 62. p. 74

<sup>101</sup> A reference to the first trial against the International in France (see Note 16). p. 74

<sup>102</sup> The reference is to the *North-German Confederation* (Norddeutscher Bund)—a federative state to the north of the Main that existed from 1867 to 1870. It was set up under Prussia's superiority and on the initiative of the Prussian Prime Minister, Otto Bismarck, after Prussia's victory over Austria in 1866 and the disintegration of the German Confederation. It included 19 states and three free cities in North and Central Germany with a population of about 30,000,000 people. The Confederation adopted its constitution on July 1, 1867. Its establishment was a major step in unifying Germany under Prussia's hegemony.

In the course of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71 South-German states joined the Confederation. On December 9, 1870 the Reichstag decreed that the united state should be renamed the German Empire. The latter was proclaimed in Versailles on January 18, 1871. p. 75

<sup>103</sup> "*Les chassepots avaient encore fait merveille*" ("Chassepots have worked wonders again"); *chassepots*—rifles improved by Chassepot and adopted by the French army in 1866. p. 76

<sup>104</sup> This was the slogan of the Lyons weavers during the rebellion of 1831. p. 77

<sup>105</sup> A reference to Austria's defeat in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866. p. 77

<sup>106</sup> The general congress of the German Social-Democrats held in Eisenach on August 7-9, 1869, founded the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party. Point 6 of the second section of the Party programme adopted by the Congress read: "Considering that the task of the emancipation of labour is neither local nor national but a social task embracing all countries where modern society exists, the Social-Democratic Workers' Party regards itself, as far as laws on associations allow, as a section of the International Working Men's Association and shares its aspirations." p. 78

<sup>107</sup> The political crisis aggravated by Austria's defeat in the war with Prussia in 1866 and the growing national liberation movement compelled its reactionary ruling circles to come to an agreement with Hungary and form a dual monarchy, Austria-Hungary on the one hand, and to make a number of political concessions to the bourgeoisie on the other. The Constitution adopted in December 1867 extended the powers of the representative body—Reichsrat, established ministerial responsibility to Parliament, introduced universal military service and centralised administration. In addition to representatives of the aristocracy, bourgeois liberals became members of the new government. p. 78

<sup>108</sup> See Note 56. p. 78

<sup>109</sup> When describing the workers' movement in Moravia, Marx drew on the articles published in *L'Internationale*, No. 29, August 1 ("Massacre d'ouvriers en Moravie"), and *Die Volksstimme*, No. 8, July 25, 1869 ("Die Opfer des 13. Juli in Brünn"), about the massacre of Brünn workers by government troops. He

also used an article from *Die Volksstimme*, No. 9, August 8, 1869 ("Der Prozess gegen die Social-Demokraten Most und Brüsshaber"), describing the trial of Austrian Social-Democrats in connection with a mass meeting in Vienna on May 29, 1869 and the adoption of a resolution which contained demands similar to those in the programme, drawn up at Eisenach, of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party. p. 78

- <sup>110</sup> *Cis-Leithanian Austria* or *Cis-Leithania*—part of Austria-Hungary which included Austria proper, Bohemia, Moravia, Galicia, Bukovina, Dalmatia and other lands. *Trans-Leithania* consisted of Hungary and Hungarian-ruled Slovakia, Transylvania, Croatia, Slavonia and other lands. These regions were named after the river Leitha that divided them. p. 78
- <sup>111</sup> At its meeting at Elberfeld-Barmen on March 28-31, 1869 the General Association of German Workers declared its accord with the programme of the International Working Men's Association and advised its members to join the International individually (see "Vereins Theil. Für den Allgem.-Deutschen Arbeiterverein. Generalversammlung", *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 47, April 21, 1869). p. 79
- <sup>112</sup> The *Riot Act*—was introduced in Parliament in 1714 and passed in 1715 for the maintenance of public peace and order. It empowered the local authorities to disperse assemblages of "trouble-makers" by force and charge them with felony. The Act obliged the authorities to read part of it to those assembled and to open fire if the latter refused to disperse within an hour. p. 81
- <sup>113</sup> This resolution was adopted at the Second General Congress of English Trade Unions at Birmingham, August 23-28, 1869, on the motion of Cremer, a member of the General Council of the International who attended it, and was published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 412, September 4, 1869. The Congress resolved to demand the eight-hour working day for the United Kingdom and to consider the agrarian question in detail at the next congress. p. 81
- <sup>114</sup> See Note 26. p. 81
- <sup>115</sup> This draft resolution was proposed by Marx at a General Council meeting on November 16, 1869 during the debate on the Irish question.

In the summer and autumn of 1869, Ireland was the scene of a widespread campaign for an amnesty of the imprisoned Fenians (see Note 1). The numerous meetings (in Limerick and other cities) sent petitions to the British Government demanding the release of the Irish revolutionaries. Gladstone, then head of the British Government, expressed his refusal to comply with these demands in his letters of October 18 and 23, 1869, to the prominent participants in the amnesty movement Henry O'Shea and Isaac Butt (see *The Times*, Nos. 26579 and 26583, October 23 and 27, 1869; for Marx's analysis of Gladstone's refusal, see this volume, pp. 407-10). In England the second campaign in defence of the imprisoned Fenians was initiated and organised by General Council members. The General Council repeatedly discussed this question in October and November 1869. The British Government's refusal to amnesty the Fenian prisoners resulted in a protest demonstration of nearly 200,000 workers in London on October 24. Marx also attended the demonstration (see the description of it in the letter from Marx's daughter Jenny to Ludwig Kugelmann on October 30, 1869, present edition, Vol. 43). On October 26, the General Council decided to draw up a resolution (an address to the English people in defence of the Irish prisoners) and set up a commission consisting of Marx, Lucraft, Jung and Eccarius to do so. However,



on Marx's proposal the question was given a wider context and on November 9 the General Council decided to discuss the British Government's attitude towards the Irish prisoners and the English working class's stand on the Irish question. Marx spoke twice during the discussion (see this volume, pp. 407-12), and his draft resolution moved on November 16 was adopted unanimously by the General Council on November 30, with an amendment proposed by Odger, a reformist leader of the English trade unions, that the word "deliberately" in the first paragraph of the resolution be omitted.

The draft resolution has been preserved as a rough copy, in the form of Marx's original letter to Engels of November 18, 1869, and as recorded by Eccarius in the Minutes of the General Council. The resolution was published in *Reynolds's Newspaper*, No. 1006, November 21, *Der Volksstaat*, No. 17, November 27, *L'Égalité*, Nos. 47 and 48, December 11 and 18, in *L'Internationale*, No. 48, December 12, 1869, and elsewhere.

In his work *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination* Lenin reproduces the text of the resolution in full (*Collected Works*, Vol. 20, Moscow, pp. 438-39).

p. 83

<sup>116</sup> In a speech made on October 7, 1862, in Newcastle, Gladstone (then Chancellor of the Exchequer) greeted the Confederacy of the Southern States in the person of its President Jefferson Davis, justifying the rebellion of the southern slave-owners against Lincoln's lawful government. The speech was published in *The Times*, No. 24372, October 9, 1862. It was mentioned by speakers during the discussion in the General Council.

p. 83

<sup>117</sup> Gladstone's Liberal Government succeeded the Tory Government, led by Disraeli, in December 1868. One of the demagogic slogans of the Liberals that brought them victory at the elections was Gladstone's promise to solve the Irish question. At the height of the election struggle, the opposition in the House of Commons criticised Tory policy in Ireland, comparing it with the policy of conquest of Britain herself pursued by William, Duke of Normandy, in the eleventh century (see *The Times*, No. 26067, April 4, 1868).

p. 83

<sup>118</sup> Marx wrote this circular letter in connection with the campaign launched by Bakunin and his followers against the General Council in November 1869. At the Basle Congress of the IWMA, Bakunin had tried to take over the leadership of the International by transferring the General Council from London to Geneva. Having failed in this, he changed his tactics and launched an open campaign against the General Council. A group of Bakunin's followers gained the majority in *L'Égalité*. The article "Le Bulletin du Conseil Général" (*L'Égalité*, No. 42, November 6, 1869) accused the General Council of violating clauses 2 and 3 of the Rules envisaging the publication by the Council of an information bulletin on the condition of workers in different countries. The article "L'Organisation de l'Internationale" (*L'Égalité*, No. 43, November 13, 1869) proposed that a special Federal Council for England should be set up, allegedly to help the General Council in fulfilling its functions as regards the general affairs of the International. The leading article "Les Parties Politiques à Genève et l'Internationale" (*L'Égalité*, No. 45, November 27, 1869) preached abstention from politics and referred to the distorted French translation of the General Rules. Finally, the leading article "Réflexions" (*L'Égalité*, No. 47, December 11, 1869) contained comments on the General Council's resolution against Gladstone (see this volume, p. 83), with sharp attacks on the Council for its position in the Irish question. Similar attacks on the General Council were made by another pro-Bakunin newspaper, *Le Progrès*.

The *Égalité* and *Progrès* attacks were first discussed at the General Council meeting of December 14, 1869. The text of the circular letter to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland, drawn up by Marx, was approved by the Council at an extraordinary meeting on January 1, 1870 and sent out to all sections of the International.

Meanwhile, early in January 1870, before it received the circular, the Romance Federal Council launched a decisive campaign against the Bakuninists and managed to have Perron, Robin, and other Alliance supporters withdrawn from the *Égalité* editorial board (for details see this volume, p. 123).

The circular letter was originally not intended for publication, but part of it was published in 1872 in the confidential circular *Fictitious Splits in the International* drawn up by Marx and Engels. The full text of the letter was first printed in *Die Neue Zeit*, Vol. 2, No. 15, July 12, 1902. There are several copies of the text: three in manuscript (one made by Mrs. Marx and corrected by Marx, another by Jung, and the third by Dupont, which is now in the Lyons municipal archives). There is also Marx's own manuscript, attached to his letter of March 28, 1870, to Ludwig Kugelmann and known as "Confidential Communication" (see this volume, pp. 112-24). The latter version was published in *Die Neue Zeit*.

In this volume the circular letter is printed from Mrs. Marx's copy corrected by Marx (Marx's insertions were made on separate sheets) and has been collated with his manuscript as sent to Kugelmann and with Jung's copy.

The circular letter was first published in English in *Letters to Dr. Kugelmann* by Karl Marx, Co-operative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the USSR, Moscow-Leningrad, 1934, pp. 105-09. p. 84

<sup>119</sup> The reference is presumably to the *League of Public Welfare*—an association of pacifist organisations, heterogeneous in composition and views, founded in France in 1863 by the petty-bourgeois journalist Edmond Potonié. Later it merged with the League of Peace and Freedom (see Note 56). p. 85

<sup>120</sup> In November 1866, John Hales proposed the reorganisation of the English branch of the International so that it would rely not on the trade unions affiliated with it, but on the new sections, formed according to the territorial principle and headed by a special Federal Council. Similar proposals were made at the end of 1869. Marx and other leaders of the Council considered the moment inopportune since this would isolate the International from the workers' mass organisations. Only after the events of 1871 (the Paris Commune), when the situation in England and in the world had changed radically and reformist trends had gained supremacy in the trade unions, did Marx and his supporters consider it advisable to form the British Federation of the International with a special Council at its head. p. 86

<sup>121</sup> The *Land and Labour League* was founded in London in October 1869 with the participation of the General Council. Its Executive Committee included more than 10 General Council members. The League's programme was drawn up by Eccarius on Marx's instruction (see this volume, pp. 401-06). Along with general democratic demands, like the reform of the finance and tax system and of public education, it contained demands for the nationalisation of the land and the reduction of working hours, as well as the Chartist demands for universal suffrage and home colonisation.

Marx held that the League could play a definite role in revolutionising the English working class and saw it as a means of establishing an independent proletarian party in England. However, by the autumn of 1870 the influence of

- bourgeois elements had grown in the League and it gradually began to lose contact with the International. p. 87
- <sup>122</sup> This refers to the London Trades Council (see Note 38). p. 87
- <sup>123</sup> The *Anglo-Irish Union* was imposed on Ireland by the British Government after the suppression of the Irish rebellion of 1798. The Union, which came into force on January 1, 1801, abrogated the autonomy of the Irish Parliament and made Ireland more dependent on Britain. One of the consequences of its introduction was, in particular, the abolition of tariffs established by the Irish Parliament at the end of the eighteenth century to protect the rising Irish industry, and this led to its total decline. p. 88
- <sup>124</sup> The position of the International on the Irish question, as expounded in this document, essentially anticipated the resolution on item 2 of the programme for the debate on this question in the General Council as proposed by Marx early in November 1869, namely, on the item defining the attitude of the English working class to the liberation struggle of the Irish people. Even though other official documents of the International were soon to remove the need for a special resolution on this issue, Marx stuck to his idea of continuing the debate on the Irish question in the General Council. Circumstances hindered this, notably Marx's protracted illness which prevented him from attending Council meetings regularly in the winter and spring of 1870. Later, more urgent matters arose, and in July 1870 the Franco-Prussian war broke out, which absorbed the attention of the Council. The Council therefore confined itself to the decisions already adopted on the Irish question. p. 89
- <sup>125</sup> Here and below, Marx compares the texts of the English and French editions: *Address and Provisional Rules of the International Working Men's Association* (London, 1864) and *Congrès Ouvrier. Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Règlement Provisoire* (Paris, 1864) which contains Proudhonist distortions of the preamble to the International's Provisional Rules.  
For details concerning the various publications of the Rules, see present edition, Vol. 20 (notes 1 and 351). p. 89
- <sup>126</sup> Marx refers to the French translation of the Provisional Rules made by Charles Longuet and published in the pamphlet *Manifeste de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs suivi du Règlement provisoire* issued in Brussels in summer 1866 by the newspaper *La Rive Gauche*. p. 90
- <sup>127</sup> Robert Shaw, a member of the General Council, a house-painter, died on December 31, 1869. At a General Council meeting on January 4, 1870 Marx was included in a deputation to attend the funeral on January 5. The General Council resolved that the news of Shaw's death should be communicated to the sections of the International. Marx, who corresponded on behalf of the General Council with De Paepe, leader of the Belgian sections, included this obituary in a letter to him dated January 8, 1870. The obituary was published by *L'Internationale*, No. 53, January 16, with an editorial note: "News from London".  
In English the obituary was published for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966. p. 92
- <sup>128</sup> Engels prepared the second edition of his *The Peasant War in Germany* (see present edition, Vol. 10) in 1870 together with Wilhelm Liebknecht, originally as a reprint in 29 numbers of *Der Volksstaat*, Leipzig (April 2-October 15, Nos. 27-83, at irregular intervals). Numbers 27 and 28 of the newspaper carried Engels' preface to the 1870 edition.

In October 1870 this work was published in book form—*Der deutsche Bauernkrieg von Friedrich Engels*. Zweiter, mit einer Einleitung versehener Abdruck, Leipzig, Verlag der Expedition des Volksstaat.

A new, third, authorised edition came out in 1875. For this edition Engels wrote a special addendum to the 1870 Preface, dated July 1, 1874.

In this volume the Preface is printed according to the 1870 Preface verified with the 1875 edition.

In English the Preface was first published in F. Engels, *The Peasant War in Germany*, International Publishers, New York, 1926. p. 93

<sup>129</sup> The *extreme Left* was one of the two factions of the Left wing of the Frankfurt National Assembly during the revolution of 1848-49 in Germany. The extreme Left, known as the radical-democratic party, mainly represented the petty bourgeoisie, but was nevertheless supported by a section of the German workers. The extreme Left vacillated and took a half-way position on the basic problems of the German revolution—abolition of the remnants of feudalism and unification of the country. Engels described the position of the petty bourgeoisie in the revolution of 1848-49 in his works, *The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution* and *The Peasant War in Germany* (see present edition, Vol. 10). p. 93

<sup>130</sup> This refers to Marx's works: *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850*, consisting of a series of articles written between January and October 1850 specially for the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue* and published in it under the general title "1848-1849" (see present edition, Vol. 10), and *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, written between December 1851 and March 1852 (see notes 78 and 79). p. 94

<sup>131</sup> On May 15, 1860, the Prussian Chamber of Deputies voted, at the Government's demand, for the allocation of 9,000,000 talers to the War Ministry till June 30, 1861 "for the temporary maintenance of the army in fighting trim and for the increase of its military might". The results of the voting (315 for, 2 against and 5 abstaining) showed that the Prussian bourgeoisie had in fact given in to the government over the reorganisation of the army. p. 95

<sup>132</sup> 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. Their 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. 95

<sup>133</sup> Engels refers to the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 which wound up 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. After a serious 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 North German Confederation was founded in its place under Prussia's supremacy (see Note

102). Austria, Bavaria, Baden, Württemberg, Hesse-Darmstadt remained outside the Confederation. 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. (On the events of the Austro-Prussian war see Engels' "Notes on the War in Germany", present edition, Vol. 20). p. 95

<sup>134</sup> In the German original the term *Haupt- und Staatsaktionen* (principal and spectacular actions) is used; this has several meanings. In the seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth century, it denoted plays performed by German touring companies. The plays, which were rather formless, presented tragic historical events in a bombastic and at the same time coarse and farcical manner.

Secondly, this term can denote major political events. It was used in this sense by a trend in German historical science known as "objective historiography". Leopold Ranke was one of its chief representatives. He regarded *Haupt- und Staatsaktionen* as the main subject-matter to be set forth. Objective historiography, which was primarily interested in the political and diplomatic history of nations, proclaimed the pre-eminence of foreign politics over domestic politics and disregarded the social relations of men and their active role in history. p. 95

<sup>135</sup> Engels refers to the Kingdom of Hanover, the Electorate of Hesse-Cassel and the Grand Duchy of Nassau annexed by Prussia following the Austro-Prussian war of 1866. p. 95

<sup>136</sup> Engels refers to what is known as Trans-Leithania (see Note 110). p. 96

<sup>137</sup> The *German People's Party* (Deutsche Volkspartei) was set up in 1865 and consisted of democratic elements of the petty bourgeoisie and partly of representatives of the bourgeoisie, chiefly from South-German states. As distinct from the National-Liberals (see Note 132), the People's Party was against Prussia's supremacy in Germany and advocated the plan of the so-called Great Germany uniting both Prussia and Austria. While pursuing an anti-Prussian policy and advancing general democratic slogans, the People's Party at the same time voiced the particularist aspirations of some German states. It was against Germany's unification as a single centralised democratic republic, advocating the idea of a federative German state.

In 1866 the Saxon People's Party, whose nucleus consisted of workers, joined the German People's Party. This Left wing of the German People's Party had, in effect, nothing in common with it except anti-Prussian sentiments and the desire jointly to solve the problems of Germany's national unification in a democratic way; it subsequently developed along socialist lines. The main section of the Party split away from the petty-bourgeois democrats and took part in founding the Social-Democratic Workers' Party in August 1869. p. 96

<sup>138</sup> In the 1860s a number of finance reforms in the interests of the bourgeoisie were carried out in the North German Confederation. In 1867 passports were abolished and freedom of movement and domicile established; in 1868 the system of uniform measures and weights was introduced and the trading code of the Customs Union extended to cover the entire territory of the Confederation. All these reforms undoubtedly facilitated the development of industry and the formation of the German nation.

However, medieval guild regulations in Prussia during the mid-1860s was a great hindrance to the development of capitalism in Germany. In conformity

with the bureaucratic system of regulating industry, there were branches in which no one could engage in business without a special license (concession). Only the Regulations of June 21, 1869 abolished the last remnants of guild privileges, and the law of June 11, 1870 provided for the establishment of joint-stock companies without preliminary permission. p. 96

- <sup>139</sup> The Basle Congress of the International adopted, on September 10, 1869, the following resolution on landed property proposed by Marx's followers:

"1. That Society has the right to abolish private property in land, and convert it into common property.

"2. That it is necessary to abolish private property in land, and convert it into common property." p. 100

- <sup>140</sup> Marx sent this article as a private letter to César De Paepe, the editor of *L'Internationale*, the newspaper of the Belgian sections of the International Working Men's Association. Marx expected the letter to be edited by De Paepe before it was printed (see Marx's letter to Engels, March 9, 1870; present edition, Vol. 43). The editors, however, published it almost without changes, only adding some explanations in brackets and dividing it into two parts. A small editorial comment was appended, which is not published in this edition.

An excerpt from the article was published in *La Liberté*, No. 10, March 10, 1872.

Marx used a great amount of factual material from *The Irish People* and *The Irishman* for 1869 and 1870.

Contextually close to this article are those written by Jenny, Marx's daughter, for *La Marseillaise* (see this volume, pp. 414-41). p. 101

- <sup>141</sup> O'Donovan Rossa, a prominent Fenian who in 1865 had been sentenced to penal servitude for life, was nominated candidate at the by-elections to Parliament in County Tipperary (South-Western Ireland). On November 25, 1869, Rossa was elected M.P. Even though the elections were quashed, the fact of his election testified to the growing protest against English policy among the Irish masses. Engels wrote about O'Donovan Rossa's election to Parliament in his letter to Marx of November 29, 1869 (see present edition, Vol. 43). p. 104

- <sup>142</sup> A writ of *Habeas Corpus*—the name given in English judicial procedure to a document enjoining the appropriate authorities to present an arrested person before a court on the demand of the persons interested to check the legitimacy of the arrest. Having considered the reasons for the arrest, the court either frees the arrested person or sends him back to prison or releases him on bail or guarantee. The procedure, laid down by an Act of Parliament of 1679, does not apply to persons accused of high treason and can be suspended by decision of Parliament. The British authorities frequently made use of this exception in Ireland. p. 104

- <sup>143</sup> A reference to the pamphlet *Two Letters to the Earl of Aberdeen on the State Persecutions of the Neapolitan Government*, published in London in 1851, in which Gladstone exposed the cruel treatment inflicted by the Government of the Neapolitan King Ferdinand II (nicknamed "Bomba" for the bombardment of Messina in 1848) on political prisoners arrested for participation in the 1848-49 revolutionary movement. p. 105

- <sup>144</sup> The *Land Bill* for Ireland was discussed in the English Parliament in the first half of 1870. Submitted by Gladstone on behalf of the English Government, ostensibly to assist Irish tenants, it contained so many provisos and restrictions

that it actually left intact the basis of big landownership by the English landlords in Ireland. It also preserved their right to raise rents and to drive tenants off the land, stipulating only that the landlords pay a compensation to the tenants for land improvement, and instituting a definite judicial procedure for this. The Land Act was passed in August 1870. The landlords sabotaged the implementation of the Act in every way and found various ways round it. The Act greatly promoted the concentration of farms in Ireland into big estates and the ruination of small Irish tenants. p. 105

<sup>145</sup> This is a report of the Standing Committee which it discussed at the sittings of February 19 and March 5, 1870. (Marx also attended them.)

The report was submitted to the General Council of the International on March 8, 1870. The Council, which had the right to arbitrate in conflicts arising between sections of the International, adopted the report and passed a decision on the conflict between Adrien Schettel and other members of the old Lyons section who supported the French Left Republicans, and the group of Albert Richard, a Bakunist.

The General Council found all the accusations made against Richard untenable and confirmed him in the post of Corresponding Secretary of the IWMA. The decision signed by the Corresponding Secretary for France, Eugène Dupont, was published in *L'Internationale*, No. 63, March 27, 1870. p. 108

<sup>146</sup> The *Russian Section* of the International was founded in Geneva in the spring of 1870 by a group of Russian political emigrants, young people influenced by the ideas of the Russian revolutionary democrats Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov. A great part in setting up this section was played by A. A. Serno-Solovyovich, a member of the International who died in 1869.

On March 11 the Committee of the Russian Section sent a letter to Hermann Jung enclosing its Programme and Rules (they were published in the section's newspaper, *Narodnoye Dyelo*, No. 1, April 15, 1870). In a letter of March 12 to Marx, the Committee asked him to be the Russian Section's representative on the General Council of the International. Johann Philipp Becker on his own behalf wrote letters of recommendation to Marx and Jung.

At its meeting on March 22, the General Council admitted the Russian Section to the International and Marx agreed to represent it in the Council. An official reply to the section was written by Marx, in the name of the General Council, on March 24 and published in *Narodnoye Dyelo*, No. 1, April 15, 1870.

The Russian Section was of great help to Marx and Engels in their struggle against the divisive activities of the Bakuninists. Its members—Nikolai Utin, Anton Trusov, Yekaterina Barteneva, Victor Bartenev, Yelena Dmitriyeva, Anna Korvin-Krukovskaya—took an active part in the Swiss and international working-class movement. Some of them participated in the Paris Commune. The section sought to establish contacts with the revolutionary movement in Russia. It virtually ceased its activity in 1872.

This document was first published in English in K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence, 1848-95*. Translated by Dana Torr, New York, International Publishers, 1942. p. 110

<sup>147</sup> For Flerovsky's book *The Condition of the Working Class in Russia*, see Marx's letters to Engels of February 10 and 12, 1870 (present edition, Vol. 43). p. 110

<sup>148</sup> This *Confidential Communication* was intended for the Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party. It included the full French text of

the General Council's circular letter of January 1, 1870 to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland (see this volume, pp. 84-91). As Corresponding Secretary for Germany Marx sent it to Ludwig Kugelmann in a letter of March 28, 1870, asking him to communicate the document to Bracke and other members of the Committee.

In English, the Confidential Communication was first published in *Letters to Dr. Kugelmann* by Karl Marx, Co-operative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the USSR, Moscow-Leningrad, 1934.

In this volume the document is published according to Marx's manuscript enclosed in the above-mentioned letter to Kugelmann. As compared with the circular letter of the General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland, Marx's manuscript contains certain mainly stylistic alterations and cuts.

- 149 See Note 56. p. 112
- 150 At the Second Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom (Berne, September 21-25, 1868), the second item on the agenda was "the relation of the economic and social question to the question of peace and freedom". By a majority vote the congress rejected the resolution proposed by Bakunin which declared the necessity for "economic and social equalisation of classes and individuals", the "abolition of the state" and the "liquidation of the right of inheritance". Having found no support at the congress, Bakunin and his followers withdrew from the League and in the same year established the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy (see Note 55) whose programme was based on the above-mentioned proposals by Bakunin. p. 112
- 151 See Note 55. p. 113
- 152 See Note 119. p. 117
- 153 See Note 120. p. 118
- 154 See Note 121. p. 119
- 155 The reference is to the London Trades Council (see Note 38). p. 119
- 156 The reference is to the Anglo-Irish Union of 1801 (see Note 123). p. 119
- 157 See Note 124. p. 121
- 158 Marx refers to a letter dated January 4, 1870, from the Romance Federal Council in Geneva to Jung, in which the Council expressed its disagreement with the *Égalité's* attacks on the General Council. It also wrote that the Alliance of Socialist Democracy had not been admitted to the Romance Federation and that the Alliance's aims had nothing in common with the tasks of the International Working Men's Association. In a private letter of January 4 to Hermann Jung, secretary Henri Perret wrote about the withdrawal of Charles Perron, Paul Robin and other Bakuninists from the *Égalité's* editorial board. The announcement of their withdrawal was published in the newspaper on January 8, 1870 (No. 2).
- The letters of the Romance Federal Council were sent from Geneva in reply to Jung's letter of November 1869, before it received the circular letter "The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland". p. 123
- 159 The reference is to the official letter of the Romance Federal Council to the General Council of the International of February 3, 1870 read at the General Council meeting on February 8. The Council unanimously agreed that the explanation was satisfactory. p. 123



<sup>160</sup> In 1858 the Russian landowner Pavel Bakhmetev sent Herzen money for propaganda purposes (the so-called Bakhmetev fund). Marx learned about this from Johann Philipp Becker's letter of March 13, 1870.

In 1869, under pressure from Bakunin and Ogaryov, Herzen agreed to divide the fund into two parts, one of which Ogaryov sent to Nechayev. After Herzen's death in 1870, Nechayev received the other part from Ogaryov.

p. 123

<sup>161</sup> See Note 146.

p. 124

<sup>162</sup> In its letter of March 12, 1870 signed by Utin, Netov (Bartenev) and Trusov, the Committee of the Russian Section asked Marx to represent them in the General Council of the International. It also stated that the section's members had decidedly broken off their ties with Bakunin and intended "in the immediate future to expose this man publicly", as he was deluding the "world of the working people".

p. 124

<sup>163</sup> Marx wrote this letter in reply to a request of January 12, 1870, from the International Metalworkers' Society in Hanover for help in establishing contacts with the English trade unions. The General Council appointed a delegation headed by Jung to conduct the talks. On April 12 Jung reported on a meeting on April 7 with the Council of the London Amalgamated Engineers. The latter was ready to establish contact with the engineers of Germany and France and handed over a list of questions which interested English workers. The questionnaire in Marx's letter slightly differs in wording from the English text preserved in Jung's letter to Marx of April 13, 1870 (see *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966, pp. 470-71).

Marx's letter, with a short editorial and conclusion was published in German in *Die Tagwacht*, No. 16, May 5, 1870, and in French in *L'Internationale*, No. 76, June 26, 1870. The author's name was mentioned in the editorial.

p. 125

<sup>164</sup> By the General Council's decision of November 22, 1864 *The Bee-Hive* was declared an official newspaper of the Association. This was announced in a supplement to the first edition of the *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association*, London, 1864. However, closely connected with trade union leaders and representatives of the radical bourgeoisie, the newspaper virtually remained, as Marx wrote to Sigfrid Meyer on July 4, 1868, a narrow trade union organ far from voicing the views of the IWMA (see present edition, Vol. 43). *The Bee-Hive* frequently suppressed the General Council's documents, mutilated them at will and sometimes did not publish the reports of the General Council meetings at all (see Marx's letters to Engels of July 29, November 18, 1869, present edition, Vol. 43). It adopted a negative attitude to the Irish national liberation movement, justifying Gladstone's policy (*The Bee-Hive*, No. 420, October 30, 1869; see also Engels' letter to Marx of November 1). Its policy was censured by members of the International in different countries.

The question of severing all connections with *The Bee-Hive* was raised by Marx at a meeting of the General Council on April 26, 1870 (see this volume, p. 444). Marx was supported by other members of the Council, who instructed him to draw up a declaration for publication. In a letter to Engels of April 28, 1870 (see present edition, Vol. 43), Marx wrote that he was to prepare a resolution for the next Tuesday, i. e. for the General Council meeting of May 3. Marx drew it up at the beginning of May and sent it to several newspapers (it was published in German in *Der Volksstaat*, No. 38, May 11, 1870 and in *Der*

*Vorbote*, No. 5, May 1870, datelined "London, May 3"). On May 3 the General Council did not discuss the question. On May 10 Marx was not present at the General Council meeting. He moved the resolution on May 17 (its text in Marx's handwriting is pasted into the Minute Book of the General Council). The General Council unanimously resolved to break with *The Bee-Hive* and to announce this resolution publicly to its different sections.

The resolution was published in French in *L'Égalité*, No. 22, May 28; *L'Internationale*, No. 72, May 29 and in *Le Mirabeau*, No. 46, June 5, 1870.

p. 126

- <sup>165</sup> Samuel Morley and other bourgeois liberals headed by Daniel Pratt built up a fund in 1869 for publishing *The Bee-Hive* and became its managers. At the beginning of 1870, H. Solley, a clergyman who championed an alliance between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, virtually became its editor-in-chief.

p. 126

- <sup>166</sup> In an attempt to strengthen its weakened position the government of Napoleon III scheduled a plebiscite for May 8, 1870. The questions were formulated in such a way that it was impossible to express disapproval of the Second Empire's policy without simultaneously opposing all democratic reforms. The Paris Federation of the International and the Federal Chamber of Workers' Societies of Paris issued a manifesto on April 24, 1870 (*Manifeste antiplébiscitaire des Sections parisiennes fédérées de l'Internationale et de la Chambre fédérale des Sociétés ouvrières*), which exposed this demagogic manoeuvre and called on the workers to abstain from voting.

On the eve of the plebiscite, members of the Paris Federation were arrested and charged with conspiring to assassinate Napoleon III. At the same time, persecution of members of the International began in Lyons, Rouen, Marseilles and other cities. The third trial of the members of the Paris Federation was held from June 22 to July 5, 1870. The attempted charge of complicity in the sham plot failed and the detainees were sentenced for being members of the International.

The declaration against the persecution of the members of the French sections written by Marx was approved by the General Council on May 3, 1870, and it was published in English as a leaflet and in the newspapers *The Daily Telegraph*, May 4, *The Eastern Post*, May 7 and *The Penny Bee-Hive*, No. 447, May 7, 1870 over the signature of General Council members. The French translation, made by Marx (see Marx's letter to Engels of May 10, 1870), was published in *La Marseillaise*, No. 138, May 7; *La Liberté*, No. 150, May 8; *L'Égalité*, No. 20, May 14; *L'Internationale*, No. 70, May 15, and *Le Mirabeau*, No. 45, May 29, 1870. In German the declaration was printed in *Der Volksstaat*, No. 38, May 11; *Der Vorbote*, No. 5, May; *Die Tagwacht*, No. 14, May 21, 1870, and in other periodicals.

p. 127

- <sup>167</sup> The first trial of the International's Paris Executive Committee took place in March 1868 (see Note 16); the second, from May 22 to June 19, 1868.

p. 128

- <sup>168</sup> This resolution was introduced at the General Council meeting of May 10, 1870 by Hermann Jung on behalf of Marx who was absent because of illness. A group of French petty-bourgeois emigrants in London, followers of Félix Pyat, who had lost contact with the International after the General Council's resolution of July 7, 1868 (see this volume, p. 7), continued to call themselves the French Section in London and to issue documents in the name of the International Working Men's Association. Throughout 1869 the question of

officially severing relations with this group was repeatedly raised in the General Council. In the spring of 1870, when a third trial against members of the International was in preparation in France, the break became all the more necessary, since the incriminatory material included documents of the so-called French Section in London, in particular an address adopted at a meeting on October 20, 1868, in which the International was identified with a secret republican society, the Revolutionary Commune, headed by Félix Pyat.

The text of the resolution in English has been preserved in the form of Marx's own manuscript pasted into the minutes of May 10, 1870 (with minor corrections in Eccarius' hand), and was published in *The Penny Bee-Hive*, No. 418, May 14; *The Times*, No. 26748, May 12; *The Echo*, No. 443, May 12, and in *Reynolds's Newspaper*, May 15, 1870.

The French text of the resolution, copied by Auguste Serrailier, is also extant; it was published in *La Marseillaise*, No. 145, May 14; *L'Internationale*, No. 70, May 15; *L'Égalité*, No. 21, May 21, and *Le Mirabeau*, No. 45, May 29, 1870. In German it was printed in *Der Volksstaat*, No. 41, May 21 and *Volkswille*, No. 18, May 28, 1870.

p. 131

- <sup>169</sup> Marx refers, in particular, to a report about a banquet given by the so-called French branch in London on May 3, 1870 in honour of Gustave Flourens, a French revolutionary, follower of Blanqui, an organiser of the Paris rising of 1870. The report was forwarded to France, Germany and other countries by the Havas and Reuters agencies and was published in the *Journal des Débats* on May 5. It stated that the banquet was chaired by "M. Le Lubez, President of the International Association", whereas Le Lubez had been expelled from the International for slander as far back as 1866.

p. 131

- <sup>170</sup> By decision of the Basle Congress, the next congress of the Association was to be held in Paris. At the General Council meeting of May 17, 1870 Marx proposed that the meeting-place should be changed in view of the increasing harassment by Napoleon III's government of the working-class and democratic movement and, in particular, of the International. It was decided to convoke the congress in Mainz.

However, the congress did not meet in Mainz because of the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war in July 1870. At the General Council meeting on August 2, Marx proposed that local sections and federations must be approached in writing and asked whether they would consent to a postponement of the congress. On receiving their consent, the General Council passed a formal resolution on August 23, 1870 for the postponement of the congress "until the earliest opportunity".

The resolution on the convocation of the congress in Mainz proposed by Marx was passed by the General Council on May 17, 1870. The German text, which Marx sent to Wilhelm Liebknecht, was printed in *Der Volksstaat*, No. 42, May 25; *Der Vorbote*, No. 6, June 1870, and in *Volkswille*, No. 20, June 11, 1870. In French the resolution was published in *L'Égalité*, No. 22, May 28 and *Le Mirabeau*, No. 45, May 29, 1870.

In English the text of the resolution has been preserved in the Minute Book of the General Council and as a handwritten copy made by Eleanor Marx. It was first published in English in *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966.

p. 132

- <sup>171</sup> On May 9, 1870, the Brunswick Committee of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party sent a letter to the General Council officially proposing that the next congress of the International be held in Germany.

p. 132

<sup>172</sup> This letter was written by Marx and Engels in connection with a congress of the International to be held in September 1870. Following the General Council's decision of May 17, 1870 on the convocation of the congress in Mainz, Stumpf, authorised by Liebknecht, wrote a letter to Marx on June 11 asking him to postpone the congress till October in view of the forthcoming September elections to the Imperial Diet in Germany. The next day the same request was made by the Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party to the General Council, and by Geib to Marx. Marx was definitely against the postponement and expressed his opinion on the matter in a letter to the Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party on June 27 (see this volume, p. 445).

This letter of Marx and Engels was published in *Der Volksstaat*, No. 51, June 26, 1872 and in the book *Leipziger Hochverrathsprozess. Ausführlicher Bericht über die Verhandlungen des Schwurgerichts zu Leipzig in dem Prozess gegen Liebknecht, Bebel und Hepner wegen Vorbereitung zum Hochverrath vom 11.-26. März 1872*, Leipzig, 1872. It was reprinted in the 1874 and 1894 editions of the book, the latter edition being prepared by Liebknecht on the instruction of the Committee of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party. p. 133

<sup>173</sup> The *Stuttgart Congress* of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party took place from June 4 to 7, 1870. It summed up the results of the party's activity for the past year, paying great attention to the work among the masses. The Congress discussed the peasant question. On Bebel's proposal it adopted the resolution on the socialisation of the land, formulating it in the spirit of the Basle Congress resolutions. In its political programme the Congress sharply criticised the Bakuninist views on the political struggle and the state.

The Congress also discussed the next congress of the International in Mainz. p. 133

<sup>174</sup> This refers to a special fund at the personal disposal of Bismarck which was used for bribing the press. p. 135

<sup>175</sup> After the *Égalité* editorial board was reorganised (see Note 158), the Bakuninists, attempting to retain their lost positions, had secured a formal majority of votes at a regular congress of the Romance Federation held in La Chaux-de-Fonds on April 4-6, 1870. The congress discussed the attitude of the working class to the political struggle. In contrast to the Geneva sections, the Bakuninists advocated abstention from the political struggle, referring to the French text of the Rules (see this volume, pp. 89-90). On Bakunin's insistence, the congress began its proceedings with the admission of the newly formed sections to the federation. A sharp struggle arose over the admission of the section named "Alliance of Socialist Democracy—Central Section" (see Note 55) and the Chaux-de-Fonds pro-Bakunin section. Utin, one of the leaders of the Russian Section in Geneva, exposed Bakunin's schismatic activities. A split occurred; the Geneva delegates and other General Council supporters continued their work independently. An announcement about the Chaux-de-Fonds split was published in *L'Égalité* on April 9, 1870.

The Bakuninists elected a new Federal Committee and transferred its seat to La Chaux-de-Fonds. Thus two Federal committees appeared in Romance Switzerland—in Geneva and in La Chaux-de-Fonds. The Bakuninists started publication of a newspaper, *La Solidarité*, that appeared under the editorship of James Guillaume, first in Neuchâtel (April 11, 1870-May 12, 1871), and then in Geneva. It was, in fact, a continuation of *Le Progrès*.

On April 12, 1870 the General Council, having received the news about the

events at the congress instructed Hermann Jung to gather more particulars. Jung brought them to the attention of the Council in April and May. At the request of the Geneva Committee members, the Council discussed the split at the Chaux-de-Fonds congress on June 28 and passed a resolution (for the record of Marx's speech on the question see this volume, p. 446). It was sent to the two Federal Committees by Jung, the Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland, and published in *La Solidarité*, No. 16, July 23 and *Le Mirabeau*, No. 53, July 24, 1870, over his signature.

In English the resolution was first published in *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966. p. 136

- <sup>176</sup> The lock-out of the Geneva building workers was discussed by the General Council at its meetings on June 14 and 21, 1870. On June 21 Marx was instructed to draw up an address to the trade unions and sections of the International in Europe and the United States. The address was approved by the General Council on July 5 and published in leaflet form in English, German and French: "The Lock-out of the Building Trades at Geneva. The General Council of the International Working Men's Association to the Working Men and Women of Europe and the United States"; "Die Aussperrung der Bauarbeiter in Genf. Der Generalrath der internationalen Arbeiterassoziation an die Arbeiter und Arbeiterinnen in Europa und den Vereinigten Staaten"; "La Grève des corps de métiers en bâtiment à Genève. Appel du Conseil général de l'Association internationale des Travailleurs aux travailleurs et travailleuses de l'Europe et des États-Unis". The German text was also published in the newspapers *Der Volksstaat*, No. 56, July 13 and *Volkswille*, No. 25, July 16, 1870 and in the journal *Der Vorbote*, No. 7, July 1870. In this volume the address is printed according to the English leaflet checked with the German and French texts. p. 137
- <sup>177</sup> The masters' appeal was adopted on June 2, 1870, at a meeting of the Association of Building Trade Masters in the Canton of Geneva, and published as a poster. It placed the whole responsibility for the strike in Geneva on the International Association. The masters demanded that the authorities should put into effect an article in the federal constitution entitling the government to expel "foreigners violating the home and foreign security of Switzerland". p. 138
- <sup>178</sup> The decision of the Geneva master builders to declare a lock-out of building workers evoked protests from workers of other trades. On June 19, 1870, *L'Internationale* wrote about a 10,000-strong meeting of Geneva workers protesting against this decision of the employers. *L'Égalité*, No. 23, June 11, 1870 published a protest of a 5,000-strong meeting of watch-makers ("Protestation votée en Assemblée populaire nationale tenue au Bâtiment Electoral 7 juin 1870"). On June 14 the *Égalité* editors published a special supplement to No. 23 on the Geneva building workers' strike. The next issue of June 18 published an address by the Geneva factory workers to the strikers, expressing solidarity with them and informing them of the aid that had been organised. p. 138
- <sup>179</sup> Engels wrote notes at the request of Marx's eldest daughter, Jenny. They were intended as a preface to *Erins-Harfe, Irländische Volksmelodien nach Thomas Moore*, which was being prepared for publication in Hanover. Jenny Marx sent them to Ludwig Kugelmann, asking him to hand them to Joseph Risse, the compiler of the collection (see Jenny Marx's letter to Kugelmann, July 17, 1870, present edition, Vol. 43). However, they did not appear in the collection

printed in 1870. They were first published in 1955, in *Movimento Operaio*, No. 2, Milano, in Italian, and in *La Pensée*, No. 75, 1957, in French.

In English this article was published in Marx and Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1978. p. 140

<sup>180</sup> The supposed works of Ossian, a mythical Celtic bard, were forged and published in 1760-65 by the Scottish poet James Macpherson. p. 140

<sup>181</sup> This confidential communication was drawn up by Marx in connection with preparations for the next congress of the International scheduled for September 5, 1870 in Mainz. At the General Council meeting on June 28, 1870 Marx proposed that the sections of the Association should discuss the change of the seat of the General Council so as to avoid creating privileged conditions for workers of one or another country. Although adopted, Marx's proposition was objected to by Hales, a General Council member. The Council resumed the debate on July 5 and 12 and turned down Hales' objections. On July 14 Marx sent Hermann Jung the French text of the confidential communication and a letter in English (see present edition, Vol. 43) to be forwarded to Switzerland, with one reservation: "The following must *not be published* but only communicated by letter to the different sections." Also extant is the text sent to De Paepe by Auguste Serrailier, Corresponding Secretary for Belgium. The sections opposed any change of the Council's seat, considering London the most suitable place for the leading body of the International Working Men's Association.

The document was first published in Russian in Marx and Engels, *Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16, Moscow, 1960 and in English in *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966. p. 142

<sup>182</sup> The agenda of the Mainz Congress of the International to be opened on September 5, 1870 was drawn up by Marx and approved by the General Council on July 12, 1870. When it was discussed Marx took the floor several times to explain different points. The text of the programme adopted by the Council was published as a leaflet entitled *The Fifth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association*. The programme was prefaced by the following text: "The International Working Men's Congress of 1870 will be held in the city of *Mayence-on-the-Rhine*. The delegates are requested to assemble on *Monday, September 5, at nine o'clock in the forenoon, in the Marble Hall*, which the Burgomaster of the City has kindly placed at the disposal of the Association during the Session of the Congress." In a letter to Jung of July 14, 1870, Marx quoted the full text of the agenda, asking him to preserve the order of the items. He wrote: "Dear Jung. Enclosed the Programme. The questions are *arranged* in such an order as will *facilitate the business* of next Congress. You'll understand my meaning. Your truly, K. M." (see present edition, Vol. 43).

In this volume the programme of the Mainz Congress is printed according to Marx's manuscript, sent to Jung, which is fuller than the text of the leaflet.

Besides the Mainz Congress agenda was published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 461, August 13, 1870; it appeared in French in *La Solidarité*, No. 17, July 30, *La Liberté*, No. 162, July 31, *L'Internationale*, No. 81, July 31, *L'Égalité*, No. 28, August 6 and *Le Mirabeau*, No. 55, August 7, 1870; and in German in *Der Vorbote*, No. 7, July 1870 (with some inaccuracies), *Die Tagwacht*, No. 24, July 30, *Der Volksstaat*, No. 65, August 13, 1870 (the text corrected and signed by Marx). p. 143

<sup>183</sup> It was Wilhelm Liebknecht who proposed that this point should be included in the agenda of the Mainz Congress (in his letter to Marx of April 27, 1870). It was also discussed at the Stuttgart Congress of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party (see Note 173), Liebknecht delivering a report on the subject. p. 143

<sup>184</sup> *The History of Ireland* is a fragment of a voluminous work which Engels intended to write and on which he worked at the end of 1869 and during the first half of 1870. Engels studied a vast selection of literary and historical sources: the works of antique and medieval writers, annals, collections of ancient law codes, legislative acts and legal treatises, folklore, travellers' notes, numerous works on archaeology, history, economics, geography, geology, etc. Engels' bibliography, embracing over 150 titles, is selective and includes only a few of the sources he studied.

Engels presumably did not complete his preparatory work. However, the collected material comprising 15 paginated notebooks, the excerpts from books, the list of literature, notes on separate sheets and newspaper cuttings show the scale of his research into Irish history as well as his understanding of certain of its aspects.

Engels studied Gaelic in order to do research into Irish sources. Marx attached great importance to Engels' work and constantly helped him with it (see their letters during this period in Vol. 43 of the present edition). The views of Marx and Engels on major problems of Irish history took shape in the course of joint discussion.

The draft plan (see p. 307) shows that Engels' work was to consist of four long chapters, the last two being subdivided into sections. Engels actually succeeded in finishing only the first chapter—"Natural Conditions". The second chapter—"Old Ireland"—is unfinished. The manuscript breaks off where Engels intended to throw light on the social structure of Irish society before the English conquest in the second half of the twelfth century. Engels did not begin writing the last two chapters, which were to describe the development of the country up to the events of his own day, although he had compiled most of the required material. In a letter to Sigismund Borkheim written in early March 1872 (see present edition, Vol. 44), Engels mentioned that the Franco-Prussian War, the Paris Commune, the clash with the Bakuninists in the International, etc., interrupted his work. Engels used the results of his research in his theoretical works, such as *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* (see present edition, Vol. 27) and in his letters to various correspondents.

The fragment *The History of Ireland* (see this volume, pp. 308-14) and some preparatory material Engels collected for this work were first published in 1948 in Russian in the *Marx-Engels Archives*, Vol. X. In English, excerpts from the draft plan and the fragment *The History of Ireland* were published in Marx and Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971, while *The History of Ireland* was published for the Irish Communist Group by Angela Clifford, 258 Liverpool Road, No. 1, August 1965.

In the present edition *The History of Ireland* is printed according to Engels' manuscript in German. Omissions in passages from different authors are marked by dots in square brackets. Italics in the quotations are mostly by Engels unless otherwise indicated in the footnotes. p. 145

<sup>185</sup> Engels refers to the formation of a centralised feudal state in England after the conquest in 1066 by William, Duke of Normandy. The reforms carried out in the twelfth century by Henry II Plantagenet were particularly instrumental in strengthening the King's power. One of the objects of the English monarchy's

aggressive designs was Ireland, a country at an earlier stage of social and political development and still in a state of feudal decentralisation. Between 1169 and 1171 part of the island was conquered by the Anglo-Norman barons, who founded a colony in South-East Ireland known as the *English Pale*. The term came into use in the second half of the fourteenth century. The boundaries of the English Pale changed during the continual wars of the conquerors against the hitherto unsubdued population. Castles and fortifications were built in the border areas. At the end of the fifteenth century the Pale included only part of the present counties of Louth, Meath, Dublin and Kildare, but it served as a bridgehead for the complete subjection of Ireland by the English in the sixteenth century. Dublin was the centre of the Pale and the seat of the English Lord Deputy. p. 147

- <sup>186</sup> A reference to County Laoighis (Leix) in Central Ireland, which, in 1557, following the confiscation by the Tudors of the lands of local tribal communities (the clans), was renamed Queen's County in honour of Mary Tudor, Queen of England. The neighbouring Offaley (Offaly) County, the population of which had also fallen victim to the expropriation policy of the English colonial authorities, was renamed King's County in honour of Mary's husband, Philip II of Spain (see also this volume, pp. 297 and 298). p. 148
- <sup>187</sup> In modern terms—deposits of the Mesozoic and Cainozoic periods. p. 152
- <sup>188</sup> Engels presumably quoted Young according to Murphy's *Ireland. Industrial, Political, and Social*, London, 1870. p. 156
- <sup>189</sup> The synopsis of Wakefield's book, which contains rich factual material on the Ireland of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, is to be found in notebooks VII, XI and XII of Engels' preparatory material on the history of Ireland (see his letters to Marx of February 22 and April 13, 1870, present edition, Vol. 43). p. 156
- <sup>190</sup> A reference to the period of cruel reprisals against the Irish population and their wholesale expropriation, which began soon after the suppression of the Irish national liberation uprising of 1641-52 by the troops of the English bourgeois republic (see Note 229). According to the Acts of the English Parliament of 1652 and 1653, some of the Irish landowners, who were declared guilty of revolt, were to be forcibly moved to the barren province of Connaught and the swampy southern County Clare. Resettlement was carried out under pain of execution.
- On the eve of the 1798 Irish uprising, Connaught, and to an even greater extent the bordering counties of the province of Ulster in the north, became the scene of widespread terrorism by English mercenaries and Protestant gangs hired by the landlords from among their menials (Ancient Britons, etc.), against the local Catholic population and its self-defence units. Under the pretext of confiscating arms from the population and billeting, soldiers committed all kinds of outrages, torturing and murdering Irish people who fell into their hands and burning down their homes. Many Catholic peasants were evicted from Ulster after receiving threatening notes reading: "Go to the devil or Connaught". p. 159.
- <sup>191</sup> A reference to the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 (see Note 219), leading to the influx of cheap corn to England and creating conditions which, from the point of view of the landlords and the bourgeoisie, favoured the development of stock-breeding in Ireland. p. 161



- <sup>192</sup> G. Boate, *Natural History of Ireland*, London, 1652. Engels, like Wakefield, gives an earlier date of publication. p. 162
- <sup>193</sup> The reference is to England's war against Napoleonic France and the European countries dependent on her (in 1812 England fought Napoleon in alliance with Russia, Spain and Portugal), and to the Anglo-American War which broke out that year. It was won by the United States in 1814. p. 165
- <sup>194</sup> The third volume of this publication, concluding the collection *Senchus Mor* (The Great Book of Old), appeared in 1873, after Engels had written the passage in this book. *Senchus Mor* is one of the most detailed records of the laws of the Brehons, guardians of and commentators on laws and customs in Celtic Ireland (for Engels' description of *Senchus Mor*, see his letters to Marx of April 29, May 8 and 10, 1870, present edition, Vol. 43). p. 165
- <sup>195</sup> Engels refers to the collection *Rerum Hibernicarum Scriptores* (Ancient Annalists of Ireland), published in four volumes in 1814, 1825 and 1826 by Charles O'Connor in Buckingham.
- The collection contains the first publications of part of the *Annales IV Magistrorum*, the *Annales Tigernachi*, which were written between the eleventh and fifteenth centuries and described events from the close of the third century, the *Annales Ultonienses* (compiled by various chroniclers between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries and describing events beginning with the mid-fifth century), and the *Annales Inisfalensis* (generally assumed to have been compiled from 1215 onwards, and treating events up to 1318), all of them mentioned by Engels, and others. p. 168
- <sup>196</sup> Arthur O'Connor was one of the few leaders of the United Irishmen Society, which prepared the 1798 uprising (see Note 229), who managed to escape execution. After his release from gaol in 1803, O'Connor was banished to France, where he stayed to the end of his days. p. 169
- <sup>197</sup> *Saerrath* and *Daerrath*—two forms of tenancy in old Ireland, whereby the tenant, generally an ordinary member of the community, was given the use of stock and later also of land by the chief of the clan or tribe and by other representatives of the tribal élite. They entailed partial loss of personal freedom (especially under *Daerrath*) and various onerous duties. These forms of dependence were typical of the period of the disintegration of tribal relations in ancient Irish society and of the early stages of feudalisation. At this time land tenure was still mainly communal, while stock and farming implements were already private property, and private landownership already existed in embryonic form.
- Engels' "see below" refers to the unfinished part of this chapter. p. 172
- <sup>198</sup> The works of Giraldus Cambrensis on Ireland, *Topographia Hibernica* and *Expugnatio Hibernica* (in Engels' manuscript *Hibernia Expugnata*), were included in the fifth volume of the *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, mentioned by Engels, the publication of which was begun by J. S. Brewer. The fifth volume, published by J. F. Dimock, appeared in 1867. p. 173
- <sup>199</sup> A reference to the following works: M. Hanmer, *The Chronicle of Ireland*; E. Campion, *History of Ireland*; E. Spenser, *A View of the State of Ireland*, published in *Ancient Irish Histories. The Works of Spenser, Campion, Hanmer and Marleburrough*, vols. I-II, Dublin, 1809, and also to: John Davies, *Historical Tracts*, London, 1786; W. Camden, *Britannia*, London, 1722 (the first edition of this book was published in 1586 in Latin; later English translations

appeared); F. Moryson, *An Itinerary Containing Ten Years Travels through the Twelve Dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Denmark, Poland, Italy, Turkey, France, England, Scotland and Ireland*, London, 1617.

p. 173

<sup>200</sup> Huxley spoke of this in a public lecture in Manchester on January 9, 1870. A detailed account of the lecture was published in the *Manchester Examiner* and *The Times* on January 12, 1870 under the heading "Professor Huxley on Political Ethnology" (see also Engels' letter of March 9, 1870 to Marx, present edition, Vol. 43).

p. 174

<sup>201</sup> See Note 180.

p. 176

<sup>202</sup> The reference is to the following medieval works: Claudianus, *De IV consulatu Honorii Augusti panegyricus*; Isidorus Hispalensis, *Etymologiarum libri XX*; Beda Venerabilis, *Historiae Ecclesiasticae libri quinque*; Anonymus Ravenatis, *De Geographiae libri V*; Eginhard, *Vita et gesta Karoli Magni*; Alfred the Great, *Anglo-Saxon Version of the Historian Orosius*. In all probability Engels used extracts from the above-mentioned works contained in K. Zeuss, *Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstaemme*.

p. 177

<sup>203</sup> *Triads*—medieval Welsh works written in the form characteristic of the poetry of the ancient Celts of Wales, with persons, things, events, etc., arranged in sets of three. As regards their content, the *Triads* are subdivided into historical, theological, judicial, poetical and ethical. The early *Triads* were composed not later than the tenth century, but the extant manuscripts of these works date back to the period from the twelfth to the fifteenth century.

p. 177

<sup>204</sup> *Alexandrian Neoplatonic school*—a trend in ancient philosophy originating in the third century A.D. in Alexandria during the decline of the Roman Empire. The source of Neoplatonism was Plato's idealism and the idealistic aspect of Aristotle's teaching, interpreted in a mystical spirit by the Neoplatonic philosophers. In the fifth century A.D. an unknown adherent of this school, who attempted to combine the Christian doctrine with Neoplatonism, signed his works with the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, the first Christian Bishop of Athens.

p. 178

<sup>205</sup> *Haraldsaga* was written early in the thirteenth century by the Icelandic poet and chronicler Snorri Sturluson and describes the life and exploits of the Norwegian King Harald (the ninth-tenth centuries), founder of the Harfagr (Fair hair) dynasty. It is part of Snorri Sturluson's book *Heimskringla* covering the history of the Norwegian kings from ancient times to the twelfth century.

p. 179

<sup>206</sup> *Krâkumâl* (Song of Krâka)—a medieval Scandinavian poem, composed as the death-song of Ragnar Lodbrök (ninth century), a Danish Viking taken prisoner and put to death by Ella, King of Northumberland. According to the legend, Krâka, Ragnar's wife, sang the song to her children to inspire them with the desire to avenge their father's death. Engels used the text of the song as given in the reader: F. E. Ch. Dietrich, *Altnordisches Lesebuch*, Leipzig, 1864, S. 73-80.

p. 180

<sup>207</sup> *Njâl's Saga*—an Icelandic saga which, according to the latest research, was recorded at the end of the thirteenth century from oral tradition and ancient written documents. The central theme is the life story of Gunnar, an Icelandic Hawding (a member of the clan nobility), and his friend Bond Njâl (a free community member), an expert and commentator on ancient customs and laws.

- The saga tells of the battle of the Norsemen against the Irish King Brian Boru, and is an authentic source for the study of a major event in Irish history—the Irish victory over the Norse invaders in 1014 at the battle of Clontarf. Engels quoted the excerpt from the *Njáls Saga* according to the text of the reader: F. E. Ch. Dietrich, *Altnordisches Lesebuch*, Leipzig, 1864, S. 103-08. p. 181
- 208 Contemporary scholars transcribe the name of King Brian's residence in Munster as Kankaraborg, or Kincora. p. 184
- 209 The Cimbri and Teutons, Germanic tribes, invaded Southern Gaul and Northern Italy in 113-101 B.C. In 101 B.C. these tribes were routed by the Roman General Marius at the battle of Vercelli (Northern Italy). The Battle of the Romans against the Cimbri and Teutons was described by Plutarch in his biography of Marius, by Tacitus in *Germania*, and by other ancient historians. p. 184
- 210 *Beowulf*—a poem about the legendary hero Beowulf is supposed to have been recorded in the eighth century and ranks as the finest known work of Anglo-Saxon poetry. It is based on folk sagas about the life of the Germanic tribes in the early sixth century.  
*Hildebrandslied*—an eighth-century German epic poem, of which only a few passages have survived.  
 Engels refers to the so-called *Elder Edda* and the *Younger Edda*. The *Elder Edda* is a collection of epic poems and songs about the lives and deeds of the Scandinavian gods and heroes. It has come down to us in a manuscript dating back to the thirteenth century, discovered in 1643 by the Icelandic Bishop Sveinsson. The *Younger Edda* is a treatise on pagan mythology and the poetry of the scalds compiled in the early thirteenth century by Snorri Sturluson. p. 185
- 211 *Leges barbarorum*—records of the common law of various Germanic tribes, compiled between the fifth and ninth centuries. p. 185
- 212 Engels' manuscript breaks off here. The extant plan for the second chapter ("Old Ireland") shows that Engels also intended to describe the clan system, landed property and the laws of old Ireland (see this volume, p. 307). p. 185
- 213 These notes were written by Marx in English as a conspectus for a speech to be made at a meeting of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association on November 26, 1867, when the discussion on the Irish question, begun on November 19, was to be continued. In view of the immense disturbance caused by the execution of the three condemned Fenians (Larkin, Allen and O'Brien) on November 23, Marx considered this speech as no longer suitable. Feeling that at such a moment it would be more appropriate for one of the English members of the General Council to express sympathy with the Irish revolutionaries, he gave the floor to Peter Fox, who was known for his support of the Irish national liberation movement. Marx described the meeting in great detail in his letter of November 30, 1867 to Engels (see present edition, Vol. 42). Later, preparing for a report on the Irish question in the German Workers' Educational Society in London (see this volume, p. 194), Marx used this draft and the materials he had compiled for it.  
 These notes were first published in English in *The General Council of the First International. 1866-1868*, Moscow, 1964. Inaccuracies in the figures have been corrected. p. 189

- <sup>214</sup> A reference to the *Act of Settlement* adopted by the Long Parliament on August 12, 1652, during the English bourgeois revolution, following the suppression of the 1641-52 national liberation uprising in Ireland. The Act legalised the reign of terror and violence established by the English colonialists in Ireland and sanctioned the wholesale plunder of Irish lands in favour of the English bourgeoisie and the "new" bourgeoisified nobility. This Act declared the majority of Ireland's indigenous population "guilty of revolt". Even those Irishmen who had not been directly involved in the uprising but had failed to show the proper "loyalty" to the English Parliament were considered "guilty". Those declared "guilty" were classified into categories, depending on the extent of their involvement in the uprising, and subjected to brutal reprisals: execution, deportation, confiscation of property. On September 26, 1653, the Act of Settlement was supplemented by the *Act of Satisfaction* which prescribed the forcible resettlement of Irish people whose property had been confiscated to the barren province of Connaught and to County Clare (see Note 190) and defined the procedure for allotting the confiscated land to the creditors of Parliament, the officers and men of the English army. Both Acts consolidated and extended the economic foundations of English landlordism in Ireland. p. 189
- <sup>215</sup> See Note 142. p. 189
- <sup>216</sup> Marx uses an appraisal of the Fenian movement given in Queen Victoria's address to Parliament of November 19, 1867 (see *The Times*, No. 25973, November 20, 1867) to describe the brutal policy of the English Government towards the Irish Fenians. p. 189
- <sup>217</sup> During an abortive coup in Boulogne in 1840, Prince Louis Bonaparte wounded an officer of the government troops. This crime did not prevent the English Government from obsequiously recognising the Bonapartist regime after the usurpation of power by Louis Bonaparte in 1851. In 1867, however, three Irish Fenians were sent to the gallows purely on suspicion of having made an attempt on the life of a policeman while attacking a prison van in Manchester. p. 189
- <sup>218</sup> The *corn-acre (conacre) system*—the subletting to the poorest peasants of small plots (up to half an acre) by middlemen on extortionate terms, which was extensively practised in Ireland. The term came into use in the eighteenth century, after the adoption of a law decreeing that corn be sown on these small-holdings. p. 191
- <sup>219</sup> The repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 led to a reduction in grain prices due to the fall in the demand for Irish grain in England, and the rise in the demand for wool and other stock-breeding products from Ireland (see Marx's letter to Engels of November 30, 1867, present edition, Vol. 42). This made landlords and rich farmers switch to extensive pasture farming which resulted in the mass eviction of small Irish tenants from the land ("clearing of estates") in the mid-nineteenth century (see also this volume, pp. 201-03). p. 192
- <sup>220</sup> A reference to the forcible eviction from the land of the population of the Scottish Highlands (the Gaels) by the Anglo-Scottish nobility in the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries, a process similar to the "clearing of estates" in Ireland. Marx describes this process in Chapter XXVII of Volume I of *Capital* and in his article "Elections.—Financial Clouds.—The Duchess of Sutherland and Slavery" (present edition, Vol. 11). p. 192

- 221 *Roundheads*—the nickname given by the Royalists to the Parliamentarians during the seventeenth-century English revolution because of their puritan custom of cutting their hair close, while the *cavaliers*—supporters of the King—wore their hair long. p. 192
- 222 See Note 123. p. 192
- 223 Early in the nineteenth century the Irish national movement developed under the slogan of the abolition of political restrictions for the Catholic population and the granting to Catholics (who formed the majority of the population) of the right to stand for election to Parliament. In 1829 the British Parliament, under pressure of a mass movement in Ireland, lifted some of the restrictions (*Catholic Relief Act*). Catholics were granted the rights to be elected to Parliament and hold certain government posts. Simultaneously the property qualification for electors was increased fivefold. With the aid of this manoeuvre the British ruling classes hoped to win over to their side the upper crust of the Irish bourgeoisie and Catholic landowners and thus split the Irish national movement. p. 192
- 224 In the 1820s the demand for the repeal of the Union became the most popular slogan of the Irish national liberation movement. In 1840 a *Repeal Association* was founded whose leader, Daniel O'Connell, stood for a compromise with the English ruling circles and reduced the programme of the movement to the demand for autonomy and other political concessions. In the mid-forties the supporters of the liberation of Ireland by revolutionary methods, up to and including armed uprising against English rule (Young Ireland—a revolutionary patriotic society), gained ground in the Repeal Association. The differences between O'Connell and those advocating the use of "physical force" led to a split in the Association and the formation of the more radical Irish Confederation (the beginning of 1847). Its Left, revolutionary wing headed the national liberation movement and became the target of severe reprisals in 1848. Eventually, the Repeal Association broke up completely. p. 193
- 225 Marx refers to France's colonial wars in Algeria which began in the 1830s and lasted (with intervals) for 40 years. p. 193
- 226 A reference to the reactionary foreign policy pursued by Castlereagh, the British Foreign Secretary (1812-22). He supported the efforts of the Holy Alliance to strengthen the reactionary feudal monarchies in Europe, notably the measures against the revolutionary movements in Italy and Spain. The counter-revolutionary Tory policy of Castlereagh was continued by Palmerston, the Whig leader, who relied on the support of the Right wing of the party. He, however, masked the real nature of this policy with liberal phrases and hypocritical expressions of sympathy with the oppressed peoples. Marx showed in his pamphlet *Lord Palmerston* (see present edition, Vol. 12) that, as Foreign Secretary, Palmerston played an ignoble role with regard to the Polish struggle for independence during the general uprising of 1830-31 and the uprising in the free city of Cracow in 1846. While inciting the Poles to action by his false promises of assistance, Palmerston sanctioned the suppression of the Polish movement by Tsarist Russia, Austria and Prussia. p. 193
- 227 Marx refers to an error which the leadership of the Reform League (see Note 39) committed by refusing to give any real support to the Irish national liberation movement, although many of the League's rank-and-file members expressed sympathy with it. The meeting of the League's Council on November 1, 1867 adopted a resolution condemning Fenianism, tabled by

bourgeois radicals. When the Irish question came up for discussion in the General Council of the International in November 1867, the speeches were spearheaded against this chauvinistic and anti-revolutionary position of the Reform League and its supporters among the liberal trade unionists. p. 193

228 This outline is a draft conspectus for a report on the Irish question that Marx was to make at a meeting of the German Workers' Educational Society in London on December 16, 1867. "Yesterday I gave a 1½ hour lecture on Ireland at our German Workers' Society (though a further 3 German workers' associations were represented, about 100 people in all)," Marx wrote to Engels on December 17 (see present edition, Vol. 42). Some members of the General Council of the International also attended the meeting. Eccarius, a Council member who attached great importance to this report, which explained the attitude of the General Council towards the Irish national liberation movement, took notes in order to prepare them for publication (for Eccarius' record of Marx's report see this volume, pp. 317-19). A copy of these notes was sent to Johann Philipp Becker, the editor of *Der Vorbote*, but they were not published.

The outline was written by Marx both in German and English. English words used by Marx are set in small caps. Longer passages written in English in the original are placed in asterisks. German words and sentences occurring in the passages written by Marx in English are, with a few exceptions, not indicated, so as to avoid numerous footnotes.

The outline was first published in English in Marx and Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971.

On the *German Workers' Educational Society in London* see Note 50. p. 194

229 A reference to the three biggest national liberation uprisings in Ireland.

The 1641-52 uprising was provoked by the colonialist policy which the English absolute monarchy pursued in Ireland and which was continued during the seventeenth-century English Revolution by the English bourgeoisie and the "new" nobility. The majority of the insurgents were Irish peasants led by the expropriated clan chiefs and the Catholic clergy. The Anglo-Irish nobility, descendants of the first English conquerors who had become related to the Irish clan élite and adopted many Irish customs and habits, also participated in the uprising. In October 1642, the insurgents formed the Irish Confederation in Kilkenny. A struggle went on within it between the indigenous Irish, who stood for Ireland's independence and action both against the Long Parliament and the English Royalists, and the Anglo-Irish aristocrats, who endeavoured to come to terms with Charles I on condition that they were allowed to keep their estates and receive a guarantee of freedom of worship for Catholics. The latter gained the upper hand and a treaty was signed with a representative of Charles I. After the defeat of the Royalists in England, Oliver Cromwell, the head of the new bourgeois republic, organised an expedition to Ireland on the pretext of suppressing a Royalist revolt there but in fact with the aim of reducing it to colonial submission and plundering the land. (He hoped that by confiscating Irish lands he would solve the problem of paying the creditors of the republic, the officers and men of the army.) In 1649-52, the Irish uprising was brutally suppressed; the garrisons and population of entire towns were destroyed, the Irish were sold en masse into slavery in the West Indies, and Irish lands were confiscated and handed over to new English landlords. These actions by Cromwell and his successors did much to prepare the ground for the restoration of the monarchy in England in 1660.

The 1689-91 uprising followed in the wake of the 1688-89 coup d'état in England (known as the Glorious Revolution), involving the overthrow of

James II and the establishment of a bourgeois-aristocratic constitutional monarchy in England under William III of Orange. The Catholic nobility in Ireland, supported by the masses who were dissatisfied with the colonial regime, rose against William. Under the banner of defence of the Stuarts the insurgents fought for the abolition of Ireland's political and religious inequality and the return of the confiscated estates. James II, who had taken refuge in Ireland and was endeavouring to use the Irish movement to regain the crown, became its official head and recognised the demands of the Irish people. But the differences between the reactionary Jacobites and the Irish patriots weakened the insurgents. Despite their stubborn resistance, they were finally defeated.

The 1798 uprising was the result of the upsurge of national sentiments in Ireland, caused by the growth of the liberation movement and the impact of the American and French bourgeois revolutions at the end of the eighteenth century. It was prepared by Irish bourgeois revolutionaries (Theobald Wolfe Tone, Edward Fitzgerald and others), who in 1791 founded a patriotic society, "The United Irishmen", in Belfast (the chief town of the Northern Irish province of Ulster) and proclaimed a fight for an independent Irish republic. On the eve of the uprising, however, most of the society's leaders were tracked down by government spies and arrested. The uprising broke out on May 23 and lasted until June 17, 1798. It flared up in a number of counties in South-Eastern and Northern Ireland and was particularly strong in County Wexford. The majority of the insurgents were peasants and urban poor. In August and September 1798, after the landing of a French force in support of the Irish patriots, the uprising spread to a number of places in Connaught. The English authorities launched savage reprisals against the rebels (almost all the leaders were executed) and passed the Act of Anglo-Irish Union (see Note 123).  
p. 194

<sup>230</sup> About 1155 Pope Adrian IV issued a Bull which conferred on the English King Henry II the title of Supreme Ruler of Ireland in exchange for the promise to subject the Irish Church to Rome. Henry II used this "gift" to launch an aggressive expedition against Ireland in 1171.

In 1576, in connection with the exacerbation of relations between Protestant England and the Catholic powers, Pope Gregory XIII declared that Queen Elizabeth I had forfeited the right to the Irish crown.  
p. 195

<sup>231</sup> See Note 185.  
p. 195

<sup>232</sup> The name given in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to merchants and bankers, particularly those from the City of London, who took part in colonial plunder and financial speculation. During the English revolution of the mid-seventeenth century, "adventurers" loaned Parliament considerable sums of money to finance the war against the Royalists in exchange for land confiscated in Ireland. Among the "adventurers" were many statesmen, members of the gentry, and civil servants.  
p. 195

<sup>233</sup> The *Anglo-Irish Parliament*, convoked at the end of the thirteenth century, was initially made up of representatives of the big barons and dignitaries of the Church of the English colony in Ireland (the Pale). With the extension of the power of the English Crown to the entire island (sixteenth-early seventeenth centuries), the Parliament became a representative body of the English and Anglo-Irish aristocracy under the English Lord Deputy. The competency of that Parliament was limited; according to an Act passed by Lord Deputy Poynings in 1495, it could be convoked only with the sanction of the Royal

Privy Council. Under the impact of the growing national liberation movement, in the 1780s the English Government was compelled to extend the rights of the Irish Parliament (Renunciation Act). In 1801, however, the Irish Parliament was abolished under the Act of Union.

p. 195

<sup>234</sup> See Note 214. p. 196

<sup>235</sup> *Amalekites*—members of a nomadic tribe living in the second millennium B.C. on the Sinai. The Amalekite warriors made raids on Palestine and drove the population into captivity. At the turn of the tenth century B.C. the Amalekites were practically annihilated. p. 196

<sup>236</sup> A reference to the capitulation at Limerick, an agreement signed in October 1691 between the Irish insurgents and representatives of the English command and approved by King William III. The surrender terms were honourable: the insurgents were given permission to serve either in foreign armies or in the army of William III; the people were promised an amnesty, the preservation of their property, suffrage and religious freedom. Several months before the Limerick Agreement, similar agreements were concluded during the capitulation of the insurgent garrisons in Galway and other towns. The terms of these agreements, however, were soon flagrantly violated by the English authorities. p. 196

<sup>237</sup> *Absentees*—landlords who owned estates in Ireland but lived permanently in England. Their estates were managed by realty agents who robbed the Irish peasants, or were leased to speculator-middlemen who subleased small plots to the peasants. p. 197

<sup>238</sup> *Penal Code* or *Penal Laws*—a set of laws passed by the English for Ireland at the end of the seventeenth and in the first half of the eighteenth centuries on the pretext of a struggle against Catholic conspiracies. These laws deprived the indigenous Irish, the majority of whom were Catholics, of all civil and political rights. They limited the right of Catholics to inheritance and to the acquisition and alienation of property, introducing the practice of confiscating property for petty offences. The Penal Code was used as an instrument for the expropriation of the Irish who still owned land. It established unfavourable lease terms for Catholic peasants, increasing their dependence on the English landlords. The ban on Catholic schools, the severe punishment meted out to Catholic priests and other measures were intended to stamp out Irish national traditions. The penal laws were abrogated, and then only in part, at the end of the eighteenth century under the influence of the growing national liberation struggle in Ireland. p. 197

<sup>239</sup> Catholics were officially deprived of voting rights by the Act on the Regulation of Elections passed in 1727. Irish Catholics had not enjoyed the right to stand for election to Parliament from the end of the seventeenth century, after the introduction of an oath to be taken by M.P.s involving the abjuration of Catholic dogma. The latter restriction was only lifted in 1829. Voting rights were restored to the Catholic population somewhat earlier, in 1793, since the English landlords themselves often needed the votes of their Catholic tenants. p. 197

<sup>240</sup> Marx refers to a number of concessions which the English Government was forced to make to Ireland because of the victory of the American troops at Saratoga in October 1777, during the American War of Independence, and the reaction to this event in England. The penal laws most hated by the Irishmen were abrogated (in 1778 the Government abrogated the law prohibiting the



- Catholics to rent more than two acres of land from Protestants or to enter into commercial or credit agreements with them). However, as before the Catholics were deprived of the right to elect M.P.s. p. 198
- <sup>241</sup> *Freehold*—a category of small landownership which had come down from medieval England. The freeholder paid the lord a comparatively small rent in cash and was allowed to dispose of his land as he saw fit. In Ireland, freeholders were mainly English colonists and their descendants. p. 198
- <sup>242</sup> See Note 123. p. 198
- <sup>243</sup> Marx refers to England's war against Napoleonic France which ended in 1815. On the movement for the emancipation of Catholics mentioned by Marx further in this passage, see Note 223. p. 198
- <sup>244</sup> *Cottiers*—a category of the rural population consisting of land-hungry or landless peasants. In Ireland cottiers rented small plots of land and cottages from landlords or real estate agents on extremely onerous terms. Their position resembled that of farmhands. p. 200
- <sup>245</sup> The *Corn Laws*, the first of which were passed as early as the fifteenth century, imposed high import duties on agricultural products in order to maintain high prices for these products on the domestic market. The Corn Laws served the interests of the big landowners. The struggle between the industrial bourgeoisie and the landed aristocracy over the Corn Laws ended in their repeal in June 1846. The repeal of the Corn Laws marked the victory of the industrial bourgeoisie whose motto was Free Trade (see also Note 219). p. 200
- <sup>246</sup> In February 1835, Daniel O'Connell, the leader of the Irish bourgeois nationalists, signed an agreement with representatives of the Whigs according to which he was to support them in the House of Commons in return for certain concessions; in particular, Irish political leaders were promised posts in the administrative apparatus after the Whigs came to office. For his part, O'Connell undertook to stop the Repeal of the Union campaign. The agreement was negotiated in Lord Lichfield's London house and became known as the Lichfield-House Contract. It meant that the liberal circles of the Irish bourgeoisie and the medium landowners had reached a compromise with the English politicians and had renounced consistent struggle for Ireland's independence (see also Note 223). p. 201
- <sup>247</sup> See Note 218. p. 203
- <sup>248</sup> Marx made these remarks on the Programme and Rules of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy (see Note 55) probably on December 15, 1868, the day when the General Council of the International Working Men's Association discussed the admission of the Alliance into the International and instructed Marx to prepare an answer. The remarks were written in the right and left margins of a French leaflet containing the Programme and Rules. Marx underlined certain words and phrases (in this volume they are set in bold type) and in some places drew vertical lines in the margins. (The names of Jules Johannard and Eugène Dupont, who had read the Programme and taken part in its discussion, were written in the margin by Jung.) The same day Marx sent this document to Engels asking for his opinion (see Note 55). Taking into account Engels' ideas, Marx drew up a circular letter "The International Working Men's Association and the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy" (see this volume, pp. 34-36) which was approved by the General Council on December 22, 1868.

Marx's comments on the Programme and Rules of the Alliance were first published in English in *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966. p. 207

<sup>249</sup> Marx apparently refers to the plans to publish *L'Égalité*. He was invited to contribute to this paper by A. A. Serno-Solovyevich in a letter of November 20, 1868 which did not mention the new newspaper's title. On December 3, 1868 Charles Perron wrote to Hermann Jung about steps taken to publish *L'Égalité* and asked Marx, Eccarius and Jung to contribute to it. Eccarius' reply of December 2 and Jung's reply of December 6 were published in a special issue of *L'Égalité* on December 16. In addition, the editors published the following note: "Citizen Marx brings it to the notice of the commission that, to his great regret, his health and the excessive amount of work make it impossible for him to guarantee his participation in the journal. Nevertheless, we hope that from time to time this brave champion of the working class will write to the organ of the Romance sections in Switzerland." p. 210

<sup>250</sup> Marx wrote this work in October and November 1869 when preparing for the forthcoming debate on the Irish question in the General Council of the International (see this volume, p. 83). This is also shown by the extracts taken by Marx from the newspaper *The Irishman* about the movement for the amnesty of the Irish political prisoners and the draft resolution on the amnesty adopted by the General Council on November 30, 1869. At a later date, apparently when looking through Marx's manuscripts after his death, Engels attached a separate page with an inscription "Hibernica" and the date "1869" to this series of manuscripts. On this basis we may assume that Marx intended to use "Extracts and Notes" as preparatory material for a report on Item 2 of his plan for the forthcoming discussion in the General Council—the attitude of the English working class to the Irish question (see Note 124). Marx's letter to Engels of December 10, 1869 (see present edition, Vol. 43) shows that he took an interest in developments in Ireland at the close of the eighteenth century because he wanted to examine the characteristics of England's policy in Ireland and of the Irish national movement at the time, whose progressive exponents demanded that Ireland be granted the status of an independent republic, a demand which was just as urgent in the nineteenth century. It was particularly important for Marx to show that the cruel treatment of the Irish revolutionaries and the subjugation of Ireland by the English authorities had a detrimental effect on the English people themselves.

Marx's work consists of two parts: the main investigation and a supplementary summary of comprehensive chronological data. Each of the parts is in the form of a separate manuscript with the author's pagination. Page 9 of the second manuscript is missing. The first manuscript is a rough draft of the main investigation with evidence of subsequent editing. On several pages the text is written in above lines crossed out by the author or insertions are made on pieces of paper pasted to the manuscript. Marx used the following sources for his "Extracts and Notes": J. Mitchel, *The History of Ireland, from the Treaty of Limerick to the Present Time*, vols. I-II, Dublin, 1869; [J. Ph. Curran,] *The Speeches of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran. Edited, with Memoir and Historical Notices*, by Thomas Davis, Dublin, 1855; G. Ensor, *Anti-Union. Ireland as She Ought to Be*, Newry, 1831, and other material such as the journal *Political Register*, published by the English radical William Cobbett, a number of documentary publications (Grattan's speeches, etc.) and historical treatises.

The work is not a synopsis of these books. Marx selected material according to his own plan, showing how he understood the course of Irish history at the

time considered and its division into periods. This is also clear from the structure of both manuscripts and by the way Marx himself divided them into sections, paragraphs and items. He very often selects facts from various sources or from various sections of the same source (for example, from Thomas Davis' "Memoir of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran" and from his commentary, or "Historical Notices", to Curran's speeches) and arranges them in his own way. The exposition proves that Marx took a creative approach to the material.

Direct quotations from various sources and Marx's own renderings of certain passages (also given in small type but without quotation marks) are written in English. His own remarks are written both in English (mostly) and German and are given in normal type. Passages written in German are indicated in the footnotes (separate German words are not indicated). In both manuscripts, there are passages indicated by Marx with vertical lines in the margin (these are reproduced in this volume). Passages enclosed by Marx in square brackets are given in this volume in braces to distinguish them from the editor's insertions in square brackets. Words doubly underlined by Marx are given in bold type.

The known sources quoted or rendered by Marx are referred to either in footnotes or in the editorial Notes to the relevant passages. Italics in the quotations belong to Marx except where otherwise stated in the footnotes.

This work was first published in English in Marx and Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1978. p. 212

- <sup>251</sup> A reference to the peace treaty concluded by Napoleonic France and her allies with England at Amiens on March 27, 1802. It was no more than a short-lived armistice. In May 1803 the armed struggle for world supremacy was resumed. The change in the royal title under the Peace of Amiens amounted to the final and formal repudiation by the English kings of their claims to the French throne, claims that dated back to the Hundred Years' War (1337-1453). p. 212
- <sup>252</sup> *Poynings' Law* was passed in 1495 by the Parliament convened by Poynings, representative of the English Crown in the town of Drogheda, in the south-eastern part of Ireland conquered by the English. It was repealed in May 1782 under the impact of the Irish national liberation movement (see this volume, p. 225). p. 212
- <sup>253</sup> The *Privy Council* of the Lord Lieutenant (Viceroy) of Ireland consisted of high officials who headed various departments of colonial administration. p. 212
- <sup>254</sup> A reference to the books: W. Molyneux, *The Case of Ireland's Being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England Stated*, Dublin, 1698; J. Swift, *Drapier's Letters*, Dublin, 1725, and *A Short View of the State of Ireland*, Dublin, 1727; Ch. Lucas, *Barber's Letters*, Dublin, 1747. (These writers are mentioned by Thomas Davis in his "Memoir of... Curran" included in *The Speeches of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran*, Dublin, 1855, p. XIX.) p. 212
- <sup>255</sup> The Statute of George I mentioned here was promulgated in 1719 and is also known as the Declaratory Act (6. George I. An Act for the Better Securing the Dependency of the Kingdom of Ireland on the Crown of Great Britain). It was repealed during 1782 and 1783 owing to the upsurge of the liberation movement in Ireland. p. 212
- <sup>256</sup> See notes 232 and 237. p. 215

- <sup>257</sup> In the latter half of the eighteenth century Britain strove for greater influence over her American colonies. From 1763 onwards, the British Government issued a series of edicts restricting both the territorial location of the American population and the rights of American states in questions of trade. In 1765 laws were issued which provided for a standing army in the colonies and made an attempt to introduce direct taxation (Stamp Act). All this caused mass anti-British actions among the American population. On March 18, 1766 the Stamp Act was repealed but the Declaratory Act was proclaimed instead. It confirmed the British Crown's supreme rights over its American colonies and repeated, almost verbatim, the Statute of George I concerning Ireland. These acts by the British Government provoked the war of the North American colonies for independence. p. 215
- <sup>258</sup> See Note 238. p. 215
- <sup>259</sup> On February 6, 1778 the French Government concluded treaties with the United States of America. France officially recognised the American Republic, promised to defend the independence and sovereignty of the USA, and undertook not to lay down her arms until Britain recognised American independence. These treaties ensured mutual support for the territorial claims of the two countries. At the same time France and the USA concluded the Treaty of Amity and Commerce. p. 216
- <sup>260</sup> This passage from Curran's speech to the Irish Parliament on February 18, 1792 is quoted from *The Speeches of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran*, Dublin, 1855, pp. 140-41. This book contains Curran's parliamentary speeches from November 1783 to May 1797, as well as those he made later in the courts and elsewhere in defence of participants in the Irish revolutionary movement and in the 1798 uprising. The quoted edition is supplied with "Memoir" and "Historical Notices" containing biographical notes on Curran and a description of the most important developments of the time. The author was Thomas Davis, a prominent Irish democrat, historian and poet, one of the leaders of "Young Ireland" (see Note 224). Throughout his work, Marx gives either direct quotations or his own rendering of passages both from Curran's speeches and from the "Memoir" and "Historical Notices" by Davis. Marx regarded this book as the most important source for a study of the political history of Ireland in the late eighteenth century and considered Curran himself a "great lawyer and the noblest personality". Marx brought this book to the attention of the English members of the General Council (see Marx's letter to Engels of December 10, 1869, present edition, Vol. 43). p. 216
- <sup>261</sup> *Protestant ascendancy*—a principle employed openly in governing Ireland between 1691 and 1800 according to which the Protestants, mostly English colonists and their descendants, enjoyed extensive political, social and religious privileges, whereas the Catholic majority was deprived of all rights and had to pay tithes to the state Anglican Church. This principle was expressed most brazenly in the Penal Code (see Note 238) against the Catholics. p. 216
- <sup>262</sup> The recognition of the American colonies' independence and the conclusion of the treaties of alliance and commerce on February 6, 1778, involved France, in alliance with Spain, in war with Britain (see Note 259). p. 217
- <sup>263</sup> The principles of armed neutrality proclaimed by the government of Catherine II in 1780 were soon recognised by several states as the norm for international maritime law. They envisaged freedom of trade between neutral and belligerent countries, prohibition of privateering, inviolability of neutral

cargo carried by enemy vessels and of enemy cargo carried by neutral vessels (with the exception of arms smuggling), and refusal to recognise a port under blockade if access is not blocked by the enemy navy. The declaration on armed neutrality undermined Great Britain's monopoly domination of the seas and helped the North American states in their struggle for independence.

p. 218

- 264 Marx borrowed the expression "armed Protestantism of Ireland" from Thomas Davis' "Memoir" in the book J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. XIX, to describe the Irish Volunteer movement in the late eighteenth century. In his outline of the four periods in the Volunteer movement, Marx gives long quotations from Davis.

p. 218

- 265 The *Catholic Committee* was founded in the late 1750s. Among its members were liberal Catholic landowners, Catholic merchants, manufacturers and intellectuals whose aim was to fight for the alleviation and repeal of the penal laws against the Catholics. Originally the Catholic Committee took a very moderate and loyal stand in regard to the English authorities. But the national upsurge at the end of the eighteenth century changed its composition and tactics, and radical elements of the Irish bourgeoisie now prevailed in the Committee. Its left wing took part in the Volunteer movement and subsequently joined the revolutionary Society of United Irishmen. The efforts of the Catholic Committee to secure for the Catholics equal rights with the Protestants continued in the first decade of the nineteenth century.

The *Whig Club* was founded in 1789 in Dublin and the Northern Whig Club in 1791 in Belfast. The composition and political tendencies of this organisation were diverse. Its Protestant leaders voiced the interests of Protestant liberal landlords and the big bourgeoisie. They stood for a compromise with the British Government and wanted to keep the national movement within strictly constitutional bounds. The committee's radical wing, on the contrary, proposed more resolute action and later formed the nucleus of the United Irishmen Society.

p. 219

- 266 The rest of the section (up to the asterisks), consists of Marx's close rendering of passages from Davis' "Memoir" in J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...* (pp. XIX-XX) and excerpts from this book.

p. 219

- 267 Marx refers to the struggle for political power among British ruling political circles under George III. In 1788, after George III's first attack of insanity, the Prince of Wales (the future George IV) and his followers believed that the Prince would become Regent, but the King quickly recovered, and the Prince, who had hoped that the Whigs would help him pay his debts, was rejected by the head of the Cabinet, Pitt. In 1806 the latter died and the administration actually went over to Fox, a representative of the Whigs. In 1811 George III's health deteriorated and the question of the Regency was finally settled.

p. 219

- 268 The *Catholic Relief Act* was passed by the Irish Parliament, with the consent of the British Government, in April 1793. It abrogated part of the Penal Code. Catholic freeholders paying income tax of not less than 40s., were officially allowed to vote. The Catholics were granted the right to acquire, sell and transfer property by will; they were allowed to enter Dublin University but, as before, could not stand for election to Parliament.

p. 220

- 269 At the beginning of February 1793 Britain officially began a war with the French Republic. This war was extremely unpopular in Ireland, and the United

Irishmen Society issued proclamations calling on the government to conclude an honourable peace with France. The English ruling circles launched an offensive against the Irish national liberation movement. The Convention, Gunpowder and other Acts passed by the Irish Parliament in 1793 effectively deprived the Volunteer organisations and the United Irishmen of their legal ground. p. 220

270 *Dublin Castle* was built by the English conquerors in the thirteenth century and became the seat of the English authorities—the Lord Lieutenant (Viceroy) of Ireland and the Privy Council (see Note 253), and a stronghold against the Irish population. It was a symbol of English colonial rule. p. 222

271 The full text of the resolution moved by Hussey Burgh reads as follows: “We beg to represent to His Majesty that it is not by temporary expedients, but by a *free trade alone*, that this nation is now to be saved from impending ruin.” It is quoted in the book: J. Mitchel, *The History of Ireland*, Vol. I, p. 127.

Marx made wide use of the factual information in this book and of the quoted texts of speeches and documents, but he hardly ever quoted the author's text. Marx must have borrowed from Mitchel's book excerpts from some of Grattan's speeches, the text of the resolution adopted by the Volunteer Convention at Dungannon and data concerning the correspondence between Fitzwilliam and Lord Carlyle (Mitchel, op. cit., Vol. I, chapters XX and XXVIII). Information on the Irish uprising of 1798, on the use of Hanoverian and other German troops for the suppression of the Irish national movement also came from the same source (Mitchel, op. cit., Vol. I, chapters XXVI, XXXII and XXXIII). When estimating the policy of the English Prime Minister Pitt the Younger, Marx also took some of Mitchel's conclusions into account. He gave high praise to Mitchel's activities as a leader of the revolutionary-democratic trend in the Irish national movement in the 1840s and valued his opinion as a historian. p. 222

272 A *Mutiny Act* (an Act for Punishing Officers or Soldiers who shall Mutiny or Desert Their Majesties' Service) was passed annually by Parliament from 1689 to 1881. This Act invested the Crown with the authority to have a standing army and navy of a certain strength, to introduce rules and regulations in the army and navy, to court-martial and to establish a system of punishment for mutiny, disobedience of orders, breach of discipline, etc. p. 224

273 The *Methuen Treaty* was a trade treaty concluded between England and Portugal on December 27, 1703. It was signed by the English diplomat John Methuen, hence its name. It opened wide access in Portugal for English woollens, in return for which Portugal received the right to export its wines to England on favourable terms. p. 224

274 See Note 142. p. 225

275 The Declaration was published in a book by J. Mitchel, *The History of Ireland, from the Treaty of Limerick to the Present Time*, Dublin, 1869, Vol. I, pp. 138-39. p. 225

276 In this section Marx must have taken passages from the speeches of Portland, Grattan, Hutchinson and others from *The Speeches of the Right Honourable Henry Grattan*, published in London in 1822-30 in four volumes (the quoted passages are from Vol. I, pp. 131-134, 139, 122-23, 129, 138-43), and from the book: J. Mitchel, *The History of Ireland*, Vol. I, pp. 144-45. p. 226

- 277 George III's Speech from the Throne of April 8, 1782 (Marx mistakenly wrote April 18) was read by Fox in the House of Commons on April 9. Conveying the contents of the speech, Marx apparently drew on J. Mitchel's *History of Ireland*, Vol. I, p. 144. p. 226
- 278 The *Court of King's (Queen's) Bench*—one of the oldest courts in England. In the nineteenth century (up to 1873) it was an independent supreme court for criminal and civil cases, competent to review the decisions of lower judicial bodies. p. 232
- 279 The *rotten boroughs* were sparsely populated constituencies which had retained the right to a seat in Parliament from the Middle Ages. In practice the election of M.P.s from the rotten boroughs depended on the landlords who controlled them. p. 233
- 280 See Note 265. p. 236
- 281 The text to the end of the section (up to the asterisks) consists of Marx's close renderings of passages from Curran's speeches and Davis' "Notices" in *The Speeches of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran*, and extracts from the book (pp. 53-60, 73-76, 91-103 and 131-36). p. 237
- 282 This section contains Marx's close renderings of passages from Curran's speeches and Davis' "Notices" in *The Speeches of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran*, and extracts from the book (pp. 46-56). p. 239
- 283 This section contains Marx's close renderings of Davis' "Notices" and Curran's speeches from the book J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, and extracts from the book (pp. 82-91). p. 241
- 284 This section contains Marx's close renderings of passages from *The Speeches of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran*, and quotations from the book (pp. 61-65, 68-73 and 76-77). p. 242
- 285 See Note 237. p. 242
- 286 *Right Boys* (from the name of an imaginary leader known as Captain Right)—a secret peasant society that arose in 1785 in the southern counties of Ireland as a spontaneous protest by the Irish peasants against cruel oppression. The Right Boys employed the same organisational forms (special ritual, oath of loyalty) and the same methods of struggle (threatening letters, raids on estates, terrorist acts against landlords, middlemen, tax and tithe collectors, destruction of enclosures put up on communal lands, seizure of the harvests grown on landlords' fields, etc.) as did the secret peasant societies that appeared in various localities of Ireland in the 1760s, such as Whiteboys, Steelhearts and the like. The actions of these societies often developed into local peasant revolts. The English authorities resorted to the most cruel punitive measures against them. p. 243
- 287 In this section Marx renders and quotes passages from Davis' "Notices" in *The Speeches of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran*, pp. 103, 128-30. p. 244
- 288 See Note 241. p. 245
- 289 See Note 265. p. 245
- 290 A reference to the final stage of the royalist uprising that flared up in March 1793 in the Vendée, a department in the west of France. The rebels were mostly backward peasants, incited by counter-revolutionary noblemen and priests. The English ruling circles supported the Vendée rebels with arms and money. A

decisive blow was inflicted on them in 1795 by republican troops under Lazar Hoche. Many leaders of the uprising were executed in 1796, but attempts to renew it were made in 1799 and in later years.

A Vendée has become a synonym for a reactionary uprising. p. 246

291 The text to the end of the section consists of Marx's close rendering of passages from Davis' "Memoir" and "Notices" in *The Speeches of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran*, and quotations from the book (pp. XX-XXI and 138-42). p. 247

292 This section consists of Marx's close renderings of passages from Curran's speeches and from Davis' "Memoir" and "Notices" in *The Speeches...*, and quotations from that book (pp. XXI, 154-56). p. 247

293 See Note 265. p. 247

294 A reference to the so-called corresponding societies—democratic organisations that arose in England and Scotland under the impact of revolutionary events in France. A particularly important role was played by the London Corresponding Society founded at the beginning of 1792 with Thomas Hardy, a shoemaker, as chairman. The corresponding societies disseminated the ideas of the French Revolution, demanded peace with the French Republic and fought for democratic reforms in England. The societies existed for a number of years despite cruel persecution by the government. p. 248

295 *Dissenters*—persons who do not profess the state religion. Here the author refers to adherents of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland among the descendants of the Scottish colonists who had moved to Northern Ireland, and to members of various Protestant sects at variance with the official Anglican Church. p. 248

296 A reference to the convocation of the Volunteer Convention at Dungannon on February 15, 1793, where the delegates expressed their readiness to fight for the equal rights for the Protestants and Catholics. p. 248

297 Marx quotes the above-mentioned Declaration and the Address of the Irish Jacobins of Belfast to the Public apparently from Davis' commentaries to Curran's speeches (see *The Speeches of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran*, Dublin, 1855, pp. 208-09). Further, till the end of the section, there follow extracts from Davis' "Memoir" and commentaries, and from Curran's speeches (op. cit., pp. XXI-XXII, 147-53, 173-74). p. 249

298 See Note 223. p. 250

299 Marx refers to the sharp criticism to which the 1793 Convention Act was subjected by the English radical writer William Cobbett in the columns of his journal *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register* (see Vol. XIX, 1811, pp. 417-18) and to its application in Ireland at the beginning of the nineteenth century. p. 251

300 See Note 223. p. 252

301 *Defenders*—the members of an organisation of Irish Catholics, which emerged in the 1780s and 1790s in defence against the terrorist gangs of Protestants (yeomen). Many of the Defenders, recruited mainly from among the Irish peasants, took part in the national liberation uprising of 1798.

*Ribbonmen*—Irish peasants who were united in secret societies and wore a green ribbon as an emblem. The Ribbonmen movement was a form of popular



resistance to the arbitrary rule of the English landlords and the forcible eviction of tenants from the land. The Ribbonmen attacked estates and organised attempts on the lives of hated landlords and managers. The activities of the Ribbonmen had a purely local, decentralised character and they had no common programme of action. p. 252

<sup>302</sup> The text below consists of Marx's close renderings of passages from Curran's speeches and Davis' "Notices" in *The Speeches of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran*, Dublin, 1855 (pp. 190, 196, 211-12, 248-58, 261, 264-85, 315-16) and quotations from the book. p. 253

<sup>303</sup> The expedition under General Hoche was organised by the French Government (Directory) on the insistence of Wolfe Tone, a leader of the United Irishmen Society, who came to France early in 1796 to obtain military assistance for the Irish patriots. He thought the arrival of the French landing force would be the signal for a general uprising in Ireland. The flotilla with the landing force sailed from Brest in mid-December 1796, but only a few ships reached Bantry Bay, the rest either being scattered by storms or sunk by English ships, as is stated in Marx's excerpts (see this volume, p. 280). The expedition was a failure and, towards the end of December, the surviving ships returned to Brest. In spite of this the English authorities waited with apprehension for General Hoche to resume landing operations early in 1797. However, fresh attempts to land French troops in Ireland were undertaken only later (one attempt, in the autumn of 1798, is described below, see pp. 281-82) with very weak landing forces, since support for Ireland's fight for independence was a subordinate issue in the strategy of the French bourgeois rulers, as compared with their plans for conquering colonies in the Middle East and other regions (Bonaparte's campaign in Egypt, Syria, etc.). p. 254

<sup>304</sup> See Note 251. p. 256

<sup>305</sup> A reference to the provocative role of Prussian ruling circles during the second and third partitions of Poland at the close of the eighteenth century. Secretly inciting Polish patriots against Tsarist Russia, the Prussian Government helped in the second partition of Polish lands (1793) and in suppressing the uprising led by Tadeusz Kościuszko, which was followed by the third partition of Poland (between Prussia, Austria and Russia) and the final liquidation of the Polish state (1795).

The policy of the English Government with respect to Ireland at the close of the eighteenth century is compared with Prussia's policy on the Polish question in G. Ensor, *Anti-Union. Ireland as She Ought to Be*, Newry, 1831, p. 85. In some sections of the present work Marx made wide use of this Irish journalist's accusatory pamphlet. Marx refers to Ensor's pamphlet mainly when he examines the concrete situation and methods of enforcing the Union. He also borrows historical parallels from Ensor (with the Cromwellian period, with the Union of 1707 between England and Scotland and with the Swedish-Norwegian Union of 1814), plus quotations from speeches made by various statesmen, and passages from newspapers and books by Petty, Lawrence, Harris and other authors whom Ensor himself often quoted without giving reference to the actual editions. p. 258

<sup>306</sup> Here and below, up to the section "Lord Cornwallis' Administration", Marx gives rendering of passages from Ensor's book *Anti-Union. Ireland as She Ought to Be*, Newry, 1831, pp. 85-89. p. 258

- <sup>307</sup> A reference to the Peace Treaty, which Charles Cornwallis concluded in 1792 with Tippoo Sahib (or Tippoo Sultan)—ruler of the South-Indian state of Mysore, who offered stubborn resistance to English expansion. Under the treaty, Mysore lost a considerable part of its territory and had to pay the East India Company 33 million rupees. Further attempts by Tippoo Sultan to prevent England's conquest of India resulted in a fourth Anglo-Mysore war (1799), in which Tippoo was killed and Mysore became a vassal state. p. 259
- <sup>308</sup> The bottom of Marx's manuscript page 46 is left blank with a remark in Marx's hand "See continuation p. 47". In turn, part of the text on page 47, repeating the foregoing description of Cornwallis' actions against the French landing force and Irish insurgents, is deleted with a vertical line. The undeleted text begins with a repetition of the sentence, a little longer this time, "Pitt now conceived..." p. 261
- <sup>309</sup> See Note 186. p. 262
- <sup>310</sup> A reference to the unification of England and Scotland into a single state—the Kingdom of Great Britain—by the Anglo-Scottish Union of 1707, which abolished Scotland's parliament, allowing Scottish deputies several scores of seats in the English Parliament. However, the autonomy and rights of the Presbyterian Church were retained. The people opposed the Union, seeing it as an encroachment on their country's independence. It was, however, enforced thanks to the efforts of the Scottish aristocrats, who sought thus to secure their privileges, and of the Scottish upper bourgeoisie seeking access to enterprise in the colonies and to England's world trade. p. 263
- <sup>311</sup> The Swedish-Norwegian Union of 1814 reflected the interests of Sweden's ruling classes. By their promises to help in incorporating Norway into the Swedish Crown, the governments of certain European countries, including England, secured Sweden's participation in the anti-Napoleon coalition of 1813-14. The annexation was sanctioned by the Vienna Congress (1814-15). The Union, however, provided for an autonomous Norwegian Parliament and administration. In 1905 the Norwegian Parliament abrogated the Union and Norway regained her independence. p. 264
- <sup>312</sup> A reference to Pitt's resignation in view of the forthcoming Anglo-French negotiations which resulted in the conclusion of the Peace Treaty of Amiens (see Note 251). p. 265
- <sup>313</sup> *Threshers* were members of a secret peasant organisation active in the Irish countries of Mayo, Leitrim, Sligo and Roscommon in 1806 and 1807. They opposed excessive requisitions made by church tithe collectors. The authorities meted out cruel punishments to the threshers, many of whom were hanged. p. 266
- <sup>314</sup> Here and elsewhere Marx quotes *The Morning Chronicle* for June 1828 from G. Ensor, *Anti-Union. Ireland as She Ought to Be*, Newry, 1831, p. 31. p. 268
- <sup>315</sup> This section consists of Marx's close rendering of passages and of quotations from Ensor's *Anti-Union. Ireland as She Ought to Be*, Newry, 1831, pp. 6, 18, 24-27, 44-45. p. 268
- <sup>316</sup> On August 16, 1819 government troops shot down unarmed participants in a mass meeting in support of electoral reform at St. Peter's Fields, near Manchester. After the "Battle of Peterloo", as this massacre was ironically

- called by analogy with the Battle of Waterloo, Parliament hastened to pass six reactionary acts against freedom of the press and assembly ("gagging laws"), Castlereagh being one of the initiators of their adoption. p. 268
- 317 This and the next section of the manuscript consist of Marx's renderings and quotations from Ensor's book *Anti-Union...*, pp. 51, 54, 56-57. p. 269
- 318 See Note 232. p. 269
- 319 *Brehon*—an ancient Irish lawyer or judge; *Brehon law*—the code of law used in Ireland before its occupation by the English. p. 269
- 320 A reference to two major uprisings against English rule in Ireland.  
The first uprising started in 1315 when a detachment led by Edward Bruce, brother of Robert Bruce, King of Scotland, landed in Ireland shortly after routing the army of King Edward II of England. Many Irish clan chiefs joined him. However, although the army led by Robert Bruce came to the assistance of the Irish insurgents, the uprising was quelled in 1318.  
On the uprising of 1641-52 see Note 229. p. 269
- 321 The second part of the work is subdivided in almost the same way as the first. The only difference being that here two paragraphs are designated by the letter c): "Volunteer Organisation" and "Declaration of Irish Independence", whereas in the main part of the work the first of these paragraphs is designated by the letter b). p. 270
- 322 See Note 240. p. 270
- 323 See Note 264. p. 270
- 324 See Note 271. p. 271
- 325 See Note 270. p. 274
- 326 Notes on Goldwin Smith's book *Irish History and Irish Character* (Oxford and London, 1861) are to be found in Notebook IV, one of those with excerpts that Engels wrote while working on *The History of Ireland*. Smith's book drew Engels' attention not as a source for the study of Irish history, but rather as a specimen of the Liberal falsification of this history that reflected the colonialist tendencies of the English bourgeoisie. Engels considered refutation of such chauvinistic conceptions to be one of his most important tasks, as witnessed by his sharp criticism of Smith in this and other articles, in particular by his description of this author in *The History of Ireland, Varia on the History of the Irish Confiscations*, as well as in his excerpts from M. O'Connor's *History of the Irish Catholics...* and in his letter to Marx of November 29, 1869 (see present edition, Vol. 43).  
Engels set down these excerpts and critical remarks on Smith's book in November 1869. The work consists of two parts: Notebook IV begins with the first; the second follows Engels' excerpts from another book on Irish history and is entitled: "Goldwin Smith. Conclusion (passages quoted word for word and addenda)". Apart from new excerpts referring to the book as a whole, Engels quotes entire passages that were merely mentioned in the first part. In both parts there are insertions in the margin made by Engels at a later date and references to other notebooks with excerpts comparing Smith's views to those of other authors and to data obtained from other sources.  
In Engels' manuscript there are direct quotations from Smith's book (and from other authors) in the original English and also his own renderings of certain passages, also in English (these are given in this volume, like the quotations, in brevier but without quotation marks). Engels wrote his own

remarks mostly in German (the English translation is in great primer) and in English (these are in small caps in this volume). Words doubly underlined by Engels are printed here in bold face. Italics in the quotations are by Engels.

The notes were first published in English in Marx and Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question*, Moscow, 1978. p. 283

- <sup>327</sup> A reference to Engels' excerpts from the book: Matthew O'Connor, *The History of the Irish Catholics from the Settlement in 1691 with a View of the State of Ireland from the Invasion by Henry II to the Revolution*, Dublin, 1813, supplemented with facts from many other works. Engels' excerpts were published for the first time in Russian in 1948 in *Marx-Engels Archives*, Vol. X, under the heading "Excerpts on the History of Ireland in the 17th and 18th Centuries". p. 283

- <sup>328</sup> Engels refers to the book by J. G. Kohl, *Reisen in Irland*, Vols. I and II, Dresden and Leipzig, 1843, excerpts from which he later inserted in the notebook of notes on Smith's book. Engels said that the Irish people were still in the grip of superstition at the time when Kohl travelled in Ireland.

"Two year olds" and "three year olds"—names applied to groups of fighters in Ireland. It is believed that these names derived from debates about the age of steers. p. 284

- <sup>329</sup> Here and below Engels refers to his excerpts from the book by John Davies, *Historical Tracts*, London, 1786, which he wrote down on separate sheets, apparently in order to compare evidence concerning Irish customs as interpreted by Smith and other English historians with that taken directly from source. Excerpts are made from Davies' main treatise: *True Causes Why Ireland was never entirely subdued and brought under obedience of the Crown of England until the Beginning of his Majesty's happy Reign* (the reference is to James I, during whose reign this treatise was published, 1612).

In Engels' opinion, this treatise by Davies was a very important source for the study of the Irish medieval history (see his letter to Marx of November 29, 1869, present edition, Vol. 43). Consequently, in addition to the excerpts, Engels wrote a detailed conspectus of this book (Notebook V) to which he refers in his insertions to the Notes on Goldwin Smith's work and in other material on the history of Ireland.

In his excerpts, Engels gave an explanation of such Irish customs as tanistry and gavelkind, either by quoting the source or by giving his own rendering.

*Tanistry*—a system regulating the inheritance of chieftainship of the Celtic clans and septs (tribes) in Ireland. Like many other Irish customs, it was a relic of the tribal system. According to this custom, the clan chief's successor was appointed during the lifetime of the chief from a definite family in the clan, whose members were considered the "eldest and worthiest".

*Gavelkind*—a term borrowed from the common law of the inhabitants of Kent and applied by English jurists to the Irish rules regulating the passing of the lands of a deceased member of the clan or sept into other hands. Ever since the time when tribal relations prevailed, land was regarded by the indigenous Irish not as private property but as a temporary tenure. Thus, after the death of its owner it did not pass to his descendants but was distributed among all free male kinsmen, including his sons out of wedlock. Although the lands of the chiefs and members of the clan élite were by that time no longer parcelled out after their death, they were not regarded as their private property and were not inherited by the family but passed to a new owner in accordance with the described tanistry principle. p. 284

- 330 See Note 230. p. 285
- 331 See Note 185. p. 286
- 332 See Note 237. p. 286
- 333 The *Wars of the Roses* (1455-85)—wars between the feudal Houses of York and Lancaster fighting for the throne, the white rose being the badge of the House of York, and the red rose that of the House of Lancaster. The wars almost completely wiped out the ancient feudal nobility and brought Henry VII to power to form a new dynasty, that of the Tudors, who established absolute monarchy in England. p. 286
- 334 The Brotherhood of St. George had as its members the thirteen most powerful English and Irish feudal lords of the Pale. Edward IV, who feared that the Pale would separate from England, hastened to renounce the services of this Brotherhood.
- The note in brackets to the effect that the fact mentioned in Thomas Moore's *The History of Ireland*, Paris, 1835-46, vols. I-IV (there are excerpts from it in Notebook II of Engels' preparatory material for *The History of Ireland*) is not to be found in Engels' *Chronology of Ireland* was apparently inserted at a later date.
- Chronology of Ireland*, compiled by Engels mainly from Moore's book, is contained in Engels' notebook XI of excerpts. The number was entered later. Engels may have compiled it in the late spring or early summer of 1870 when he began work on his preparatory material for *The History of Ireland* before, or simultaneously with, the writing of its first chapters. Written in German, the manuscript was first published in Russian in *Marx-Engels Archives*, Vol. X, Moscow, 1948. In English it was first published in Marx and Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971. p. 287
- 335 In 1366, the Parliament in Kilkenny adopted the Statute of Kilkenny—a code of prohibitions designed to protect the colonists from the spread of Irish customs and habits. Under the threat of confiscating land, the Statute forbade the English resident in Ireland to intermarry with the Irish, to appoint Irishmen to ecclesiastical posts, and to use their apparel, customs, or language. The English law was valid within the territory of the Pale. The adoption of the Statute was prompted by the desire of the English authorities to intensify their policy of conquest in Ireland and to legalise the inequality of the Irish population in the occupied part of the island, as well as to counteract the separatist tendencies of the Anglo-Irish nobility, whose strength lay in their ties with the Irish clan chiefs. p. 287
- 336 In his synopsis of Davies' book (in Notebook V), to which Engels is here referring, he accused Smith of misinterpreting the quoted sources. Among other things, Davies wrote that indigenous Irishmen accused of murder were convicted and fined a specified sum of money in favour of the English King. From Davies' text it also followed that one Irish chief's answer concerning the sheriff was given in jest, whereas Smith quotes it to prove that the laws on the legal privileges of English colonists in Ireland are allegedly fully justified.
- Excerpts from Spenser's book, *A View of the State of Ireland*, to which Engels also refers in connection with the Kilkenny Statute, are to be found in Notebook VI of his preparatory material. p. 287
- 337 *Geraldines*—an Anglo-Irish aristocratic family that descended from the first conquerors of Ireland, the Anglo-Norman nobles from South Wales. In

- Ireland, the Geraldines became related to the clan chiefs and thereby acquired considerable connections and influence. At the same time they fought in the wars of conquest against the indigenous Irish. From the beginning of the fourteenth century, two branches of the Geraldine family—the Earls of Desmond and the Earls of Kildare—played a particularly prominent role. Both were descendants of Maurice Fitzgerald, the leader of one of the armies of the Anglo-Norman barons that invaded Ireland in 1169-71. p. 288
- 338 See Note 189. p. 288
- 339 “*Potemkin villages*”—an expression for false, ostentatious prosperity, originating from rumours that, when the Russian Empress Catherine II made a trip to the South in 1787, her favourite G. A. Potemkin, governor-general of the southern provinces of Russia, had sham villages put up all along her route to demonstrate the “prosperity” of his region. p. 288
- 340 See Note 186. p. 289
- 341 *Orangemen* or *Orange Lodges* (the Orangeist Order)—named after William III, Prince of Orange—an organisation set up in Ireland in 1795. The English authorities, the landlords and Protestant clergy used this organisation to fight the Irish national liberation movement. The Order united English and Irish elements from all layers of society and systematically incited Protestants against the Irish Catholics. The Orangemen had a particularly great influence in Northern Ireland, where the majority of the population were Protestants. p. 289
- 342 *Sepoys* were native Indian soldiers serving in the British colonial army. They made up the core of the popular Indian uprising of 1857-59 (Sepoy mutiny) against British colonial rule. p. 289
- 343 In this passage Engels exposes the apologetic attempts of Smith and other English historians to justify English cruelty in Ireland by references to the intolerance and fanaticism characteristic of the whole period of the religious wars (including the Thirty Years' War, 1618-48, whose main battleground was Germany), and to the persecution of the Protestants in the absolutist Catholic states of Europe. p. 289
- 344 See Note 236. p. 289
- 345 Engels refers to MacGeoghegan's *History of Ireland*. Translated by O'Kelly, Dublin, 1844 (originally published in French, in Paris in 1758). John Mitchel's *History of Ireland* was written as a continuation of that book (see Note 250). p. 290
- 346 See Note 311. p. 291
- 347 Major battles in the *Hundred Years' War* between England and France (1337-1453) took place at Crécy in 1346 and at Poitiers in 1356. p. 291
- 348 *Irishry*—the name used from the second half of the fourteenth century to distinguish the indigenous population of Ireland from the English settlers. The former were mainly Irishmen who lived beyond the Pale and who retained their independence, their social order and customs up to the sixteenth century. p. 292
- 349 See Note 278. p. 293
- 350 A reference to the uprising in Ulster that broke out on October 23, 1641, under the leadership of Phelim O'Neill and sparked off the Irish people's national liberation uprising (see Note 229). p. 293

- <sup>351</sup> *Sicilian Vespers*—a popular uprising against the French invaders that broke out in Palermo on March 30, 1282, during vespers. Inflamed by the cruelty of the French soldiers, the uprising spread throughout Sicily. As a result, the French army was driven out and the Anjou dynasty, which had ruled the Kingdom of Sicily from 1266, was dethroned. p. 294
- <sup>352</sup> In 1853, Parliament adopted a Bill on the encumbered estates in Ireland belonging to the Irish nobility. At that time there were many estates in Ireland which had been mortgaged and mortgaged again because their owners were unable to make ends meet. Moreover, according to English legislation they were obliged to help the poor residing on their lands. Under the 1853 Act, these estates (the remnants of the Irish landed estates) were to be sold quickly to the highest bidder and the proceeds used to pay off creditors. This was one of the measures that helped English landlords to take possession of Irish lands and use them as pasture. p. 295
- <sup>353</sup> Engels' own title for the preparatory material to his unfinished work on the history of Ireland, included in Notebook X, is *Varia zur Geschichte der irischen Konfiskationen*. J. N. Murphy's *Ireland, Industrial, Political, and Social*, London, 1870, of which he made a conspectus in the previous notebook, served Engels as the main source for this work. In the *Varia*, however, Engels endeavoured to disclose and generalise the historical facts relevant to the cardinal problem in the history of Anglo-Irish relations, the expropriation of the indigenous population of Ireland in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and of her conversion into a mainstay of English landlordism as a result of the plunder of Irish lands by the "new" nobility and bourgeoisie. This process, which took place in the period of English absolutism and bourgeois revolution, led to the final colonial subjugation of Ireland by bourgeois-aristocratic England.

The pages in Notebook X are divided into two columns. Excerpts from Murphy's book are in the left-hand column. The right-hand column was, most probably, meant for excerpts from other sources but remained blank (except for two lines on one of the pages). However, on the basis of numerous references made by Engels to his own notebooks, as well as to works and collections of documents mentioned by Murphy, we may assume that Engels intended to collect extensive material on this subject from various sources and to supplement and, in some cases, verify data given by Murphy with evidence from other authors (Thomas Leland, Thomas Carte, John Patrick Prendergast, Matthew O'Connor and others). The pages of the notebook were numbered by Engels. At the top of each one he wrote the title of the relevant section, which sometimes repeated that given on the preceding page, adding the word "continued".

The first page, entitled "15th Century", remained blank. The left-hand column is sometimes not entirely filled. Some pages are left blank merely reproducing the titles given on the preceding page.

*Varia* was written by Engels in German and English. Direct quotations from different sources (written by Engels as a rule in English) and Engels' close renderings of passages in German or English are given in this volume in brevier, while Engels' own remarks, mostly in German, are given in great primer. Separate English words, titles, or phrases, occurring in the German text are given in small caps.

The work was published in English for the first time in Marx and Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971. p. 297

- 354 *Fee tail*—an estate the use of which is limited to a category of heirs stipulated in the grant; in practice it means life tenancy. p. 298
- 355 Engels refers to W. Camden's *Annals, or the History of Elizabeth*. The book was first published in Latin (London, 1615); the English translation was also published there in 1625-29. Here and below Engels quotes this work according to Murphy's *Ireland, Industrial, Political, and Social*. p. 298
- 356 In this passage Engels analyses the anti-Catholic act passed by the Government of Elizabeth, given by Murphy on pp. 256-60 of his book. (This act imposed fines for non-attendance at a Protestant Church, introduced the Oath of Supremacy to the Queen as head of the Anglican Church, making this oath a condition of access to government service, to practice at the bar and to obtaining documents for the acquisition of land, etc.) Engels describes the act of 1560 and similar later acts as penal laws, evidently by analogy with the widespread term used to describe the anti-Catholic legislation for Ireland at the end of the seventeenth century and in the early half of the eighteenth century (see Note 238). p. 299
- 357 Engels refers here to his excerpts from J. Davies' *Historical Tracts* (see Note 329), pp. 127, 128, 135, 136. p. 299
- 358 See Note 329. p. 299
- 359 See Note 278. p. 299
- 360 See Note 334. p. 299
- 361 A reference to the book by Th. Carte, *An History of the Life of James, Duke of Ormonde, from His Birth in 1610, to His Death in 1688*, vols. I-II, London, 1735-36. Below Engels refers both to the extracts from this edition in Murphy's book and to his excerpts from Carte's work included in Notebook VII of his preparatory material for his *History of Ireland*. p. 299
- 362 Engels' excerpts in the indicated passage describe in detail the confiscation of the lands of Irish clans in the province of Leinster during the reign of James I under the pretext of defective titles possessed by clan chiefs. The text of the corresponding passage from Carte's book is reproduced in *Marx-Engels Archives*, Vol. X, Moscow, 1948, p. 254, and in Marx and Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971, Note 248. p. 300
- 363 Engels refers to the passage in his excerpts from M. O'Connor's *History of the Irish Catholics*, already referred to *Chronology of Ireland*. p. 300
- 364 "Graces"—minor concessions "granted" to Irish Catholic lords and gentry by Charles I in 1628, after receiving from them large financial subsidies over a period of three years. The relevant document granted Irish Catholics certain guarantees of title deeds and instituted that only those of less than sixty years' duration were to be verified; it replaced the Oath of Supremacy to the King as head of the Anglican Church by the Oath of Loyalty in the event of Catholics being appointed to office; it permitted them to practise at the bar, etc. However, these "graces" were not properly formalised, and very soon representatives of the English Crown, in particular the Lord Lieutenant of Wentworth (Strafford), began quickly to violate them. p. 301
- 365 The *Court of High Commission* was founded in England in 1559 by Elizabeth I to deal with breaches of royal edicts and Acts of Parliament instrumental in furthering the Reformation, and with offences against the Church of England.



- It was directed not only against the Catholics but also against the radical Protestant sects—the Puritans. p. 301
- <sup>366</sup> The *Star Chamber* was founded in England in 1487 by Henry VII as a special court for the trial of local barons. Under Elizabeth I it became one of the supreme judicial bodies investigating political crimes, a weapon in the ruthless struggle against the opponents of absolutism. Like the Court of High Commission, it was abolished by the Long Parliament in 1641.
- In Ireland, the introduction by Strafford of similar institutions (one of them was called the Castle Chamber because it convened in Dublin Castle, the residence of the Lord Deputy) mainly served the purpose of expropriation and colonisation. p. 301
- <sup>367</sup> Edmund Spenser, *A View of the State of Ireland*, in *Ancient Irish Histories*, Dublin, 1809. In Engels' excerpts from Spenser's book (see Note 336) the following passage refers to the Irish clergy:
- "...ye may find there ... gross simony, greedy covetousness, fleshly incontinency, careless sloth, and generally all disordered life in the common clergyman. And besides ... they do go and live like laymen, follow all kinds of husbandry and other worldly affairs as other Irishmen do. They neither read Scriptures, nor preach to the people, nor administer the Communion, but baptism they do, ... they take the tithes and offerings and gather what fruit else they may of their living, ... and some of them ... pay, as due, tributes and shares of their livings to their bishops..." (Spenser, pp. 139-40). Engels added the following remark: "*All the above, apparently, refers to the Protestant priests of that time.*" p. 302
- <sup>368</sup> A reference to an order given in 1641 by Lords Justices Parsons and Borlase to the English Commander with instructions to "wound, kill, slay, and destroy all the rebels and their adherents and relievers, and burn, spoil, waste, consume, destroy, and demolish all the places, towns, and houses where the rebels were or have been relieved or harboured, and all the corn and hay there, and to *kill and destroy all the men there inhabiting able to bear arms*". p. 302
- <sup>369</sup> In October 1642, the participants in the Irish uprising of 1641-52 (see Note 229) formed the *Catholic Confederation*, a state organisation with its centre in Kilkenny and the Supreme Council as a provisional government. A struggle went on within the Kilkenny Confederation between the Anglo-Irish nobility and the high Catholic clergy, on the one hand, and the more radical elements from among the gentry expropriated by the English, and émigré officers who had returned to Ireland, on the other hand. While the former strove for compromise with Charles I, the latter stood for Ireland's independence and resolute action both against the English parliamentary forces and the English Royalists. The predominance of aristocrats, their policy of vacillation, their treaties with Charles I which put him in control of the armed forces and resources of the Confederation—all this weakened the Irish resistance and led to the defeat of the uprising. p. 302
- <sup>370</sup> Cromwell and his followers (who had defeated the Royalist forces in England, proclaimed a republic and beheaded Charles I) organised a punitive expedition to Ireland on the pretext of destroying a Royalist stronghold. The true aim of the expedition was the colonial subjugation of the country. On August 15, 1649, Cromwell's army landed in Ireland and commenced the brutal suppression of the Irish rebellion, which was continued by Cromwell's successors, the Republican generals.

Drogheda, an ancient fortress in Eastern Ireland, was besieged by Oliver Cromwell on September 3, 1649, and taken by storm on September 12. In accordance with the Commander-in-Chief's order to show no mercy to anyone caught with arms, the three-thousand-strong Irish garrison was massacred and many peaceful citizens were killed. p. 302

<sup>371</sup> *Soldiers' debentures*—titles to plots of Irish land of definite size. They were given to soldiers of the Parliamentary army in lieu of wages. In many cases officers and profiteers bought them from the soldiers for a song. p. 303

<sup>372</sup> Engels refers to his excerpts from the book by J. Prendergast, *Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland*, London, 1865. In these excerpts, Engels describes the Act of Settlement (August 12, 1652) and the Act of Satisfaction (September 26, 1653) (see Note 214). Both acts legalised the expropriation of the local Irish population in favour of the English conquerors after suppression of the 1641-52 national liberation uprising in Ireland. The English set up a special commission in Athlone (which is mentioned by Engels below) to implement the second act and compensate Irishmen found only partially guilty of revolt by allotting them land in the barren province of Connaught and in Clare County. This commission defined the size of the domains to be kept, the other one, at Lougry, allotted lands in Connaught and Clare on the instructions of a special Committee in Dublin. p. 303

<sup>373</sup> See Note 232. p. 303

<sup>374</sup> Engels refers to his notes from Matthew O'Connor's *The History of the Irish Catholics*, supplemented by excerpts from other sources. In this particular case the reference is to the passage dealing with the declaration made in 1660 by the government of Charles II at the outset of the Stuart Restoration (on the Irish policy of the post-Restoration Stuarts see Note 387). According to that declaration the "adventurers" (see Note 232), the officers and men of the Parliamentary army retained their possessions in Ireland, while officers of Ormonde's Royalist army, who had served under him up to 1649 (hence the term "forty-nine officers"); in that year the majority of the defeated English Royalists left Ireland and the resistance to Cromwell's troops was continued mainly by the Irish rebels), received compensation in the form of those same confiscated Irish lands. Indigenous Irishmen, who had fought under the King's banner during the Civil War and been deprived of their possessions because of it, received practically no compensation. p. 304

<sup>375</sup> Given below are data on the confiscations of Irish lands carried out by William III after the suppression of the 1689-91 Irish uprising (see Note 229) and in violation of the terms of surrender signed with the insurgents at Limerick (see Note 236). p. 305

<sup>376</sup> This plan is part of Engels' vast preparatory material for his *History of Ireland* (see Note 184). It includes Engels' own division of Irish history into periods.

In English this plan was first published in Marx and Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971. p. 307

<sup>377</sup> The plan of Chapter Two and the most significant fragments for Engels' *History of Ireland* comprise part of his preparatory material for this work. Chapter Two, "Old Ireland", remained unfinished, but its plan gives an idea of the problems Engels wanted to raise.

In English this plan is published for the first time in this volume. Some fragments were first published in English in Marx and Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971.

- In this volume the plan and fragments are printed according to the manuscript written mostly in German, and partly in English. English words used by Engels are given in small caps. p. 308
- 378 Engels refers to the works on the history of ancient Ireland by Ed. Ledwich, a well-known Irish archaeologist. p. 308
- 379 *Coshery*—an ancient right, dating back to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, of an Irish chief of a tribe or a clan with his retainers to claim bed and board at the expense of a dependent. This right was widely exercised during festivals. p. 310
- 380 A reference to an uprising of the Scottish highlanders in 1745. The rebellion was caused by oppression and eviction from the land carried out in the interests of the Anglo-Scottish landed aristocracy and bourgeoisie. Part of the nobility in the Scottish Highlands, who supported the claims of the overthrown Stuart dynasty to the English Crown (the official aim of the insurgents was to enthrone Charles Edward, the grandson of James II), took advantage of the discontent among the highlanders. The suppression of the rebellion put an end to the clan system in the Scottish Highlands and resulted in more evictions. p. 312
- 381 The *Island of Heligoland* (North Sea) was settled in early times by a Germanic tribe, the Frisians. Having become a Danish possession in the eighteenth century, it was captured by the English in 1807 and ceded to England in 1814 by the Treaty of Kiel. p. 312
- 382 The Prussians defeated the Austrians on July 3, 1866, near the village of *Sadowa*, in the vicinity of the town of Königgrätz in Bohemia (now Hradec Kralové).  
On the *North-German Confederation* see Note 102. p. 312
- 383 The name given in Ireland to those who took part in the movement against the colonial authorities and landlords in the latter half of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. The name was derived from the original meaning of the word—a bully, a ruffian. The Tories were mostly peasants, their leaders—expropriated Irish noblemen. At the end of the seventeenth century there emerged detachments made up of peasants alone, the *rapparees*. The authorities used extremely brutal methods in the fight against the Tories and rapparees. Those caught were hanged, drawn and quartered. Informers were rewarded generously. In England the nickname Tory was given by the Whigs to their opponents—the representatives of the conservative aristocratic circles supporting the absolutist claims of the Stuarts, who were restored in 1660.  
On the *Penal Laws* see Note 238. p. 313
- 384 A reference to the trial, held in Dublin at the end of 1865, of the prominent Fenians, accused of organising an anti-government plot. The principal defendants were O'Leary, Luby, Kickham and O'Donovan Rossa, the publishers and editors of *The Irish People*, the Fenian newspaper suppressed by the police on September 15. Many other Fenians were also arrested on denunciation by *agents provocateurs* and traitors. The picked pro-English jury was hostile to the Irish rebels. The sentences were extremely severe: twenty years' penal servitude to O'Leary and Luby, fifteen years' penal servitude to Kickham and penal servitude for life to O'Donovan Rossa. p. 314
- 385 This record of Marx's speech on the Irish question on December 16, 1867 was made by Eccarius (for the outline of this report made by Marx himself see this

volume, pp. 194-206). It was intended for the journal *Der Vorbote* and was sent by Friedrich Lessner to Johann Philipp Becker in Switzerland but remained unpublished.

The record of Marx's speech was first published in English in Marx and Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971.

p. 317

386 The *Reformation*, begun in England under King Henry VIII (Act of Supremacy, which declared the King the head of the Church in place of the Pope, and other Acts), was completed under Elizabeth I (the adoption, in 1571, of the "39 articles" of the Anglican Church—a variety of Protestantism). The introduction of the Reformation to Catholic Ireland was a means of subjecting her to the English absolute monarchy and expropriating her population in favour of the English colonists on the pretext of struggle against Catholicism.

p. 317

387 A reference to the Restoration of the Stuart dynasty in England in 1660. The restored Stuarts (Charles II and James II) continued to rule up to the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89. The Restoration was the result of a compromise between the bourgeois élite and the "new" nobility, which had grown rich during the revolution, and the aristocrats supporting the Stuarts. The adherents of the Stuarts, many of whom had lost their estates in England, now received title to confiscated Irish lands in compensation. Only in rare cases did the representatives of the new regime take action on complaints and petitions for the return of property to Irish owners, and after the 1665 Act such complaints were no longer considered. Thus, the sweeping expropriation of the Irish population implemented during the English bourgeois revolution was sanctioned by the restored monarchy.

p. 317

388 See Note 238.

p. 317

389 See Note 233.

p. 317

390 See Note 123.

p. 318

391 Marx made these speeches to substantiate his proposal to change the venue of the congress and the subsequent withdrawal of the relevant resolution. The record of his speeches is reproduced from *The Bee-Hive Newspaper* because it is more detailed than in the Minute Book of the General Council.

p. 320

392 See Note 18.

p. 320

393 See Note 4.

p. 320

394 Wilhelm Eichhoff wrote this pamphlet with Marx's active assistance. This was the first work on the history of the International Working Men's Association. Wilhelm Eichhoff conceived it in the summer of 1868, when his brother Albert, a publisher, planned to issue the Workers' Calendar (*Arbeiterkalender*) for 1869. Wilhelm Eichhoff proposed that the leading item should be devoted to the history of the establishment, spread and activity of the International Working Men's Association. On June 6, 1868 Wilhelm Eichhoff informed Marx of his intention and asked the latter to send the necessary material and help him in writing the article. On June 27 Marx sent to Berlin many documents of the Association, newspaper cuttings and notes on the activity of the International. The day before Marx wrote to Engels: "...I am writing something for Eichhoff. Tomorrow I shall send it off" (see present edition, Vol. 43). In his reply of June 29, Eichhoff thanked Marx for the material and wrote that he was going to use Marx's manuscript word for word and supplement and expand it as advised by Marx.

There is every reason to believe that Marx drew up the thesis and plan that determined the work's structure, general tendency and basic conclusions.

Eichhoff's work grew into a pamphlet because of the abundance of material sent by Marx. Eichhoff's letters show that in the course of his work Marx answered his numerous questions, gave advice and made suggestions. Some sections of the pamphlet include documents of the General Council (the Inaugural Address, Rules and Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council) or give their contents. Eichhoff used the Minutes of the Geneva and Lausanne congresses of the International, addresses of the General Council and local sections, Becker's pamphlet *Die Internationale Arbeiterassoziation und die Arbeitseinstellung in Genf im Frühjahr 1868*, the pamphlet *Procès de L'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Bureau de Paris* published in 1868, and extracts from English, German, French and Belgian newspapers on the activity of local sections of the International. A number of pages in the pamphlet contain Marx's own material which he subsequently used elsewhere. Thus, the description of the Charleroi events, the information about an incident with the Geneva Congress documents on the French frontier and talks of Minister Rouher with the delegate of the Paris Committee of the International Working Men's Association were partially included by Marx in the Fourth Annual Report of the General Council (see this volume, pp. 12-17). Marx presumably wrote the section about the political activity of the General Council, the list of periodicals of the Association, etc. From July 12 to 22, 1868 Marx edited the pamphlet and read the proofs. On July 29 a specimen copy of the pamphlet was sent to Marx in London, and the entire edition was printed in August 1868. Copies were also sent to Engels, Liebknecht, Becker, Lessner, Kugelmann, to the General Council, the German Workers' Educational Society in London, and others.

p. 322

395 In 1824, under public pressure, the British Parliament lifted the ban on the trade unions. In 1825, however, it passed a Bill on workers' combinations, which, while confirming the raising of the ban on trade unions, greatly restricted their activity. In particular any agitation for workers to join unions and take part in strikes was regarded as compulsion and violence and punished as a crime.

p. 323

396 The Statutes submitted by Luigi Wolff to the Sub-Committee on October 8, 1864 were an English translation entitled *Fraternal Bond Between the Italian Workmen's Associations*, which had been published in *Il Giornale delle Associazioni Operaie* on July 31, 1864 and adopted by a congress of Italian pro-Mazzini working men's associations, held in Naples at the end of October. By submitting these Statutes, written from bourgeois-democratic positions, to the International Working Men's Association, Mazzini and his followers sought to spread their influence on it.

p. 323

397 At the beginning of April 1864 Garibaldi made a fund-raising journey to England to finance an expedition against Austrian rule in Venice. Garibaldi hoped to get support from English ruling circles. The people gave the Italian national hero an enthusiastic welcome. At first the British Government treated Garibaldi as an honoured guest. However, the discontent of the English ruling circles was aroused by his meeting with Mazzini, who was living in London as a political emigrant, and his speeches in defence of the Polish insurgents. Garibaldi left England at the end of April.

p. 323

<sup>398</sup> Eichhoff's pamphlet included the programme documents of the International—Inaugural Address and Rules. They were given in a new and highly accurate translation made by Eichhoff and edited by Marx. This helped to familiarise more people in Germany with these documents. Eichhoff translated the Address from the pamphlet *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association* published in London in 1864. Eichhoff's translation was later reprinted in a number of German works about the International.

Here, the text of the Address is reproduced from the 1864 English edition, with an account of the changes in Eichhoff's German translation. The most significant discrepancies are indicated in footnotes. p. 324

<sup>399</sup> Apparently a reference to the articles "The Trade and Navigation Returns" and "Pauperism.—July 1850 and 1849" published in *The Economist*, Vol. VIII, No. 363, August 10, 1850. p. 324

<sup>400</sup> *Garotters*—highway robbers who strangled their victims. In the early 1860s the practice was so widespread in London that it was the subject of a special debate in Parliament. p. 325

<sup>401</sup> See Note 90. p. 325

<sup>402</sup> The passage quoted by Marx from Gladstone's speech of April 16, 1863 appeared in nearly 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 report of parliamentary debates in which the text was corrected by the speakers themselves. 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 *Volksstaat* editors written 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 Sadley Taylor.

This accusation was refuted 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 (see present edition, Vol. 27). p. 327

<sup>403</sup> The *Ten Hours' Bill*, the battle for which had been fought for many years, was passed by Parliament in 1847 against a background of the sharply intensified contradictions, generated by the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, between the landed aristocracy and the industrial bourgeoisie. To revenge themselves 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.

In 1850 Engels wrote two articles on the Ten Hours' Bill (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 271-76 and 288-300). True, they were written when Marx's economic teaching was not yet sufficiently developed, and this can be seen in a certain underestimation of the struggle for a shorter working day.

p. 330

<sup>404</sup> At the 1863 parliamentary session, the Irish deputies led by Thomas Maguire demanded legislative measures limiting the irregularities of the landlords and, in particular, they demanded that tenants should have the right to receive compensation for all their expenditures on a rented plot when the lease expired or was terminated. In his speech on June 23 Palmerston called these

demands "communistic doctrines" and described them as "subversive of all the fundamental principles of social order" (*The Times*, No. 24593, June 24, 1864).  
p. 331

405 During the US Civil War the English workers opposed the government's attempts to interfere in the war on the side of the Southern slave-holding states. Their massive campaign, which reached its peak at the end of 1861 and the beginning of 1862, prevented the reactionaries from drawing Europe into the war on the side of the slave-holders and helped considerably to strengthen the international solidarity of the workers.  
p. 332

406 The *Rules and Administrative Regulations* of the International Working Men's Association were approved by the Geneva Congress on September 5 and 8, 1866. These Rules were based on the text of the Provisional Rules, written by Marx in October 1864 (see present edition, Vol. 20), with certain changes and additions. The Administrative Regulations were drawn up by a Congress commission of which Eccarius was a member. The German text of the two documents was published by Johann Philipp Becker in *Der Vorbote*, No. 9, September 1866.

In the autumn of 1867 Eccarius, instructed and assisted by Marx, prepared a new official edition of the Rules and Administrative Regulations which was sanctioned by the General Council on November 5. The pamphlet *Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association* came off the press in London in 1867.

Eichhoff translated the Rules into German according to this pamphlet, omitting the section "Administrative Regulations" (for the full text of the Rules see present edition, Vol. 20, Appendices).  
p. 332

407 This and the preceding paragraphs of a declarative character were included by Marx in the Preamble to the Provisional Rules on the insistence of other members of the Sub-Committee who discussed the document on October 27, 1864 (see Marx's letter to Engels on November 4, 1864, present edition, Vol. 42).  
p. 333

408 The *London Conference of the International Working Men's Association* was held from September 25 to 29, 1865. It was convened on the insistence of Marx who believed that the International's sections were not strong enough to hold a general congress as envisaged by the Provisional Rules. The conference was attended by nine delegates from France, Switzerland and Belgium, and the Central (General) Council members. On September 28 a meeting (soirée) was held in St. Martin's Hall to celebrate the first anniversary of the founding of the Association.

The conference heard the Central Council's reports and reports of local sections. The main question discussed was the agenda of the forthcoming congress and the order of its convocation. It was decided to hold it in Geneva in May 1866 (later it was postponed by the Central Council until the beginning of September 1866). Despite the Proudhonists, who demanded that the Polish question should be excluded from the agenda of the congress and that any member of the Association may have the right to take part in it, the conference retained the item on the restoration of Poland's independence and recognised as competent only elected delegates. The conference also adopted the Council's other proposals on the work of the congress. Prepared and conducted under Marx's leadership, the London Conference of 1865 played a big role in the establishment of the International and in shaping it as an organisation.

p. 335

<sup>409</sup> See Note 5.

p. 335

<sup>410</sup> The *Geneva Congress of the International* met from September 3 to 8, 1866. It was attended by 60 delegates from the Central (General) Council, the different sections of the Association and the workers' societies of England, France, Germany and Switzerland. The Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional Central Council were drawn up by Marx in August 1866, when the final preparations were being made for the Geneva Congress. They were written in English and then translated into French by Paul Lafargue.

The Instructions were read at the congress as the General Council's official report. The congress became the scene of a heated debate between Marx's followers and the Proudhonists, who countered the Instructions with their own programme. Jung, Eccarius and other members of the General Council managed to have most points of the Instructions adopted as congress resolutions. The Proudhonists were only able to have their resolutions passed on matters of secondary importance.

The Geneva Congress approved the Rules (based on the Provisional Rules drawn up by Marx) and the Regulations of the International Working Men's Association, and marked the end of the International's organisational period.

Compared with the original English text (see present edition, Vol. 20), Eichhoff's German translation of the Instructions contains some differences in reading and abridgements.

p. 336

<sup>411</sup> The general scheme of statistical inquiry into the condition of the working class as proposed by Marx was unanimously accepted by the Geneva Congress. In practice, however, the collection of data and their publication in the form of the Central Council's reports were hampered by lack of money and negligence on the part of local sections. The Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses of the International confirmed the need to carry the Geneva Congress resolution on workers' statistics, while the London Conference of 1871 included point "c" of Section 2 of the Instructions in the Administrative Regulations of the Association (see present edition, Vol. 23).

p. 338

<sup>412</sup> After the Civil War, the movement for the legislative introduction of an eight-hour working day intensified in the USA. Leagues of struggle for an eight-hour working day were formed all over the country. At its inaugural congress in Baltimore in August 1866, the National Labour Union (see Note 26) declared the demand for an eight-hour working day to be an indispensable condition for the emancipation of labour.

p. 338

<sup>413</sup> The *Lausanne Congress of the International* was held from September 2 to 8, 1867. Marx took part in preparing the congress but did not attend it because he was busy reading the proofs of Volume I of *Capital*. He withdrew his candidature at the General Council meeting of August 13, 1867.

Sixty-four delegates from six countries (England, France, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium and Italy) were present at the congress. Apart from the General Council's report, the congress heard local reports. The latter showed that the influence of the International on the proletarian masses had increased and that its organisations in different countries had become stronger. The Proudhonist-minded delegates at the congress tried to change the International's line and programme principles. Despite the General Council's efforts, they managed to impose their own agenda on the congress and sought to revise the Geneva Congress decisions in a Proudhonist spirit. They carried out a number of their resolutions, in particular on the question of co-operation and credit.

The Proudhonists, however, failed to achieve their main aim. The congress



confirmed the Geneva resolutions on economic struggle and strikes. In contrast to the Proudhonists' demand for abstention from political struggle, the Lausanne Congress resolution on political freedom emphasised that the social emancipation of workers was inseparably bound up with their political emancipation. Nor did the Proudhonists manage to take over the leadership of the International. The congress re-elected the General Council in its previous composition and retained London as its seat. p. 341.

- <sup>414</sup> On the League of Peace and Freedom and the General Council's attitude to its congress, see Note 56.

The Lausanne Congress ignored the General Council's resolution on the attitude of the International Working Men's Association towards the League's congress (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 204), and, influenced by petty-bourgeois elements, it resolved to take part officially in the League's congress. The League's congress itself (several members of the General Council and of the International attended) revealed a big difference between the proletarian and the abstract-pacifist approach to the struggle for peace. Marx's tactics as regards the League of Peace and Freedom was fully acknowledged by the Brussels Congress of the International in 1868 which opposed the official affiliation to the League. p. 342

- <sup>415</sup> The *Manchester School*—a trend in economic thought reflecting the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie. It advocated Free Trade and non-interference by the state in economic affairs. In the 1840s and 1850s the Free Traders were an independent political group; later they constituted the Left wing of the Liberal Party. p. 343

- <sup>416</sup> The conference of trades delegates in Sheffield was held from July 17 to 21, 1866 and was attended by 138 delegates representing 200,000 organised workers. A resolution calling on trade unions to join 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. p. 344

- <sup>417</sup> See Note 38. p. 344

- <sup>418</sup> On British trade unions' participation in the general democratic movement for the second electoral reform, see Note 39. p. 345

- <sup>419</sup> This refers to the reform finally adopted by the British Parliament on August 15, 1867. The law extended suffrage to people resident in town for a period of not less than 12 months and renting houses or flats. In counties the right to vote was granted to tenants with an annual income of £12. The extension of suffrage increased the number of voters from one to two million. Apart from the middle-class strata of town and country, the law also applied to a better-off section of the working class. However, the bulk of the toiling people of England, as before, had no right to vote. p. 345

- <sup>420</sup> The economic crisis of 1866 involved mainly Britain, France and the USA. It was preceded by the US Civil War which caused the notorious "cotton famine". The latter proved extremely advantageous for big manufacturers and ruinous for hundreds of small factory owners.

The 1866 crisis chiefly affected finances. At the same time the mining and iron and steel industries reduced production, railway construction was curtailed and so on. p. 345

- 421 This refers to the abrogation of the 1791 Le Chapelier law prohibiting workers' coalitions and strikes (France, 1864) and to the lifting of the ban on workers' coalitions (Belgium, 1867). p. 345
- 422 On the strike of weavers and spinners in Roubaix and of bronze-workers in Paris, see Note 14. p. 347
- 423 This appraisal of the Geneva strike was given by Marx—see “The Fourth Annual Report of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association” (see this volume, p. 16) and the “Report of the General Council to the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association” (this volume, pp. 71-72). p. 349
- 424 This description of the situation in Belgium was written by Marx—see “The Belgian Massacres” (this volume, p. 47). p. 353
- 425 This appeal was drawn up by Eccarius on the instructions of the General Council (meeting of February 26, 1867) and published in *The International Courier*, No. 8, March 13, 1867. p. 357
- 426 See Note 71. p. 359
- 427 See Note 18. p. 360
- 428 The *Secessionists* advocated the withdrawal of the Southern States from the USA before and during the Civil War of 1861-65. In 1861 the slave-holders staged a rebellion and proclaimed the establishment of the Confederate States of America. p. 361
- 429 The reference is to the Austro-Prussian war of 1866. See Note 133. p. 362
- 430 See Note 278. p. 363
- 431 See Note 17. p. 363
- 432 See Note 13. p. 364
- 433 Eichhoff's description of the incident on the French frontier, and the events associated with the seizure of the Memorial of the French delegation (see pp. 365-66) draws on Marx's material, contained in “The Fourth Annual Report of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association” (this volume, pp. 12-14). p. 364
- 434 See Note 16. p. 366
- 435 The text to the end of this section (see pp. 365-74) is based on the book *Procès de l'Association Internationale de Travailleurs. Bureau de Paris* (Paris, 1868) and consists either of an abridged rendering of the text or direct quotations. On interrogation of Tolain see also pp. 12-15 of this book. p. 366
- 436 A reference to the conflict between the ruling circles of Prussia and France over their claims to the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg early in 1867. It was accompanied by military preparations and brash militarist propaganda in both states and marked a stage in the preparations for the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71.

On October 17, 1867 Liebknecht criticised, in a speech to the North-German Reichstag, Bismarck's policy on the Luxembourg question. At the General Council meeting of October 22, Marx read some extracts from it. The speech was included in the report of this Council meeting published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 315, October 26, 1867. Marx attached great importance to it and

- instructed Lafargue to translate it into French and send it to France for publication in *Le Courrier français*. p. 368
- <sup>437</sup> See Note 167. p. 371
- <sup>438</sup> On December 2, 1852 Louis Napoleon Bonaparte was proclaimed Emperor of France under the name of Napoleon III, and this led to the fall of the Second Republic. The coup d'état which resulted in the establishment of Louis Napoleon's dictatorship, had taken place a year earlier, on December 2, 1851. p. 374
- <sup>439</sup> See Note 5. p. 375
- <sup>440</sup> See Note 4. p. 376
- <sup>441</sup> See Note 26. p. 377
- <sup>442</sup> *Grütli Union* (Grütli-Verein)—a Swiss reformist organisation founded in 1838 as an educational association of artisans and workers. Its name emphasised its Swiss national character: according to a legend, representatives of three Swiss cantons met in 1307 in the Grütli (Rutli) meadow and concluded an alliance on a joint struggle against Austrian rule. p. 378
- <sup>443</sup> See Note 21. p. 378
- <sup>444</sup> The movement for the eight-hour working day began in the USA in the 1840s and 1850s.  
 In the 1860s the movement acquired a mass character, with leagues of struggle for an eight-hour working day and trade unions taking part. The National Labour Union (see Note 26) was also active in it.  
 Under pressure from the mass movement a law on an eight-hour working day was passed in several states by Congress (see Note 27). However, in practice it was either not carried out or was violated by the employers. The National Labour Union called on the trade unions to resist the employers. p. 380
- <sup>445</sup> In the Minutes of the General Council meeting of July 21, 1868, Marx's speech is given as follows: "Citizen Marx. Germany. The General Working Men's Union is going to do in a round-about way what the Prussian law prohibits to be done directly. There is another working men's union in the Southern and Eastern States of Germany which has some affiliations in Switzerland; they also are going to join. A new paper, *Le Réveil*, published by Ledru-Rollin's party, makes favourable comments upon the International Association" (see *The General Council of the First International. 1866-1868*, Moscow, 1964, p. 228).  
 In this volume the record of Marx's speech is reproduced from a more detailed report of this Council meeting in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 353, July 25, 1868). p. 381
- <sup>446</sup> Marx refers to the Union of German Workers' Associations headed by August Bebel (see Note 24). In his letter of July 17, 1868, Wilhelm Liebknecht gave Marx details of the preparations for a general congress of the Union and of his and Bebel's intention to raise there the question of affiliating to the International. p. 381
- <sup>447</sup> Marx delivered his speech on the consequences of using machinery under capitalism at a meeting of the General Council on July 28, 1868 when the agenda of the Brussels Congress were discussed (see Note 8).  
 This record of Marx's speech was taken down by the General Council's

Secretary Eccarius and has been preserved in the Minute Book of the General Council in the form of clipping from *The Bee-Hive*, No. 354, August 1, 1868.

p. 382

<sup>448</sup> See Note 403.

p. 382

<sup>449</sup> This refers to the growing poverty in London, particularly in the East End, after the 1866 crisis. It was also mentioned at the General Council meeting of August 11, 1868, during the debate on the reduction of the working day.

p. 384

<sup>450</sup> This appeal was written by Friedrich Lessner in connection with the Brussels Congress of the International to be held in September 1868 and was sent to Marx for review. When returning it to Lessner, Marx wrote on August 11, 1868: "Because of spelling mistakes I have entirely rewritten the enclosed appeal" (see present edition, Vol. 43).

Marx's extant manuscript is identical with the text of the appeal as published in the London newspaper *Hermann*, No. 502, August 15, 1868.

p. 385

<sup>451</sup> Marx delivered this speech at the General Council meeting of August 11, 1868, during the debate on the reduction of the working day, the point included in the Brussels Congress agenda.

The record of this speech has survived in the Minute Book of the General Council in the form of a clipping pasted in from *The Bee-Hive*, No. 358, August 22, 1868 with corrections by the Secretary, Eccarius.

p. 387

<sup>452</sup> Here the record mistakenly mentions Eccarius. It was Milner, who, in opposition to Eccarius, asserted that the reduction of working hours, though desirable, would mean lower production.

p. 387

<sup>453</sup> Marx refers to Eccarius' substantiation of the harmful effect of the lengthy working day on the workers' health which he made at the General Council meeting.

p. 387

<sup>454</sup> Marx made this speech at the General Council meeting of January 5, 1869 on behalf of the Standing Committee which, at its meeting on January 2 discussed a letter from the Rouen Section requesting help for the locked-out Rouen workers, and put up this question for discussion by the General Council. After Marx's speech, the General Council adopted a resolution, which voiced its protest at the French manufacturers' actions and called on the English workers to give assistance to the Rouen workers.

This record by Jung has been preserved in the Minute Book of the General Council. The speech was also summarised briefly in the *Bee-Hive* (No. 379, January 16, 1869) report of the General Council meeting.

The full text of Marx's speech was first published in English in *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966.

p. 388

<sup>455</sup> At the General Council meeting of February 23, 1869 Marx set forth in detail the "Report on the Miners' Guilds in the Coalfields of Saxony" written by Engels in German (see this volume, pp. 39-44). A record of Marx's speech has been preserved in the Minute Book of the General Council. The newspaper report of it published in this volume is more complete and precise.

p. 389

<sup>456</sup> The agenda of the Basle Congress of the International was approved by the General Council on June 22, 1869. As far back as February 16, the Council instructed the corresponding secretaries to write to all the Continental sections and ask them which additional subjects they would like to be brought before

the congress apart from the three questions already put on the agenda by decision of the previous congress, namely Land, Credit and Education. As a result, two more items were included in the final text of the agenda: "The right to inheritance" introduced by the Geneva Alliance of Socialist Democracy and "The influence of trades unions upon the emancipation of the working class" (introduced by the Paris bronze-workers).

The agenda of the Basle Congress was discussed in the General Council of July 29 and July 6, 13 and 20, 1869.

It was published by the General Council as a leaflet, *Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association*, London, 1869, and was also printed in a number of English newspapers and in French in *L'Égalité*, No. 24, July 3, 1869. p. 391

- 457 Marx spoke twice on landed property during the discussion of the Basle Congress programme at the General Council meeting of July 6, 1869 (see this volume, p. 391). Although the Brussels Congress of 1868 had adopted a resolution by a majority vote in favour of common property, this question was again put on the agenda of the Basle Congress on the insistence of a minor group of advocates of small private property in land headed by Proudhonist Tolain.

In his first speech Marx replied to the General Council member Milner who had spoken in defence of the natural right of man to land when trying to substantiate the Brussels Congress resolution on land.

In his second speech Marx opposed the French anarchist Elisée Reclus who was present at the meeting as a guest and who declared that since the peasants did not attend the International congresses they should not be cared for.

By a majority vote the General Council confirmed the correctness of the resolution on landed property adopted by the Brussels Congress.

Marx's speeches have been preserved in the Minute Book as written down by Eccarius. They were also published in brief in the *Bee-Hive* (No. 404, July 10, 1869) report of the General Council meeting of July 6, 1869.

In English they were first published in full in *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966. p. 392

- 458 The Committee, elected at the Brussels Congress to prepare a study of landed property, presented two reports to the congress on the agrarian question: one by Emile Aubry (Rouen Section) and the other by César De Paepe (Brussels Section). The Committee informed the congress that they were all unanimous on the socialisation of mines, collieries, canals, railways etc., but disagreed over arable land. The majority, headed by De Paepe, a Belgian delegate, moved a resolution in favour of common property in all land. It was adopted by the congress, while the minority headed by Tolain, a Proudhonist, defended the ownership by peasants of small private property in land. p. 393

- 459 Marx spoke on the right to inheritance at the General Council meeting of July 20, 1869, during the debate of the programme of the Basle Congress (see this volume, p. 391). The record of his speech in Eccarius' hand has been preserved in the Minute Book of the General Council.

There is also a brief summary in *The Bee-Hive* (No. 406, July 24, 1869) in the report of this Council meeting.

The full text of Marx's speech on the right to inheritance was first published in English in *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966. p. 394

- <sup>460</sup> A mistake in Eccarius' entry: the reference is here to Saint-Simon's followers, not to Saint-Simon, who died in 1825 (see Note 94). p. 395
- <sup>461</sup> Marx delivered a speech on general education at the General Council meeting of August 10, 1869 during the debate on the Basle Congress programme (see this volume, p. 391), and a concluding speech on August 17. Both speeches have been preserved in the Minute Book of the General Council in Eccarius' hand. A brief account of the first speech is included in the report of the General Council meeting of August 10 printed in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 409, August 14, 1869; a brief account of the concluding speech was published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 410, August 21, 1869.  
A brief account of Marx's speeches in German translation from *The Bee-Hive* was given in the article "Die Internationale und die Schule", *Die Neue Zeit*, No. 52, Jg. 12, Bd. 2, 1893-1894. p. 398
- <sup>462</sup> The question of general education was discussed at the previous congresses of the International Association—in Geneva (1866), Lausanne (1867) and Brussels (1868). p. 398
- <sup>463</sup> Harriet Law's proposition moved at the General Council meeting of August 17, 1869 meant the transfer of the Church's property and income to schools. p. 399
- <sup>464</sup> George Milner proposed at the Council meetings of August 10 and 17, 1869 that the children should be taught bourgeois political economy, which was unacceptable from the proletarian viewpoint and in practice would only increase the ideological influence of the ruling bourgeoisie on the rising generation. Milner particularly stressed the need to give the pupils an idea of the "value of labour" and distribution. He referred, in particular, to the American Utopian Socialist Warren who preached the theory of "just exchange". p. 399
- <sup>465</sup> Marx mentioned the abolition of the standing army because during the debate at the General Council meetings, Eccarius and Reclus proposed increasing funds for general education by abolishing expenditures on standing armies. p. 400
- <sup>466</sup> This address is in fact the programme of the Land and Labour League founded in October 1869 (see Note 121). It was drawn up by Eccarius who was on the commission preparing it, and edited by Marx, and this found expression in the League's programme. p. 401
- <sup>467</sup> In agitating for the repeal of the Corn Laws, the advocates of the Anti-Corn Law League endeavoured to prove to the workers that with the introduction of Free Trade their real wages would rise and their loaf of bread would be twice as large. Life proved these promises to be utterly false. The industrial capital of Britain, which became stronger after the repeal of the Corn Laws (see Note 219), intensified its onslaught on the vital interests of the working class. p. 401
- <sup>468</sup> This category of taxpayers included people deriving their income from trade and those of the free professions. p. 402
- <sup>469</sup> A reference to the workhouses, where all needy people were sent after the passing of the Poor Law of 1834. This law abolished relief for all the poor, who had until then lived in parishes. Because of the prison regime in the workhouses, people called them "Bastilles for the poor". p. 403

<sup>470</sup> At the General Council meeting on November 9, 1869 Marx proposed the discussion of the following questions: the attitude of the British Government towards the Irish prisoners and the position of the English working class in the Irish question.

On November 16 Marx opened the discussion and moved a resolution on this question (see this volume, p. 83). Stormy debates followed, particularly on November 23, when Motterhead, an Englishman, opposed Marx's resolution and tried to justify Gladstone's colonial policy in Ireland; Motterhead was supported by Odger, another English member of the General Council. Two other speeches (on November 23 and 30) were made by Marx in reply to them (see the next article in this volume). Marx described in detail the discussion on November 23 in his letter to Engels on November 26 (see present edition, Vol. 43).

In the Minute Book of the General Council Marx's speeches on November 16, 23 and 30 are recorded by Eccarius.

The report of the General Council meeting of November 16 was published in *Reynolds's Newspaper*, No. 1006, November 21 and *The National Reformer*, November 28, 1869; the report of the November 23 meeting—in *Reynolds's Newspaper*, No. 1007, November 28 and *The National Reformer*, December 5, 1869. However, these reports were brief and inaccurate. The full text of Marx's three speeches was first published in English in *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966.

In German a brief account of Marx's first speech (November 16) was published in *Der Volksstaat*, No. 21, December 11, and in French in *L'Égalité*, No. 48, December 18, 1869.

When preparing his speeches Marx made wide use of material from the Irish press, in particular in *The Irishman*. Their contents have much in common with Marx's later articles on the subject written for *L'Internationale* (see this volume, pp. 101-07), and with the articles of Jenny Marx, his daughter, for *La Marseillaise* (see this volume, pp. 414-41).  
p. 407

<sup>471</sup> See Note 2.  
p. 407

<sup>472</sup> The amnesty was granted to the participants in the Hungarian national liberation movement following the re-organisation of the Austrian Empire into Austria-Hungary in 1867. This amnesty was the result of Austria's defeat in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 and the growth of national contradictions within the multinational Austrian state.  
p. 407

<sup>473</sup> See Note 117.  
p. 407

<sup>474</sup> A reference to Gladstone's negative reply to the petitions for an amnesty for Irish prisoners adopted at mass meetings in Ireland, including the one in Limerick on August 1, 1869. Gladstone endeavoured to justify his refusal in his letters to O'Shea and Butt (see Note 115), which were published in *The Times* on October 23 and 27, 1869. Marx criticised the motives given by Gladstone in these letters (see this volume, p. 83).  
p. 408

<sup>475</sup> This expression was current in the Irish workers' press of the time and meant England's 700-years oppression of Ireland (see *The Irishman*, Nos. 13 and 20, September 25 and November 13, 1869).  
p. 408

<sup>476</sup> An article in the *New-York Irish People*, a newspaper of Irish emigrants published in the USA, said that Gladstone's refusal to grant an amnesty to the participants in the Fenian movement, was only furthering the movement (this remark was quoted by *The Irishman* in its issue of November 13, 1869). The likening of Gladstone to the Head Centre of the plot is tinged with irony, since this

- was the title of the leader of the Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood, the secret Fenian organisation. p. 409
- <sup>477</sup> See Note 116. p. 409
- <sup>478</sup> On *dissenters* see Note 295.  
 Before the elections, Gladstone, the leader of the Liberal Party, made many promises to settle the Irish question in the hope of winning votes among the new categories of voters (see Note 117). Even before the election campaign got under way, he proposed the separation of the Anglican Church from the state in Ireland, thereby depriving it of state support and subsidies. He expected that this would win him popularity with the Irish Catholic voters. After winning the elections and assuming office at the end of 1868, Gladstone passed a bill through Parliament in March 1869 which placed the Anglican Church in Ireland on an equal footing with the Catholic Church. Gladstone and the Liberals hoped that their policy of moderate reform would weaken the revolutionary movement in Ireland. p. 409
- <sup>479</sup> In 1840, a single Parliament was set up in England's Canadian possessions. The 1867 Act transformed them into the self-governing Canadian Confederation and granted it Dominion status. p. 410
- <sup>480</sup> On October 30, 1869, *The Irishman* carried a report which said that in his letter to the Dublin branch of the Ancient Order of Foresters (a Friendly Society founded in England as early as 1745 as a society of royal foresters which adopted its name in 1834 and which campaigned for an amnesty on behalf of the Irish prisoners), Gladstone had neglected his pre-election promises to improve Ireland's position. p. 410
- <sup>481</sup> See Note 141. p. 410
- <sup>482</sup> Marx had in mind *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register*. In it William Cobbett and other English radicals sharply criticised the policy of the English Government, notably its police measures in Ireland. p. 411
- <sup>483</sup> The British authorities brutally put down the Irish national liberation movement in 1798 (see Note 229). Marx compares this act with those during the revolution of 1849 in Hungary. p. 411
- <sup>484</sup> In the Minutes of this meeting published in *Reynolds's Newspaper*, November 28, 1869, the concluding sentence of Marx's speech is given as follows: "The question was which was most important—to conciliate the Irish or make this resolution acceptable to Mr. Gladstone." p. 412
- <sup>485</sup> On November 23, 1869, during the debate of the draft resolution of the General Council of the International on the English Government's policy towards the Irish prisoners, Odger, a trade union leader, proposed to delete the word "deliberately" from the sentence "Mr. Gladstone deliberately insults the Irish nation". At the next meeting on November 30, 1869, he made new attempts to subdue the revolutionary and anti-government tone of the resolution. p. 412
- <sup>486</sup> In contrast to Marx, who sought to expose the colonialist policy of the English Government, Odger demanded that the expressions used by Marx in the draft resolution on Gladstone's policy should be toned down. Otherwise, as Odger explained, the Council would fail to secure the release of the prisoners. He reminded the Council members that, in his replies to the petitions, Gladstone had expressed dissatisfaction with the sharp tone of some of them. Odger justified and defended Gladstone's policy. This was an attempt by reformist trade union leaders



- to reduce the resolution, a document exposing English policy and expressing solidarity with the fighters for Ireland's independence, to a humble appeal to the ruling classes for clemency. p. 412
- <sup>487</sup> Marx meant the second item in his draft for the debate on the Irish question—the attitude of the English working class. Marx explained the General Council's stand on this question in "Confidential Communication" (see this volume, pp. 119-21) and in his letters to Ludwig Kugelmann on November 29, to Engels on December 10, 1869, to Paul and Laura Lafargue on March 5, and to Sigfrid Meyer and August Vogt on April 9, 1870 (see present edition, Vol. 43). p. 413
- <sup>488</sup> These eight articles by Marx's daughter Jenny were written for the French republican newspaper *La Marseillaise* and dealt with the problems raised in Marx's article "The English Government and the Fenian Prisoners" (see this volume, pp. 101-07). The third article was written together with Marx (see his letter to Engels of March 19, 1870, present edition, Vol. 43). All articles, except the second, were signed: J. Williams (see Marx's letter to Engels of March 5 and Engels' letter to Marx of March 7, 1870, present edition, Vol. 43). Jenny Marx's authorship is confirmed by Marx's letter to Engels of March 10. These articles received a widespread response. The sixth article was also published in English in *The Irishman*, No. 45, May 7, 1870 under the heading "Agrarian Crime in Ireland (Translated from the *Marseillaise*)". Passages from Jenny's fifth article were quoted in the article "The Irishman in Paris" in *The Irishman*, No. 40, April 2, 1870.  
In English, these articles were first published in full in Marx and Engels, *Ireland and the Irish Question*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971. p. 414
- <sup>489</sup> On February 8, 1870 the French police arrested Henry Rochefort, the editor-in-chief of *La Marseillaise*, for an article published after the assassination of the newspaper's journalist, Victor Noir, by Prince Pierre Bonaparte. The arrest intensified the opposition movement and resulted in mass affiliation to the International Working Men's Association. p. 414
- <sup>490</sup> In the small hours of September 16, 1865, the Dublin police raided the premises of *The Irish People*, confiscated its property and imprisoned almost all its editors. Mass arrests of Fenians took place in Dublin and, later, in Cork. p. 416
- <sup>491</sup> *La Marseillaise* supplied this article by Jenny Marx with a short introduction signed *A. De Fonvielle, temporarily at liberty*. It deals with O'Donovan Rossa's activity and the reasons for his persecution by the government. De Fonvielle welcomes Rossa's election to the Irish Parliament. p. 417
- <sup>492</sup> See notes 341 and 301. p. 419
- <sup>493</sup> The demonstration demanding an amnesty for the Fenians detained in English prisons was held in Hyde Park on October 24, 1869 (see also Note 115). p. 424
- <sup>494</sup> An article written by Henry Bruce, Home Secretary in the Liberal Government and published anonymously in *The Times*, No. 26699 of March 16, 1870, attempted to deny the facts adduced by O'Donovan Rossa. p. 424
- <sup>495</sup> Moore's speech in the House of Commons and Gladstone's reply there on March 17, 1870 were published in *The Times*, No. 26701, March 18, 1870. p. 426
- <sup>496</sup> On December 13, 1867, a group of Fenians set off an explosion in London's Clerkenwell Prison in an abortive attempt to free the goaled Fenian leaders.

The explosion destroyed several neighbouring houses, killing several people and wounding 120. This was used by the bourgeois press to incite chauvinistic anti-Irish feelings among the English population. p. 426

<sup>497</sup> Jenny Marx refers here to announcement in *The Irishman* on March 12, 1868 of the publication of a Blue Book: *Report of Commission on the Treatment of certain Treason-Felony Convicts in English Prison, who have been transferred thereto at the request of the Irish Government*, 1867. p. 426

<sup>498</sup> In December 1868, when the election campaign was in full swing, Gladstone and the Liberals sharply criticised in the House of Commons the Conservative Government's policy in Ireland, especially the reprisals against the Fenians. The Liberals compared the actions of the Conservatives with the subjugation of England by William the Conqueror in the eleventh century.

The Fenian insurrection was prepared by the Fenian Irish Revolutionary (republican) Brotherhood early in 1867 with the aim of winning independence for Ireland. It was to begin on March 5. The organisers planned to form several mobile columns of insurgents who were to conduct guerrilla warfare from bases in woods and mountainous areas. However, weak military leadership and the fact that the authorities got to know of the insurgents' intentions prevented the plan from being brought to fruition. Armed revolts broke out only in some eastern and southern counties. The insurgents seized several police barracks and stations and for a short time gained control of the town of Killmalock (County Limerick). There were clashes with the police in the suburbs of Dublin and Cork. The insurrection failed because of the conspiratorial tactics of the Fenians and their weak ties with the masses. Half of the 169 participants in the insurrection who had been arrested and brought to trial were sentenced to hard labour. p. 426

<sup>499</sup> The reference is to the *Coercion Bill* submitted by Gladstone to the House of Commons on March 17, 1870. Aimed at the national liberation movement, the Bill provided for the suspension of constitutional guarantees in Ireland and the introduction of extraordinary powers for the English authorities in the struggle against Irish revolutionaries. The Bill was passed by Parliament.

On the *Land Bill* see Note 144.

p. 428

<sup>500</sup> *Dahomey*, a state in Africa, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was notorious for its despotic regime, maintained by espionage and denunciation. p. 430

<sup>501</sup> Lawyer Laurier made this speech on March 25, 1870, at the trial of Prince Pierre Bonaparte, who was accused of assassinating the journalist Victor Noir. The speech was published in the French newspaper *La Marseillaise*, No. 97, March 27, 1870. p. 438

<sup>502</sup> Eccarius wrote this letter on the instructions of the General Council after it discussed, on April 19, 1870, Hume's letter and the memorial in which he suggested that special representatives should be appointed for various nationalities in different countries. The Minutes of the General Council meeting for April 19 contain the following resume of Marx's speech on the subject: "Citizen Marx disagreed with the memorial as the different nationalities were represented on the Council and the rest must be left to the correspondents of the Association. The letter pointed out that the trade union movement tended to assume the form of secret societies in the United States. This was confirmed by a letter from the German correspondent of New York who appealed to the Council to interfere by trying to dissuade Hume and

Jessup from taking part in it." The Council decided that the Secretary should solicit further information on the question (see *The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1966, p. 226).

Eccarius' letter has been preserved in the form of a clipping from an American newspaper (presumably *The Democrat*) pasted into the Minute Book of the General Council, in the Minutes for May 24, 1870. p. 442

<sup>503</sup> In March 1870, Cluseret was appointed the General Council's agent for establishing contacts with the French sections in the USA. However, passing himself off as an organiser of the International, Cluseret ignored the already existing sections in the USA and exceeded his powers. Soon, certain sections of the International in the USA censured his behaviour and approached the General Council, Johann Philipp Becker and Eugene Varlin with an inquiry concerning the powers granted to Cluseret. Marx replied to the inquiry in his letter to Sigfrid Meyer and August Vogt of April 9, 1870 and mentioned the matter in a letter to Sorge dated September 1, 1870 (see present edition, Vol. 43). p. 442

<sup>504</sup> Marx spoke about *The Bee-Hive* at the General Council meeting of April 26, 1870, to substantiate his resolution on it (see this volume, p. 126). p. 444

<sup>505</sup> *The Bee-Hive's* policy of compromise became particularly manifest in its attitude towards the Irish national liberation movement. The newspaper openly supported Gladstone's Government in this question, having refused to print the General Council's resolution in defence of the Fenians. On November 1, 1869 Engels wrote to Marx: "I've never seen such a filthy issue as yesterday's. This cringing before Gladstone and the whole bourgeois-patronising-philanthropic tone should soon break the neck of that paper and make it necessary to have a real workers' paper" (see present edition, Vol. 43). p. 444

<sup>506</sup> See Note 499. p. 444

<sup>507</sup> The content of Marx's letter to the Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party of June 27, 1870 was given by the President of the court proceedings at the Leipzig trial (1872) of Wilhelm Liebknecht, August Bebel and Adolph Hepner, all three accused of high treason. It was presented as incriminating evidence at the trial of the Brunswick Committee of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party in 1871.

The text is published here from *Leipziger Hochverrathsprozess...*, Leipzig 1872 which was reprinted in 1874 and 1894. The latter edition was prepared by Wilhelm Liebknecht on the instructions of the Committee of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party. According to the President of the Leipzig court the letter was signed: "In the name of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, *Karl Marx*, Secretary for Germany." p. 445

<sup>508</sup> See Note 172. p. 445

<sup>509</sup> Marx delivered this speech in the General Council on June 28, 1870 to substantiate his resolution on the subject (see this volume, p. 136). The speech was recorded by Eccarius. p. 446

<sup>510</sup> The reference is to the congress of the Romance Federation held at La Chau-de-Fonds from April 4 to 6, 1870 (see Note 175). The Alliance of Socialist Democracy made vigorous preparations for the congress and, as a result of various manoeuvres, managed to send 21 delegates representing 13 minor and often fictitious sections (about 700 members), while the Federal Council failed to secure full representation of all its sections and had only 19 delegates from 23 sections (about 1,500 members). p. 446

## NAME INDEX

## A

- Abercorn, James Hamilton, Duke of* (1811-1885)—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1866-68, 1874-76).—192, 202, 206
- Abercromby, Ralph* (1734-1801)—English general, Commander-in-Chief in Ireland (1797).—257, 281
- Abingdon*—see *Bertie, Willoughby, Earl Abingdon*
- Adam of Bremen* (d. after 1081)—medieval chronicler, author of *Gesta Hammaburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum*.—184
- Addington, Henry, Viscount Sidmouth* (1757-1844)—British statesman, Tory, Prime Minister (1801-04).—266
- Adrian IV (Nicholas Breakspear)* (before 1100-1159)—Pope (1154-59), Englishman by birth.—195, 285
- Albinus* (4th cent.)—Irish Christian missionary.—177
- Albinus* (second half of the 8th cent.)—Irish monk, invited by Charles the Great to teach in Pavia.—178
- Alexander II* (1818-1881)—Emperor of Russia (1855-81).—8
- Alexander of Macedon (Alexander the Great)* (356-323 B.C.)—soldier and statesman of Ancient Greece.—169
- Alexeyev*—see *Bartenev, Viktor Ivanovich*
- Alexeyeva*—see *Barteneva, Yekaterina Grigoryevna*
- Alfred the Great* (849-901)—King of the West Saxons (871-901), promoted enlightenment.—177
- Allement, Louis*—210
- Allen, William Philip* (1848-1867)—Irish Fenian, sentenced to death by an English court and executed.—3, 13
- Ammianus Marcellinus* (c. 330-c. 400)—Roman historian.—177
- Anne* (1665-1714)—Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1702-14).—192, 196, 317
- Annesley, John, Baron Mountnorris*—member of the Irish Parliament (1799).—262
- Anonymus Ravennatis*—geographer in Ravenna, author of *De Geographiæ*.—177
- Anselm of Canterbury* (c. 1033-1109)—theologian, representative of early scholasticism.—179
- 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.—26, 38, 51, 54, 82
- Ardin, Antoine* (d. after 1898)—Swiss worker; Chairman of the Coach-makers' and Smiths' Society affiliated to the International.—210
- B
- Bacon, Francis, Baron Verulam, Viscount St. Albans* (1561-1626)—English philosopher, naturalist and historian, Lord Privy Seal and Lord Chancellor of England.—287
- Bagenal, Beauchamp*—member of the Irish Parliament for the County Carlow (1782).—229, 274
- Bakunin, Mikhail Alexandrovich* (1814-1876)—Russian revolutionary and journalist, participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; later an ideologist of Narodism and anarchism; opposed Marxism in the First International.—112-16, 125-26, 209, 445
- Bakunina, Antonina Ksaveryevna* (née *Kvyatkovskaya*) (c. 1840-1887)—Mikhail Bakunin's wife.—210
- Ball, Thomas*—Irish lawyer.—266
- Baquet, Joseph*—210
- Bara, Jules* (1835-1900)—Belgian statesman, Liberal, Minister of Justice (1865-70, 1878-84).—14, 15, 50, 320, 375-76
- Barrett, Michael* (d. 1868)—Irish Fenian, sentenced to death by English authorities.—432
- Barrington, Sir Johan* (1760-1834)—lawyer, Protestant, member of the Irish Parliament (1790-97, 1798-1800), opposed the Anglo-Irish Union.—266, 290
- Barry, Catherine*—Richard Burke's sister.—422
- Bartenev, Viktor Ivanovich* (1838-1918)—Russian army officer, emigrated to Switzerland; in 1869 broke with the Bakuninists; member of the Russian Section Committee of the International in Geneva, vigorously opposed the Bakuninist splitting activities after 1869.—210
- Barteneva, Yekaterina Grigoryevna* (1843-1914)—Russian revolutionary and journalist; took part in founding the Russian Section of the First International; actively opposed the Bakuninist splitting activities after 1869; Viktor Bartenev's wife.—210
- Bauer, Edgar* (1820-1886)—German philosopher and journalist; Young Hegelian; emigrated to England after the 1848-49 revolution; editor of the London *Neue Zeit* (1859); Prussian official after the 1861 amnesty.—27
- Beaufort, Daniel Augustus* (1739-1821)—Irish geographer and clergyman of French origin.—157
- Bebel, August* (1840-1913)—a leading figure in the international and German working-class movement; turner; President of the Union of German Workers' Associations from 1867; member of the First International; deputy to the Reichstag from 1867; one of the founders and leaders of German Social-Democracy; fought Lassalleanism; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—32
- 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).—24
- Becker, Ernest* (d. after 1898)—210

- 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 German sections of the International in Switzerland; delegate to the London Conference (1865) and all the congresses of the International; editor of *Der Vorbote* (1866-71); in October 1868 became a member of the provisional committee of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, but, influenced by Marx and Engels, soon broke with the Bakuninists; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—90, 114, 122, 209, 336, 348-49, 378
- Bede (Beda or Baeda) the Venerable* (c. 673-735)—Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastic, scholar and historian.—177
- Bédeau, J.*—210
- Bedell, William* (1571-1642)—Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh in Ireland.—302
- Bel, André* (d. after 1898)—Swiss worker, joiner; Secretary of the Joiners' Society in Geneva.—210
- Bellingham, Edward* (d. 1549)—Lord Deputy of Ireland from 1548.—297
- Belvidere*—Irish Lord.—263
- Benignus* (d. 468)—Irish priest; according to tradition, a compiler of *Senchus Mor*, a collection of ancient laws.—171
- Beresford, John* (1738-1805)—Irish statesman; supporter of the Anglo-Irish Union, M. P., Pitt's adviser on Irish policy.—251
- Beresfords*—aristocratic family in Ireland, Protestants.—252
- Bernard, Marie*—Belgian house-painter; member of the General Council of the International (September 1868-69); Corresponding Secretary for Belgium (September 1868-November 1869).—37, 51, 55
- Bernard of Clairvaux (Bernard, Saint)* (c. 1091-1153)—French theologian, fanatical champion of Catholicism.—172, 285, 308, 311
- Bertel*—Mayor of Sotteville-lès-Rouen and one of the biggest manufacturers there.—388
- Bertie, Willoughby, Earl Abingdon* (1740-1799)—Speaker in the House of Lords (1775-99), Whig supporter.—232, 275
- Bervi, Vasily Vasilyevich* (pseudonym *N. Flerovsky*) (1829-1918)—Russian economist and sociologist, enlightener and democrat, Narodnik utopian socialist; author of *The Condition of the Working Class in Russia*.—110-11
- Besson, Alexandre*—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; follower of Félix Pyat.—4
- Biscamp (Biskamp), Elard*—German democrat, journalist; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; emigrated after its defeat; member of the editorial board of *Das Volk*, the newspaper of the German refugees in London published with Marx's active participation.—27
- Bismark (or 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 counterrevolutionary means.—21, 75, 134-35
- Blackburn, Colin, Baron Blackburn* (1813-1896)—British judge, presided at the trial of the Manchester Fenians (October 1867) and took part in the

- trial of the former Jamaica Governor Edward John Eyre (June 1868).—362
- Blackburne, Francis* (1782-1867)—Irish lawyer and statesman, held high posts in English judiciary in Ireland.—200
- Blackwood*—see *Dufferin and Ava, Frederick Temple Hamilton-Temple-Blackwood*
- Blake, J. A.*—British politician, Liberal M.P.—431
- Blanc, André*—member of the Lyons Section of the International.—108
- Blanchard, D.A.* (d. 1869)—owner of a printing house in Geneva, member of the International.—210
- Blount, Charles, Lord Mountjoy, Earl of Devonshire* (1563-1606)—Lord Deputy of Ireland from 1599; directed the suppression of Tyrone's uprising against the English.—257, 281, 298
- Boate* (or *Botius*), *Gerard* (1604-1650)—English physician of Dutch origin; author of *Ireland's Natural History*.—162
- Bofféty, François* (d. after 1898)—Swiss worker, joiner.—210
- Bohn, Henry George* (1796-1884)—English publisher.—173
- Boileau - Despréaux, Nicolas* (1636-1711)—French poet and theoretician of Classicism.—426
- Bond, Oliver* (c. 1760-1798)—member of the United Irishmen Society in Dublin, Republican.—255, 281
- Boon, Martin James*—British worker, mechanic; active in the British working-class movement, member of the General Council of the International (1869-72), Secretary of the Land and Labour League, member of the British Federal Council (1872).—54, 406
- Borlase (Borlace), Edmund* (d. 1682)—British historian and physician; son of Sir John Borlase; wrote a book on the history of the Irish uprising of 1641-52.—302
- Borlase, Sir John* (1576-1648)—British army officer; Lord Justice of Ireland (1640-44); governed Ireland with William Parsons in absence of Lord Deputy.—302
- Borret, Étienne*—210
- Boudet, Paul* (b. 1800)—French Minister of the Interior (1863-65).—364, 368
- Bourdon, Antoine Marie* (b. 1842)—French worker, engraver; active participant in the French working-class movement; delegate to and secretary of the Geneva Congress (1866); member of the Paris Committee of the International.—13, 365
- Brechtel, Carl* (d. after 1898)—member of the Geneva Central Committee of the German-speaking sections in Switzerland (from 1866); member of the Geneva Section of the International named Alliance of Socialist Democracy (January-March 1870).—210
- Brewer, John Sherren* (1810-1879)—English historian and philologist, professor of King's College, London.—173
- Brian Borumha* (926-1014)—King of Ireland (1001-14) who routed the Norsemen at the battle of Clontarf (1014).—140, 181-84
- Bright, John* (1811-1889)—British manufacturer and politician, a Free Trade leader and founder of the Anti-Corn Law League; leader of the Left wing of the Liberal Party from the early 1860s; held several ministerial posts.—97, 103, 343, 407, 409, 430
- Bristol*—see *Hervey, Frederick, Earl of Bristol*
- Broadstreet, Samuel*—member of the Irish Parliament (1782).—228
- Brodhir (Brodir or Brodar)* (d. 1014)—Norse Viking, killed Irish King Brian Borumha at the battle of Clontarf (1014).—181-84

- Brown, John* (1800-1859)—American farmer; a prominent leader of the revolutionary wing of the abolitionist movement; took an active part in the armed struggle against the slave-owners in Kansas (1854-56); attempted to organise a revolt of Negro slaves in Virginia in 1859; was tried and executed.—189
- Brownlow*—member of the Irish Parliament (1785).—227, 237, 277
- Bruce, Henry Austin, 1st Baron Aberdare* (1815-1895)—British Liberal statesman, Home Secretary (1868-73).—81, 103, 104, 408, 421-22, 426-28, 430-32, 438
- Buckingham*—see *Grenville, George Nugent-Temple, 1st Marquis of Buckingham*
- Buckley, James*—British trade unionist; member of the General Council of the International (November 1864-69) and of the Reform League.—26, 54
- Burgh, Walter Hussey* (1742-1783)—Irish statesman, Whig, lawyer; member of the Irish Parliament; Free Trader.—222, 271
- Burke, Richard* (d. 1870)—Irish Fenian, officer in the North-American Army; an organiser of the 1867 uprising in Ireland; arrested in 1867, died in prison.—102, 416, 421, 425-26, 430-32
- Burke, Thomas F.* (b. 1840)—Irish Fenian, General of the Southern Army in the US Civil War; an organiser of the 1867 uprising in Ireland; sentenced to life imprisonment in April 1867.—103
- Burke, Thomas Henry* (1829-1882)—British statesman, permanent Irish Under-Secretary from 1869.—408
- Burnet, Gilbert* (1643-1715)—English bishop and historian.—302
- Bush, Charles Kendal* (1767-1843)—Lord Chief Justice; member of the Irish Parliament from 1796; opposed the Anglo-Irish Union.—261, 266
- Butler, James, 12th Earl and 1st Duke of Ormonde* (1610-1688)—Irish statesman.—300, 302-04
- Butt, Isaac* (1813-1879)—Irish lawyer and politician, Liberal M.P.; in the 1860s came out in defence of the Fenian prisoners; an organiser of the Home Rule movement in the 1870s.—83, 408, 410
- Byrne, William* (1775-1799)—member of the United Irishmen society, hanged for taking part in the 1798 uprising.—249, 256

## C

- Caesar (Gaius Julius Caesar)* (c. 100-44 B.C.)—Roman general, statesman and writer, author of *De Bello Gallico*.—185
- Caird, Sir James* (1816-1892)—Scottish agriculturist, Liberal M.P.; author of works on the land question in England and Ireland.—158
- Cairnech* (5th cent.)—Christian missionary in Ireland; according to tradition, a compiler of *Senchus Mor*, a collection of ancient laws.—171
- Camden*—see *Pratt, John Jeffreys, 2nd Earl and 1st Marquis of Camden*
- Camden, William* (1551-1623)—English antiquary and historian.—173, 298, 308, 311
- Campe, Johann Julius Wilhelm* (1792-1867)—German publisher and bookseller; co-proprietor of the Hoffmann & Campe Publishing House in Hamburg (from 1823); published works by the authors of the Young Germany group in the 1830s.—56
- Camperio, Philipp* (1810-1882)—Swiss statesman, Italian by birth, lawyer; member of the Grand Council (1847-70); President of the State Council of Geneva and head of the Department of Justice and Police.—138, 352



- Campion, Edmund* (1540-1581)—exponent of Catholicism in Britain, author of *A History of Ireland*.—173, 307
- Canning, George* (1770-1827)—British statesman and diplomat, Tory; Foreign Secretary (1807-09, 1822-27), Prime Minister (1827).—266
- Carew, George, Baron Carew of Clopton and Earl of Totnes* (1555-1629)—British statesman, president of Munster (South Ireland); brutally suppressed Irish uprising in Tyrone (1595-1603).—257, 281
- Carey, Martin Henley*—Irish journalist, Fenian, sentenced to five years' penal servitude in 1865.—102, 409, 416
- Carhampton*—see *Luttrell, Henry Lawes, Earl of Carhampton*
- Carlisle*—see *Howard, Frederick, Earl of Carlisle*
- Carolan (O'Carolan), Torlogh* (1670-1738)—Irish bard, author of many folk songs.—140
- Carte, Thomas* (1686-1754)—English historian; in his writings defended the Stuart dynasty.—299, 300, 302, 303
- Casey, John*—Irish Fenian, arrested and sentenced to five years' penal servitude in 1866.—437-38
- Castlehaven*—see *Touchet, James, Baron Audley of Hely or Heleigh, 3rd Earl of Castlehaven*
- Castlereagh, Robert Stewart, Viscount* (1769-1822)—British Tory statesman, Chief Secretary for Ireland (1799-1801), Secretary for War and for the Colonies (1805-06, 1807-09), and Foreign Secretary (1812-22).—193, 227, 236, 252, 254, 256, 258-59, 262, 263, 266, 268, 280-82, 411, 430
- Catalan, Adolphe*—Swiss radical journalist, editor of *La Liberté* delegate to the Brussels Congress of the International (1868).—210
- Cavendish, Sir Henry* (1732-1804)—British politician, member of the British (1768-74) and the Irish Parliament (1766-68, 1776-1800); Deputy Vice-Treasurer of Ireland from 1795.—238
- Celestine I (Saint)* (mid. 4th-early 5th cent.)—Irish missionary; Pope (422-32).—177
- Chanoz, Jean Baptiste* (b. 1828)—French worker, weaver; member of the Lyons Section of the International.—108
- Charette de la Contrie, François* (1763-1796)—French army officer, a leader of the royalist revolt in Vendée; executed after the defeat of the Quiberon expedition.—246
- Charlemont, James Caulfield, 1st Earl of* (1728-1799)—Irish aristocrat, politician, Commander-in-Chief of the Irish Volunteers in the Duke of Leinster's army; opposed the Anglo-Irish Union.—219, 223, 231, 234-35, 245, 271, 273, 275
- Charles I* (1600-1649)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1625-49); beheaded during the English Revolution.—195, 269, 300-01, 304
- Charles II* (1630-1685)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1660-85).—196, 289, 304, 305
- Charles II the Bald* (823-877)—King of France (840-77).—179
- Charles (Carlos) III* (1716-1788)—King of Spain (1759-88).—217, 270
- Charles the Great (Charlemagne)* (c. 742-814)—King of the Franks (768-800) and Holy Roman Emperor (800-14).—178
- Charras, Jean Baptiste Adolphe* (1810-1865)—French military leader and politician, moderate republican; took part in suppressing the June 1848 uprising of the Paris workers; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic (1848-51); opposed Louis Bonaparte; banished from France after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—57

- Cheneval, L. J.*—210
- Chernyshevsky, Nikolai Gavrilovich* (1828-1889)—Russian revolutionary democrat, materialist philosopher, writer and literary critic; a predecessor of Russian Social-Democracy.—111
- Chevallier, François*—active in the Swiss working-class movement; member of the committee of the Geneva Bakers' Cooperative Society which was a section of the International.—210
- Chichester of Belfast, Arthur Chichester, Baron* (1563-1625)—Lord Deputy of Ireland (1604-14).—300, 301
- Clanmorris*—Irish Lord, member of the Irish Parliament (1800).—263
- Clare*—*see Fitzgibbon, John, Earl of Clare*
- Clarendon, Edward Hyde, 1st Earl of* (1609-1674)—British statesman and historian.—294
- Clarendon, George William Frederick Villiers, Earl of, Baron Hyde* (1800-1870)—British statesman, Whig, later Liberal; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1847-52), Foreign Secretary (1853-58, 1865-66, 1868-70).—29
- Claudians, Claudius (Claudian)* (late 4th-early 5th cent.)—Latin epic poet; an Alexandrian by birth.—177
- Clerfayt, Karl, Count* (1733-1798)—Austrian field marshal; took part in the war between Austria and Turkey (1788-89); in 1794 and 1795 Commander-in-Chief of the Austrian army in the war with the French Republic.—246
- Cluseret, Gustave Paul* (1823-1900)—French politician, general; joined Garibaldi's volunteers in Italy (1860); fought in the US Civil War; member of the First International, Bakuninist; the General Council's correspondent in the USA in the spring of 1870; took part in revolutionary uprisings in Lyons and Marseille (1870); member of the Paris Commune; emigrated after its defeat.—442
- Cobbett, William* (c. 1762-1835)—British politician and radical writer.—251, 266, 411
- Cockburn, Sir Alexander James Edmund* (1802-1880)—Lord Chief Justice of England from 1859.—363
- Cohn, James*—leading figure in the British working-class movement, President of the London Association of Cigar-Makers; member of the General Council of the International (1867-71), Corresponding Secretary for Denmark (1870-71), delegate to the Brussels Congress (1868) and the London Conference (1871) of the International.—26, 55
- Columba* (c. 521-597)—Irish Christian missionary in Scotland.—178
- Conaing*—nephew of the Irish King Brian Borumha, killed at the battle of Clontarf (1014).—183
- Condon, Edward O'Meagher* (c. 1835-1915)—Irish Fenian; in 1867 was sentenced to death; this was commuted into imprisonment.—3
- Conolly, Thomas* (1738-1803)—Irish politician, member of the Irish Parliament (1761-1800); supporter of the Anglo-Irish Union.—229, 234, 242, 278
- Cooke, Edward* (1755-1820)—British statesman, held several posts in the Irish government (1778-1800), member of the Irish Parliament (1789-1801), supporter of the Anglo-Irish Union.—256
- Coote*—Sheriff of the Monaghan County in Ireland (1870).—313
- Copeland*—a leading figure in the atheist movement in Britain, member of the General Council of the International (1868-69).—26
- Coppet, Louis de*—210
- Corc* (5th cent.)—King of Munster; according to a legend from Irish chronicles, helped in compiling *Senchus Mor*, a collection of ancient laws.—171

- Cormac Mac Art (Cormac Ulfada)* (d. 260)—King of Ireland (218-54).—176
- Cormac McCulinan* (836-908)—King of Munster and Bishop of Cashel (901-08).—172
- Cormier, Aristide*—worker in the lace industry, member of the Lyons Section of the International.—108
- Cornell, Ezra* (1807-1874)—US capitalist and philanthropist, founder of Cornell University in Ithaca (USA).—161
- Cornwallis, Charles Cornwallis, 1st Marquis* (1738-1805)—British politician, Governor-General of India (1786-93, 1805); as Viceroy of Ireland (1798-1801) suppressed the Irish uprising of 1798.—217, 259-62, 271, 281, 282
- Costello, Augustin*—Irish Fenian, American army officer; in 1867 came to Ireland to take part in the uprising, was arrested and sentenced to twelve years' penal servitude.—422
- Coulin, L.*—210
- Courtois, Jacques*—Swiss worker, joiner; member of the First International.—210
- Cowley, Henry Wellesley, Earl of* (1804-1884)—British diplomat, Ambassador to Paris (1852-67).—364
- Creed, H. Herries*—correspondent of *The Times*; in December 1866-January 1867, in collaboration with W. Williams, published a series of articles on Belgian industry.—357
- Crochet, François* (d. after 1898)—Swiss worker, carpenter.—210
- Cromwell, Henry* (1628-1674)—son of Oliver Cromwell; general in the English Parliamentary Army; in 1650 took part in Oliver Cromwell's punitive expedition to Ireland; Commander of the English army in Ireland (1654); Lord Deputy (1655-57) and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1657-59).—196, 289
- Cromwell, Oliver* (1599-1658)—leader of the English Revolution; Lord Lieutenant and Commander-in-Chief of Ireland from 1649; Lord Protector of England, Scotland and Ireland from 1653.—140, 192, 194, 195, 196, 264, 294, 300, 302-04, 317
- Croset, J.*—210
- Croset, Suzette*—210
- Crosset, Édouard*—Swiss worker, printer; took part in the Inaugural Congress of the Romance Federation of the International (January 1869); opponent of Bakunin.—210
- Curran, John Philpot* (1750-1817)—Irish politician and judge, member of the Irish Parliament, defended leaders of the United Irishmen revolutionary society at state trials.—216, 230, 234, 236-44, 247-55, 256, 267, 276-80
- Custine, Adam Philippe, comte de* (1740-1793)—French general and politician; took part in the war of the French Republic against the First European Coalition, General-in-Chief of the Vosges army in 1792.—249

## D

- Daire* (5th cent.)—a ruler of Ulster; according to tradition, a compiler of *Senchus Mor*, a collection of ancient laws.—171
- Davies, Sir John* (1569-1626)—British statesman, poet, author of books on the history of Ireland, Attorney-General of Ireland (1606-19), supporter of the English colonisation of Ireland.—173, 284-87, 299, 308, 310
- Davis, Jefferson* (1808-1889)—American statesman, big slave-owner and planter, Democrat; an organiser of the Southern slave-holders' revolt; took an active part in the war with Mexico (1846-48); U.S. Secretary of War (1853-57); President of the Confederate States of America (1861-65).—409

- Davis, Thomas Osborne* (1814-1845)—Irish democrat, historian and poet; a leader of the Young Ireland group; prepared a publication of Curran's speeches with commentaries.—219, 250, 252, 256
- Davison, A. N.*—secretary of the Board of Directors of the Schiller Institute in Manchester at the end of the 1860s.—18
- Dean, Frederick*—English worker, a smith; delegate to the Brussels Congress (1868) of the First International.—26
- Deane, Robert*—member of the Irish Parliament (1779-80).—222
- Defoe, Daniel* (c. 1660-1731)—English novelist and journalist.—269
- Delescluze, Louis Charles* (1809-1871)—French revolutionary, journalist; participant in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848; founder, editor and publisher of *Le Réveil* (1868-71); member of the Paris Commune of 1871.—374
- Delesvaux*—President at the trial of the Executive Committee of the Paris Section of the First International (1868).—366-67
- Dell, William*—interior decorator; active in the British working-class and democratic movement; member of the British National League for the Independence of Poland; took part in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall, London; member of the General Council of the International (1864-69) and its Treasurer (1865, 1866-67); participated in the London Conference (1865); a leader of the Reform League.—26
- Derby, Edward Geoffrey Smith Stanley, 14th Earl of Derby* (1799-1869)—British statesman, Tory leader, Prime Minister (1852, 1858-59, 1866-68).—105, 427
- Derkinderen*—member of the General Council of the International (1866-67), Corresponding Secretary for Holland (1867).—4
- Desmond, Gerald Fitzgerald, Earl of* (d. 1583)—powerful Anglo-Irish feudal lord; a leader of the uprising against English rule in the south of Ireland.—299
- Détraz, Charles*—210
- Dickson, William* (1745-1804)—Irish Bishop of Down and Connor (1783).—261
- Dinter, Johann Gottlieb* (1813-1910)—German miner, leader of the miners' union in Zwickau.—43, 389
- Diodorus, Siculus* (c. 80-29 B.C.)—Greek historian, author of *Bibliothecae historicae*.—174
- Dionysius Areopagiticus (the Areopagite)* (1st cent.)—first Christian Bishop of Athens, member of the Athenian Areopagus.—178
- Disraeli, Benjamin, 1st Earl of Beaconsfield* (1804-1881)—British statesman and writer; adherent of the Young England group in the 1840s; later a Tory leader; Prime Minister (1868, 1874-80).—105, 407, 427
- Donat*—210
- Downing, M'Carthy*—Irish politician, Liberal M.P.—431-32
- Drennan, William* (1754-1820)—Irish poet, a leader of the United Irishmen society in Dublin.—248
- Dubhghall*—son of Amhlaeibh (Amhlanibh Anlaf, or Olaf), killed at the battle of Clontarf (1014).—183
- Dubthach Maccu Lugir* (5th cent.)—Irish court poet and lawyer; according to tradition, a compiler of *Senchus Mor*, a collection of ancient laws.—171
- Duchâtel, Charles Marie Tanneguy, comte* (1803-1867)—French statesman, Orleanist, Minister of the Interior (1839-40, 1840-February 1848).—373

*Dufferin and Ava, Frederick Temple Hamilton-Temple-Blackwood, 1st Marquis of* (1826-1902)—British statesman and diplomat, Liberal, member of Gladstone's Cabinet (1868-72), big landowner in Ireland.—190, 206, 428, 435

*Duffy, Edward* (1840-1868)—a leader of the Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood, leader of the Fenian movement in Western Ireland; in 1867 was sentenced to fifteen years of penal servitude, died in prison.—418

*Dumas, Alexandre (Dumas père)* (1802-1870)—French writer.—423

*Dumouriez, Charles François du Perier* (1739-1823)—French general, commanded the Northern revolutionary army in 1792-93; was close to the Girondists, betrayed the revolution in March 1793.—248, 249

*Dunaud, Antoine*—Swiss worker, engraver; at a congress of the Romance Federation of the International, held in La Chaux-de-Fonds (April 1870), opposed the Bakuninists.—210

*Duncker, Franz Gustav* (1822-1888)—German publisher, prominent figure in the Party of Progress; founder and editor of the *Volks-Zeitung* (1853-59); in 1868, together with Max Hirsch, founded reformist trade unions, known as Hirsch-Duncker unions, which existed until 1933.—25

*Dungal* (died c. 827)—Irish monk, scholar and poet, invited to teach in Pavia (c. 820).—178

*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 Con-

ference (1865) and the Geneva Congress (1866); Chairman of the Lausanne Congress (1867), 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.—4, 37, 51, 55, 341, 364, 443

*Dupraz, Louis*—delegate of the Geneva building workers at the talks with the government during their strike in the spring of 1869.—210

*Dutoit, Jules*—an editor of *L'Égalité* (1870).—123

## E

*Eccarius, Johann Georg (John George)* (1818-1889)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; tailor; member of the League of the Just, later of the Communist League; a leader 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, London; 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 International's congresses and conferences; until 1872 follower of Marx; in the spring of 1872 joined the reformist leaders of the British trade unions.—4, 17, 51, 55, 82, 139, 358, 364, 378, 406, 443

*Edgeworth, Richard Lovell* (1744-1817)—British writer; from 1782 lived in Ireland, where he owned an estate; member of the Irish Parliament (1798-1800); opponent of the Anglo-Irish Union.—264

*Edward I* (1239-1307)—King of England (1272-1307).—287

- Edward II* (1284-1327)—King of England (1307-27).—269
- Edward III* (1312-1377)—King of England (1327-77).—290
- Edward VI* (1537-1553)—King of England (1547-53).—297
- Edward "the Confessor"* (1004-1066)—King of England (1043-66).—292
- Eichhoff, Wilhelm Karl* (1833-1895)—German socialist and journalist; refugee in London (1861-66); member of the International (from 1868) and one of its first historians; organiser of the Berlin Section of the International; General Council's correspondent; member of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party of Germany (from 1869).—326, 329, 330, 337, 345, 354, 357, 363, 364, 377, 378
- Einhard (Eginhard)* (c. 770-840)—historian of the Franks, biographer of Charles the Great.—177
- Elizabeth I* (1533-1603)—Queen of England and Ireland (1558-1603).—140, 192, 195, 257, 281, 288, 292, 297-99, 302, 317
- Ella* (or *Aella*) (d. 867)—King of Northumbria (c. 862-67).—180
- Elpidin, Mikhail Konstantinovich* (1835-1908)—participant in the Russian students' revolutionary movement in the early 1860s; in 1865 emigrated to Geneva, founded a Russian printing plant where the newspaper *Narodnoye Dyelo (The People's Cause)* was published.—210
- Ely*—Irish aristocrat, Marquis, M.P. (1800).—263
- Emmet, Thomas Addis* (1764-1827)—Irish politician, lawyer, secretary of the United Irishmen society from 1795.—255, 281
- Engels, Frederick* (1820-1895).—18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 93, 94, 95, 135, 154, 156, 158, 161, 185, 284, 286, 299, 307, 308, 309-11
- Ensor, George* (1769-1843)—Irish journalist; opponent of the Anglo-Irish Union; in his works denounced the colonial policy of the English ruling classes.—259, 264, 265-68, 269
- Erdmann, Johann Eduard* (1805-1892)—German philosopher, Right-wing Hegelian.—178
- Erigena, Johannes Scotus* (c. 810-c. 877)—medieval philosopher, theologian, and translator; Irish by birth.—179, 308, 311
- Erlingr from Straume*y—Norse Viking, killed at the battle of Clontarf (1014).—181
- Eyre, Edward John* (1815-1901)—British colonial official, Governor of Jamaica (1864-66); suppressed a Negro insurrection in 1865.—49, 362

## F

- Fane, John, Earl of Westmoreland* (1759-1841)—British statesman, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1790-95); opposed emancipation of the Catholics.—229, 230, 234, 236, 245-47, 249, 278
- Ferdinand II* (1810-1859)—King of the Two Sicilies (1830-59), nicknamed King Bomba for his bombardment of Messina in 1848.—105, 422
- Fergus* (5th cent.)—Irish poet; according to tradition, a compiler of *Senchus Mor*, a collection of ancient laws.—171
- Ferguson, Patrick* (1744-1780)—English army officer, commanded troops during the American War of Independence; killed in the battle at Kings Mountain in 1780.—217
- Filliétaz, G.*—participant in the Swiss working-class movement in the second half of the 1860s; member of the International.—210
- Finn*—King of Leinster; Murchadh's father.—183

- Fitzgerald, Edward* (1763-1798)—Irish bourgeois revolutionary; a founder of the United Irishmen society; was in charge of preparations for the 1798 rebellion.—194, 198, 255, 281
- Fitzgerald, George Robert* (c. 1748-1786)—member of the Anglo-Irish clan of Geraldines; took part in the political life of Ireland; supported independent legislature in Ireland; executed in 1786.—226
- Fitzgerald, James* (1742-1835)—Irish lawyer and politician, M.P. from 1769; supported emancipation of the Catholics; Prime Serjeant of Ireland from 1787; in 1799 dismissed for his opposition to the Anglo-Irish Union; later supporter of the Union.—266
- Fitzgerald, John David, Lord Fitzgerald* (1816-1889)—Irish lawyer and Liberal politician, M.P.; held a series of high judicial posts in the British administration in Ireland.—439
- Fitzgerald, William Robert, 2nd Duke of Leinster* (1749-1804)—member of the Irish Parliament from Dublin (1769-73); colonel in the Dublin volunteers' army; supporter of the Anglo-Irish Union.—222, 271
- Fitzgeralds* (or *Geraldines*)—the name of an ancient Irish dynasty; owners of large estates in Leinster and Munster.—288
- Fitzgibbon, John, Earl of Clare* (1749-1802)—Lord Chancellor of Ireland (1789); member of the Irish Parliament; supported the government's trade policy; adherent of the Anglo-Irish Union.—225, 227, 234, 236, 243, 244, 252, 261, 273, 277, 278, 279
- Fitzherbert, Alleyne, Baron St. Helens* (1753-1839) — British statesman; Chief Secretary of Buckingham's government in Ireland from 1787, member of the Irish Parliament.—242, 244, 278
- Fitzpatrick, Richard* (1747-1813)—British general and statesman, Whig, M.P., Chief Secretary for Ireland (1782), War Secretary (1783, 1806-07).—229
- Fitzwilliam, William Wentworth Fitzwilliam, 2nd Earl* (1748-1833)—Whig leader, member of Pitt's government, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (January-March 1795).—220, 245, 251, 252, 255, 258, 279
- Fleetwood, Charles* (d. 1692)—general in the Parliamentary Army during the English Revolution; Commander-in-Chief of the English army in Ireland from 1652; Lord Deputy of Ireland (1654-57).—196
- Flerovsky, N.*—see *Bervi, Vasily Vasilyevich*
- Flood, Henry* (1732-1791)—Irish statesman, member of the Irish Parliament, leader of the people's party; in the 1780s spoke in Parliament against Grattan's moderate position, moved the Renunciation Act adopted in 1783.—228, 230-33, 236, 240, 273-75
- Forbes, George, 6th Earl of Granard* (1760-1837)—general, member of the House of Lords; opposed the Anglo-Irish Union.—237, 238, 277, 278
- Fornachon, L. H.* (d. after 1898)—member of the Geneva Section of the International named Alliance of Socialist Democracy.—210
- Försterling, Emil* (1827-1872)—coppersmith; member of the General Association of German Workers; later President of the Lassallean General Association of German Workers founded by Hatzfeldt (1867-68); deputy to the North German Imperial Diet (1867-70).—24
- Fortescue*—see *Parkinson-Fortescue, Chichester Samuel, Baron Carlingford*
- Foster, John*—English worker, carpenter; member of a co-operative society in Hull, delegate to the Brussels

- Congress of the First International (1868).—26
- Foster, John*—English worker, mechanic; member of a co-operative society in Hull, delegate to the Brussels Congress of the First International (1868), John Foster's son.—26
- Foster, John, Baron Oriol* (1740-1828)—Irish lawyer, Privy Councillor; Speaker of the Irish House of Commons from 1785; member of the united Parliament from 1801; opposed the Anglo-Irish Union.—261, 266
- Fourier, François Marie Charles* (1772-1837)—French utopian socialist.—175
- Fox, Charles James* (1749-1806)—British statesman, a Whig leader, Foreign Secretary (1782, 1783, 1806).—226, 228, 230, 231, 240-42, 259, 273-74, 278
- Fox, Henry Richard Vassall, 3rd Baron Holland* (1773-1840)—Whig, member of Grenville's Cabinet (1806-07), opposed the Anglo-Irish Union.—266
- Fox, Luke*—Irish lawyer, M. P., in 1799 actively supported the Anglo-Irish Union.—261, 282
- 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, London; 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.—16
- Frederick William IV* (1795-1861)—King of Prussia (1840-61).—60
- Fridolin or Fridold, Saint* (6th cent.)—Irish Christian missionary among the Allemanni of the Upper Rhine.—178
- Friess, J. (or Fries)*—member of the International and of the Central Committee of the German-speaking sections in Geneva.—210
- Frodi*—son of Harald I Fairhair.—179
- Fulliquet, Louis*—Swiss worker; member of the International, Secretary of the Geneva cabinet-makers' section.—210

## G

- Gallus (Gall St.)* (c. 550-c. 645)—Irish Christian missionary.—178
- Gandillon, Ami*—210
- Garbani, Paul*—210
- Gardiner, William or William Neville* (1748-1806)—English army officer, aide-de-camp of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1793); member of the Irish Parliament from 1799.—236
- Garibaldi, Giuseppe* (1807-1882)—Italian revolutionary and democrat; took part in the revolutionary movement in South America in the 1830s and 1840s and in the 1848-49 revolution in Italy; headed the struggle for Italy's national liberation and unification in the 1850s and 1860s.—101, 323, 341
- Gathorne-Hardy, Gathorne* (1814-1906)—British statesman, Conservative, Home Secretary (1867-68).—3
- Gay, Désirée*—210
- Gay, François*—in May 1869 refused to join the committee of the Geneva Section named Alliance of Socialist Democracy.—210
- Gay, Jules Leopold* (1807-d. after 1876)—French journalist; utopian communist, communist, follower of Owen; publisher of *Le Communiste* in Paris (1849); member of the International; an editor of *L'Égalité* and *La Liberté*.—210



- 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).—133
- Gennadius* (5th cent.)—Gallic writer.—177
- George I* (1660-1727)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1714-27).—212, 225, 228, 229, 230, 232, 270, 272-74
- George III* (1738-1820)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1760-1820).—197, 212, 215, 222-24, 226, 227, 228, 232-34, 241, 242, 252, 257, 259-62, 264, 273-74, 275, 278
- George IV* (1762-1830)—Prince Regent (1811-20), King of Great Britain and Ireland (1820-30).—242, 256, 278
- Gerlach, Karl Heinrich Eduard Friedrich von*—Prussian official, Regierungspräsident in Cologne (1839-44).—60
- Gillaciarrain*—Viking, son of Gluniarrin, killed at the battle of Clontarf (1014).—183
- Giraldus Cambrensis (Gerald de Barry)* (c. 1146-c. 1220)—English writer; took part in the military expedition to Ireland (1185); author of essays on Ireland.—172, 173, 180, 185, 285-86
- Gladstone, William Ewart* (1809-1898)—British statesman, Tory, later Peelite; leader of the Liberal Party in the latter half of the 19th century; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852-55, 1859-66) and Prime Minister (1868-74, 1880-85, 1886, 1892-94).—28, 83, 103, 105, 189, 324, 326, 327, 345, 407-11, 415, 416-18, 421-30, 434-36, 438-40
- Gluniarrin*—father of Gillaciarrain.—183
- Godfrey, Thomas*—English inventor of a patent medicine (Godfrey's Cordial).—327
- Gordon, James Bentley* (1750-1819)—English historian, author of works on the history of Ireland.—309
- Gottlob, Walter*—210
- Gottraux, Jules*—a Swiss, who became a British subject; member of the International.—364
- Grange, Charles*—Swiss worker, plasterer; member of the Geneva Section named Alliance of Socialist Democracy.—210
- Grattan, Henry* (1746-1820)—Irish politician, lawyer; from 1775 to 1800 leader of moderate Liberal opposition to the British Government in the Irish Parliament; member of the British Parliament from 1805.—222, 227-34, 235, 236, 241, 244, 247, 250, 254, 258, 271, 273-75, 276, 278, 280
- Graves, Charles* (1812-1899)—Irish scholar, mathematician; in 1852-99 member of the government commission for translating and publishing the ancient Irish laws; Bishop of Limerick from 1866.—170
- Gray, Sir John* (1816-1875)—British journalist, member of the House of Commons (1865-75).—407
- Gregory XIII* (1502-1585)—Pope (1572-85).—195
- Grenville, George Nugent-Temple, 1st Marquis of Buckingham* (1753-1813)—British statesman, member of the Privy Council, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1782-83, 1787-90).—222, 231, 236, 238, 241, 242, 264, 274, 278
- Grenville, William Wyndham Grenville, Baron* (1759-1834)—British statesman, Tory, later Whig; in 1782 he became secretary to his brother, Marquis of Buckingham; Foreign Secretary (1791-1801), Prime Minister (1806-07).—231, 274
- Grenville-Nugent, Reginald*—Irish army officer, Liberal.—439
- Grey, Charles, Earl of, Viscount Howick, Baron Grey* (1764-1845)—British

- statesman, a Whig leader; First Lord of the Admiralty (1806), Prime Minister (1830-34); opposed the Anglo-Irish Union of 1801.—266
- Gréy* or *Gray*, *Lord Leonard*, *Viscount Grane of Ireland* (d. 1541)—Deputy-Governor of Ireland (1535-40).—288
- Griffith*, *Richard* (1752-1820)—member of the Irish Parliament (1783-90).—239, 276
- Grimm*, *Jacob Ludwig Carl* (1785-1863)—German philologist, author of a historical grammar of the German language and of folklore adaptations; professor in Göttingen and then in Berlin; Liberal.—175, 184
- Grouchy*, *Emmanuel*, *marquis de* (1766-1847)—Marshal of France, participated in the Napoleonic wars.—254, 280
- Guerry*—210
- Guillaume*, *James* (1844-1916)—Swiss teacher; anarchist, Bakuninist; member of the International, delegate to the Geneva (1866), Lausanne (1867), Basle (1869) and the Hague (1872) congresses of the International; an organiser of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy; editor of *Progrès*, *La Solidarité* and the *Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne*; was expelled from the International at the Hague Congress for his splitting activities.—114-15
- Guillmeaux*—member of the Romance Federation of the International; Chairman of the section of turners and mechanics; elected member of the *Égalité* editorial board at the Federation's congress in January 1869, withdrew from the board in January 1870, together with the other Bakuninists.—123, 210
- Guinet*, *Jenny*—210
- Guizot*, *François Pierre Guillaume* (1787-1874)—French historian and statesman; virtually directed France's home and foreign policy from 1840 to the February 1848 revolution; expressed the interests of the big financial bourgeoisie.—61
- Guyot*, *Charles*—210

## H

*Habsburgs* (or *Hapsburgs*)—dynasty of emperors of the Holy Roman Empire from 1273 to 1806 (with intervals), Spanish Kings (1516-1700), Austrian emperors (1804-67) and Austro-Hungarian emperors (1867-1918).—289

*Haerberling*, *Adolphe*—member of the committee of a bakers' co-operative society in Geneva affiliated to the International.—210

*Hales*, *John* (b. 1839)—British trade-union leader; weaver; member of the Reform League, the Land and Labour League; 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.—26, 54

*Hallam*, *Henry* (1777-1859)—English historian, author of works on the history of English constitution.—285, 288

*Hancock*, *U. Nelson*—Irish lawyer, with O'Mahony published two volumes of *Senchus Mor*, a collection of ancient laws.—170

*Hanmer*, *Meredith* (1543-1604)—English clergyman and historian, author of *The Chronicle of Ireland*.—173

*Hansemann*, *David Justus* (1790-1864)—German capitalist, a leader of the Rhenish liberal bourgeoisie; Prussian Finance Minister (March-September 1848).—40

*Harald I Fairhair* (c. 850-c. 933)—King of Norway (872-930).—179

- Harcourt, Simon, 1st Earl Harcourt* (1714-1777)—British aristocrat, held various posts at Court; Ambassador to Paris (1768-72), Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1772-77).—222, 238
- Hardy, Jean* (1763-1802)—French general; taken prisoner by the English during the expedition to Ireland (1798); later fought in the French Rhenish Army.—282
- Harris, Walter* (1686-1761)—Irish historiographer, author of works on the history of Ireland; published documents collected by Sir James Ware with his additions and comments.—269
- Hastings, Francis Rawdon, Marquis of Hastings, Earl of Moira* (1754-1826)—English army officer; member of the Irish Parliament from 1780.—245
- Hatzfeldt, Sophie, Countess von* (1805-1881)—German aristocrat, friend and supporter of Lassalle.—24
- Hay, Peter*—governor of Spike Island Convict Prison.—106
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich* (1770-1831)—German philosopher.—61, 309
- Heine, Heinrich* (1797-1856)—German revolutionary poet.—348
- Hely-Hutchinson, John* (1724-1794)—Secretary of State in Ireland from 1777, supported English rule in Ireland.—227, 273
- Hely-Hutchinson, John, Earl of Donoughmore* (1757-1832)—Irish general; member of the Irish Parliament; supporter of the Anglo-Irish Union; son of the above.—260
- Hennessy, John Pope* (1834-1891)—Irish politician, Conservative M. P.; proposed several minor reforms in Ireland in the early 1860s.—206
- Henry I* (1068-1135)—King of England (1100-35).—173
- Henry II Plantagenet* (1133-1189)—King of England (1154-89).—195, 285
- Henry V* (1387-1422)—King of England (1413-22).—291
- Henry VII* (1457-1509)—King of England (1485-1509).—212, 270, 287
- Henry VIII* (1491-1547)—King of England (1509-47).—287, 288, 292, 297, 302
- Héridier, Marc*—210
- Heron, Denis Caulfield* (1824-1881)—Irish lawyer and economist, M. P.—440
- Hervey, Frederick, Earl of Bristol* (1730-1803)—Bishop of Derry; member of the Irish Parliament; commanded a volunteer regiment in Londonderry (1782), took an active part in the volunteer congress in Dublin in 1783.—226, 234, 235, 275
- Herzen, Alexander Ivanovich* (1812-1870)—Russian revolutionary democrat, materialist philosopher and writer; left Russia in 1847, from 1852 lived in England where he established the Free Russian Press and published the periodical *Polyarnaya Zvezda* (Polar Star) and the newspaper *Kolokol* (The Bell).—123
- Hieronymus*—see *Jerome, St.*
- Hirsch, Max* (1832-1905)—German economist, prominent figure in the Party of Progress; in 1868, together with Franz Duncker, founded reformist trade unions which were known as Hirsch-Duncker trade unions and which existed until 1933.—25, 26
- Hobart, Robert, Lord Hobart, Earl of Buckinghamshire* (1760-1816)—English army officer; Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1784-93); member of the Irish Parliament (1787-93).—234, 236, 238, 245, 278
- Hoche, Lazare Louis* (1768-1797)—French general; directed the suppression of the counter-revolutionary revolt in Bretagne and Vendée in 1794; in 1795 routed the royalist landing party at Quiberon thus put-

- ting an end to Vendean wars; in 1796 commanded an expeditionary corps that was to land in Ireland.—246, 254, 280
- Holinshed* (or *Hollingshead*), *Raphael* (died c. 1580)—English historian, author of the *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* from ancient times to the 1570s.—298
- Holland*—see *Fox, Henry Richard Vassall, 3rd Baron Holland*
- Homer*—semi-legendary Greek epic poet, author of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.—294
- Hood, Gunner*—Irish Fenian, sentenced to four years' penal servitude by a military tribunal in 1866.—415-16
- Houchard, Jean Nicolas* (1740-1793)—French general; commanded the Northern army which defeated the Duke of York's troops (1793).—246
- Howard, Frederick, Earl of Carlisle* (1748-1825)—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1780-82).—224, 251
- Howell, George* (1833-1910)—British mason; a reformist leader of the British trade unions; former Chartist, 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, London; member of the General Council of the International (October 1864 to 1869); participant in the London Conference of the International (1865); Secretary of the Reform League; opposed revolutionary tactics.—26
- Howison*—Irish politician, alderman; in 1790 was put up by the Municipal Council as candidate for the post of Mayor of Dublin.—244, 279
- Hrafn the Red*—Norse Viking, took part in the battle of Clontarf (1014).—181
- Hugo, Victor Marie* (1802-1885)—French writer; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; opposed Louis Bonaparte.—56
- Humbert, Jean Robert Marie* (1755-1823)—French general; commander of a French force that landed in Ireland.—281
- Hume, Robert William*—American petty-bourgeois radical, journalist; a leader of the National Labour Union; member of the International, General Council's correspondent.—442-43
- Huriot, Victor*—member of the editorial board of *Le Courrier français* (1866-68).—348
- Huxley, Thomas Henry* (1825-1895)—English naturalist; close associate of Charles Darwin and populariser of his teaching.—174

## I

- Ireton, Henry* (1611-1651)—prominent figure in the English Revolution; an ideologist of the Independent Party; general in the Parliamentary Army; participant in Oliver Cromwell's punitive expedition to Ireland (1649-50); succeeded Cromwell as Commander-in-Chief and Lord Deputy of Ireland (1650-51).—196
- Isidore of Seville (Isidorus Hispalensis)* (c. 570-636)—Spanish bishop and Catholic writer.—177

## J

- Jackson, William* (c. 1737-1795)—Irish Catholic clergyman, member of the United Irishmen society; in 1794 came from France to establish links with Theobald Wolfe Tone, was arrested and sentenced to death, committed suicide.—251, 253
- Jaclard, Charles Victor* (1843-1900)—French journalist, Blanquist; member of the International; was active in the Paris Commune, 1871; member of

- the National Guard's Central Committee, commander of a legion of the National Guard; following the suppression of the Paris Commune, emigrated to Switzerland and then to Russia; after the 1880 amnesty returned to France and resumed his activities in the socialist movement.—210
- James*—alderman and, from 1790, Mayor of Dublin; commanded troops that crushed the Defenders' uprising near Dublin (1795).—244-45, 279
- James I* (1566-1625)—King of England, Scotland and Ireland (1603-25).—140, 195, 288, 293, 297, 299-300
- James II* (1633-1701)—Duke of York (from 1634), King of England, Scotland and Ireland (1685-88).—194, 196, 289-90, 294, 304-05
- Jerome, St. (Eusebius Sophronius Hieronymus)* (c. 340-420)—theologian; born in Dalmatia; translated the Bible into Latin.—176
- Jessup, William J.*—American worker, carpenter; active participant in the American labour movement; Vice-President (1866) and Corresponding Secretary (1867) of the National Labour Union of the United States for the State of New York; a leader of the Workers' Union of New York; General Council's correspondent in the USA.—443
- Johannard, Jules* (1843-1888)—prominent figure in the French working-class movement; lithographer; member of the General Council of the International (1868-69, 1871-72) and Corresponding Secretary for Italy (1868-69); in 1870 founded a section of the International at St. Denis; member of the Paris Commune of 1871; sided with the Blanquists; after the defeat of the Commune emigrated to London; delegate to the Hague Congress (1872).—51, 55
- John (Lackland)* (c. 1167-1216)—King of England (1199-1216).—173
- Johnstone, James* (d. 1798)—Scottish collector and publisher of ancient Scandinavian literature.—181
- Jost, Jean*—secretary of the section of the Geneva turners, mechanics and foundrymen.—210
- Jourdan, Jean Baptiste, comte* (1762-1833)—Marshal of France; fought in the wars of the French Republic and Napoleonic France, won a victory at Fleurus (1794); commanded the French Army in Spain (1808-14); Minister of Foreign Affairs during the July monarchy.—246
- Jukes, Joseph Beete* (1811-1869)—English geologist, supervised the geological survey of Ireland in 1850-69.—148, 151
- 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 before the Hague Congress of 1872, later joined the reformist leaders of the British trade unions.—4, 37, 38, 51, 55, 123, 136, 336-37

## K

- Kamp*—Mayor of Seraing (Belgium), member of the Cockerill Company.—48
- Kane, Sir Robert John* (1810-1890)—Irish scientist, professor of chemistry and physics; also studied the economy of Ireland.—152, 163

- Kelly, Jeremiah Hubert*—physician in Spike Island Convict Prison.—106-07
- Kenyon, Lloyd Kenyon, 1st Baron* (1732-1802)—British lawyer, Master of the Rolls and Lord Chief Justice of England, M. P.—265
- Keogh, John* (1740-1817)—Irish merchant; member of the Catholic Committee, supported emancipation of the Irish Catholics; on his initiative the Relief Act was adopted in 1793; member of the United Irishmen society.—219, 249
- Kerthialfadh (Kerthialfadr)*—Irish soldier, participant in the battle of Clontarf (1014).—182-83
- Kickham, Charles Joseph* (1826-1882)—Irish journalist; took part in the national liberation movement of the 1840s; Fenian; an editor of *The Irish People* (1865); in 1865 was arrested and sentenced to 14 years' penal servitude, released in 1869.—102, 422, 440
- Kilian (Chilian, Killian), St.* (d. 697)—Irish missionary, preached Christianity in Eastern Franconia; first Bishop of Würzburg.—178
- Kimbaoth* (3rd cent. B. C.)—mentioned in chronicles as the ruler of Ulster.—169
- Knox, Alexander Andrew* (1818-1891)—English journalist and police magistrate; member of a commission which reported to Parliament in 1867 on the treatment of political prisoners in British prisons.—418, 424, 428, 438
- Kohl, Johann Georg* (1808-1878)—German geographer, author of several works on the geography of European countries.—284

## L

- Laeghaire (Loeghaire)* (d. 458)—King of Ireland (428-58).—171
- 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 sections of the International in France (1869-70), Spain and Portugal (1871-72); delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); a founder of the Workers' Party of France; disciple and associate of Marx and Engels; husband of Marx's daughter, Laura.—4, 55
- Lake, Gerard, 1st Viscount Lake of Delhi and Leswarree* (1744-1808)—British general, M. P. (1790-1802); commanded troops that quelled the Irish uprising of 1798.—254, 260, 280
- Lambert, John* (1619-1683)—general in the Parliamentary Army during the English Revolution; took part in all major battles with royalist troops and in conquering Scotland; Lord Deputy of Ireland (1652).—196
- Langrishe, Sir Hercules* (1731-1811)—Irish politician, M. P.—263
- Lanigan, John* (1758-1828)—Irish bishop, supported the Anglo-Irish Union, wrote several works on ecclesiastical history.—263, 265
- Laplace, Jacques*—delegate to the third congress of the Romance Federation of the International from the Carouge Section.—210
- Larcom, Sir Thomas Aiskew* (1801-1879)—Irish government official, later major-general; from 1826 worked at the British geological survey of Ireland, studied material on the history of old Ireland; permanent Irish Under-Secretary from 1853.—170
- Larkin, Michael* (d. 1867)—Irish Fenian, sentenced to death by English court.—3, 13
- Lassalle, Ferdinand* (1825-1864)—German journalist and lawyer, petty-bourgeois socialist; took part in the 1848-49 revolution, founder and first President of the General Association

- of German Workers (1863), one of the originators of the opportunist trend in the German working-class movement.—20, 21, 23-24, 59
- Laurier, Clement* (1832-1872)—French lawyer and politician, Republican; after the revolution of September 4, 1870 was in the service of the Government of National Defence; later a monarchist.—438
- La Valette, Charles Jean Marie Félix, marquis de* (1806-1881)—French statesman, Minister of the Interior (1865-67).—364
- Lavelle, Patrick*—Irish clergyman, sympathized with the Fenians; author of the book *The Irish Landlord since the Revolution*.—434
- Lavergne, Louis Gabriel Léonce Guilhaud de* (1809-1880)—French bourgeois economist, author of a number of works on agricultural economics.—159-60, 283
- Law, Harriet* (1832-1897)—a leading figure in the atheist movement in England; member of the General Council (June 1867-72) and of the Manchester Section of the International (1872).—26, 55, 399-400
- Lawrence (Laurence), Richard* (1643-1682)—Parliamentary Army colonel during the English Revolution; took part in Cromwell's expedition to Ireland and in land confiscations there; author of pamphlets on Ireland.—269
- Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre Auguste* (1807-1874)—French journalist and politician, a leader of the petty-bourgeois democrats; editor of *La Réforme*; Minister of the Interior in the Provisional Government in 1848; Deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (leader of the Montagne party); emigrated to England following the events of June 13, 1849; returned to France in 1870.—376, 381, 411
- Ledwich, Edward* (1739-1823)—Irish archaeologist; author of works on the history of old Ireland (*The Antiquities of Ireland* and others).—308
- Leinster, Duke of*—see *Fitzgerald, William Robert, 2nd Duke of Leinster*
- Leland, Thomas* (1722-1785)—English historian, author of *The History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II*.—298-300, 301-03
- Lepelletier*—public prosecutor at the trial of the Executive Committee of the Paris Section of the International (1868).—367
- Leslie, Thomas Edward Cliffe* (c. 1827-1882)—English economist.—191, 205
- Lessner, Friedrich* (1825-1910)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; tailor; member of the Communist League from 1847; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; prosecuted at the Cologne Communist trial in 1852; emigrated to London in 1856; member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London and of the General Council of the International (November 1864 to 1872); delegate to 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 a founder of the British Independent Labour Party; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—55
- Levy, Joseph Moses* (1812-1888)—a founder and publisher of *The Daily Telegraph*.—421
- Lewis, Sir George Cornwall, Baronet* (1806-1863)—British statesman, Whig; Financial Secretary to the Treasury (1850-52); editor of *The Edinburgh Review* (1852-55); Chancellor of the Exchequer (1855-58), Home Secretary (1859-61), Secretary of State for War (1861-63).—28
- Liddell, A. F. O.*—English employee in the Home Office (1870).—422

- Liebknecht, Wilhelm* (1826-1900)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; participant in the 1848-49 revolution; member of the Communist League and the International; delegate to the Basle Congress (1869) of the International; deputy to the Imperial Diet from 1867; a founder and leader of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—24, 32, 90, 116, 122, 133, 354, 445
- Limbürg, W.*—German shoemaker; member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London, member of the General Council of the International (1868-69).—55
- 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 which led to the adoption of revolutionary methods of warfare; assassinated by a slave-holders' agent in April 1865.—53, 361, 362
- Lindegger, Antoine* (d. after 1898)—Swiss worker, loader; follower of Bakunin; member of the Committee of the Geneva Section named Alliance of Socialist Democracy; member of the *Égalité* editorial board (1869).—123, 209
- Lingard, John* (1771-1851)—English historian, author of *A History of England* in eight volumes.—303, 305
- Loder*—Norse ruler of Orkney Islands; fought at the battle of Clontarf (1014).—183
- Longfield*—Irish nobleman, M.P. from County Cork (1787).—243
- Louquet, Charles* (1839-1903)—prominent in the French working-class movement; journalist; Proudhonist; member of the General Council of the International (1866-67, 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 joined the Possibilists; husband of Marx's daughter, Jenny.—366
- Louis XIV* (1638-1715)—King of France (1643-1715).—289, 295
- Louis Philippe I* (1773-1850)—Duke of Orleans, King of France (1830-48).—328
- Lucas, Charles* (1713-1771)—Irish physician and journalist, patriotic pamphleteer.—212
- Lucraft, Benjamin* (1809-1897)—a reformist leader of the British trade unions; cabinet-maker; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall, London; 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 withdrew from the International.—26, 55, 139
- Luttrell, Henry Lawes, Earl of Carhampton* (1743-1821)—English general, member of the Irish Parliament; from 1796 Commander-in-Chief in Ireland.—257, 281
- Lynch, John* (c. 1599-c. 1673)—Irish clergyman, author and translator of several works on the history of Ireland.—174
- Lynch, John* (1832-1866)—Irish Fenian, leader of a Fenian organisation in Cork; sentenced to ten years' penal servitude in January 1866; died in Working Prison that year.—418, 437-38
- Lyons, Robert Spencer Dyer* (1826-1886)—Irish physician, Liberal, member of



the commission of inquiry (1870) into the treatment of the Irish political prisoners.—417

## M

*McCann*—member of the United Irishmen society, took part in preparing an uprising in 1798.—255, 281

*Macaulay, Thomas Babington Macaulay, Baron* (1800-1859)—English historian and politician, Whig, M.P.—294, 301, 313

*McCormic*—Irish politician, secretary of the Catholic Committee in the early 1790s.—249

*McCracken, Henry Joy* (1767-1798)—a founder of the United Irishmen society in Belfast, leader of the Antrim uprising (1798).—219

*M'Donnel*—Irish typographer, printed the *Hibernian Journal* at the end of the 18th century.—250

*M'Donnell*—prison doctor in Dublin dismissed from the post because of his protest against the brutal treatment of the Fenian prisoners.—106-07, 409, 427

*MacGeoghegan, James* (1702-1763)—French abbot of Irish origin, author of *History of Ireland*.—290, 299

*Machiavelli, Niccolò* (1469-1527)—Italian politician, historian, military theorist and writer.—75, 419

*MacNevin (MacNeven), William James* (1763-1841)—Irish physician, member of the United Irishmen society.—255, 281

*Macpherson, James* (1736-1796)—Scottish poet, author of several poems based on an Irish epic.—140

*Maelseachlainn II.* (949-1022)—King of Ireland, (980-1002 and 1014-22).—183

*Maguane*—government spy in the United Irishmen society.—255

*Maguire, Thomas*—Irish sailor; arrested in 1867 on a false charge of trying to

arrange the escape of the imprisoned Fenians; was sentenced to be hanged but was released soon afterwards.—3

*Malachy*—see *Maelseachlainn II*

*Malachy, St.* (c. 1094-1148)—Irish prelate, Archbishop of Armagh and papal legate in Ireland.—172, 285

*Malthus, Thomas Robert* (1766-1834)—English clergyman and economist, author of a theory of population.—373

*Manners, Charles, Duke of Rutland* (1754-1787)—British statesman, member of the Privy Council, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1784-87).—236, 239, 242, 243, 276-77

*Mansfield*—see *Murray, William, Lord Mansfield*

*Maolmordha* (d. 1014)—King of Leinster (999-1014).—181, 183

*Marauda*—210

*Marilly, Joseph*—210

*Marly*—Irish Catholic leader, Bishop of Waterford.—261

*Martin, John* (1812-1875)—Irish politician, participant in the national liberation movement in the 1840s; a founder of the National League (1864); Honorary Secretary of the Home Rule League, M.P. (1871-75).—439

*Marx, Jenny (née von Westphalen)* (1814-1881)—wife of Karl Marx.—61

*Marx, Jenny* (1844-1883)—Karl Marx's eldest daughter.—414, 420-21, 424

*Marx, Karl* (1818-1883)—4, 10, 18, 32, 33, 35, 38, 51, 55-64, 90, 93, 94, 101, 110-12, 122, 124, 125, 133, 134, 195, 210, 278, 317, 320, 322, 323, 324, 326, 337, 344, 361, 366, 378, 380, 382, 383, 386, 387, 389, 392-93, 394, 397, 398, 399, 407, 410, 411, 412, 413, 443-46

*Mary I* (1516-1558)—Queen of England (1553-58), wife of Philip II, of Spain.—289, 297, 298

- Massey, William Nathaniel* (1809-1881)—English historian, author of an unfinished work on the reign of George III.—290
- Matis, A.*—210
- Maulet, Joseph D.*—210
- Maurice, Zévy*—tailor; member of the General Council of the International (1866-72), Corresponding Secretary for Hungary (1870-71).—26
- Maxwell*—Attorney-General of Ireland (1796).—254, 280
- Mayo*—see *Naas, Richard Southwell Bourke, Earl of Mayo*
- 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); after the foundation of the International in 1864 tried to bring it under his influence.—323
- Meagher, Thomas Francis* (1823-1867)—leader of the Irish national liberation movement in the 1840s; a founder of the Irish Confederation (1847); in 1848 was arrested and sentenced to penal servitude for life for taking part in the preparation of an uprising; escaped in 1852 and emigrated to the USA; during the US Civil War (1861-65) commanded the brigade of Irish volunteers that fought on the side of the Northerners.—200, 206, 318
- Meissner, Otto Karl* (1819-1902)—Hamburg publisher; brought out Marx's *Capital* and other works by Marx and Engels.—62
- Mela, Pomponius* (1st cent.)—Roman geographer, author of *De situ orbis* in three volumes.—161
- Mende, Fritz* (d. 1879)—member of the General Association of German Workers; president of the Lassallean General Association of German Workers founded by Hatzfeldt (1869-72); deputy to the North-German Imperial Diet (1869).—24
- Mermillod, François*—Swiss case-maker; took an active part in the Swiss working-class movement in the latter part of the 1860s; Vice-President of the Romance Federation of the International; delegate to the Brussels Congress (1868).—210
- Methuen, John* (c. 1650-1706)—British diplomat; in 1703 concluded a trade treaty with Portugal known as the Methuen Treaty.—224
- Meyer, Sigfrid* (c. 1840-1872)—a prominent figure in the German and American working-class movement, socialist; engineer; member of the General Association of German Workers; opposed the Lassallean influence in the German working-class movement; in 1864 published in Germany, at his own expense, the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* by Marx and Engels; in 1866 emigrated to the USA, member of the New York Communist Club; an organiser of the International's sections in the USA; follower of Marx and Engels.—443
- Meyers*—doctor at Broadmoor asylum.—422, 431.
- Milner, George*—Irishman, prominent figure in the British working-class movement; follower of James O'Brien; member of the National Reform League and of the Land and Labour League; member of the General Council of the International (1868-72), delegate to the London Conference (1871) of the International; member of the British Federal Council (autumn of 1872 to 1873); fought the reformist wing in the Council.—26, 55, 387, 392, 399
- Mitchel, John* (1815-1875)—Irish revolutionary democrat, Left-wing leader of the Young Ireland group; deported to a penal colony for taking part in the preparation of an uprising in 1848; escaped in 1853 and emig-

- rated to the USA; fought on the side of the Southerners during the US Civil War; author of *The History of Ireland*.—222, 232, 256, 266
- Moir**—see *Hastings, Francis Rawdon, Marquis of Hastings, Earl of Moira*
- Molyneux, William** (1656-1698)—Irish scholar, studied philosophy, mathematics and astronomy; M.P. from Dublin University; author of an essay, *The Case of Ireland* (1698).—197, 212
- Monachon, L.**—210
- Monk (Monck), George, 1st Duke of Albemarle** (1608-1670)—English general and statesman; originally a royalist; later served in Cromwell's army; helped restore the Stuart dynasty in 1660.—264
- Moore, Charles, 6th Earl and 1st Marquis of Drogheda** (1730-1822)—Anglo-Irish politician; judge; field marshal, M.P., supported the Anglo-Irish Union.—266
- Moore, George Henry** (1811-1870)—Irish politician, leader of the tenant-right movement, M.P. (1847-57, 1868-70); defended the imprisoned Irish Fenians.—103, 313, 408, 410, 415, 422, 425-26, 430
- Moore, John**—coroner of the Midleton district.—104, 107, 415
- Moore, Thomas (Morus)** (1779-1852)—Irish poet and writer, author of *The History of Ireland* in four volumes.—287, 309, 310
- Moreau, Jean Victor Marie** (1763-1813)—French general; took part in the wars waged by the French Republic against European coalitions.—246
- Morhardt, Emile**—Swiss official in the Geneva canton in the 1860s.—71
- Morley, Samuel** (1809-1886)—English manufacturer and politician; owner of *The Bee-Hive Newspaper* (1869).—126
- Moryson, Fynes** (1566-1630)—English traveller; author of *An Itinerary...*, a part of which contains the description of Ireland.—173
- Mottershead, Thomas** (c. 1825-1884)—English weaver; member of the General Council (1869-72), Corresponding Secretary for Denmark (1871-72); delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872) of the International; opposed Marx's line in the General Council and the British Federal Council; expelled from the International by decision of the General Council on May 30, 1873.—411
- Mountjoy**—see *Blount, Charles, Lord Mountjoy, Earl of Devonshire*
- Mroczkowsky, Valérien** (1840-1889)—photographer; took part in the Polish insurrection of 1863, after which he emigrated first to France and then to Switzerland; follower of Bakunin; member of the League of Peace and Freedom Committee; member of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, both the open and the secret alliance.—210
- Mulcahy, Denis Dowling** (b. 1840)—Irish journalist and physician; leader of the Fenian organisation in Clonmel; a leader of the Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood; assistant editor of *The Irish People* (1863-65); sentenced to ten years' penal servitude (1865); amnestied in 1871.—101
- Müller, Anton**—Swiss watchmaker; member of the General Council of the International (1869).—55
- Münzer, Thomas** (c. 1490-1525)—leader of the urban plebeians and poor peasants during the Reformation and the Peasant War in Germany (1525); advocated egalitarian utopian communism.—93
- Murchadh** (d. 1070)—first Irish King of the Dublin Danes; son of Finn, King of Leinster.—183
- Murphy** (called *O'Leary*)—Irish Fenian; in 1864 was arrested for agitation among the royal army soldiers in

- Ireland; sentenced to ten years' penal servitude.—102, 415
- Murphy, John Nicholas*—English journalist, author of several works, including *Ireland, Industrial, Political, and Social* published in London in 1870.—297, 298, 300, 301-05
- Murray, Patrick Joseph*—inspector of a convict prison in Dublin.—104, 409, 427
- Murray, William, Lord Mansfield* (1705-1793)—British statesman, Chief Justice of the King's Bench.—232, 275
- N
- Naas, Richard Southwell Bourke, Earl of Mayo* (1822-1872)—British statesman, Conservative; Chief Secretary for Ireland (1852, 1858-59, 1866-68); Viceroy of India (1869-72).—103, 409, 427
- Napoleon I Bonaparte* (1769-1821)—Emperor of the French (1804-14 and 1815).—246, 313
- Napoleon III (Charles Louis Napoleon Bonaparte)* (1808-1873)—nephew of Napoleon I; President of the Second Republic (December 1848 to 1851), Emperor of the French (1852-70).—13, 18, 42, 49, 57, 62, 72, 97, 189, 365, 408, 435
- Neilson, Samuel* (1761-1803)—an organiser of the United Irishmen society; founder of *The Northern Star* (Belfast, 1792); supporter of Ireland's independence.—219, 247, 255
- Nennius* (8th cent.)—Welsh chronicler, author of *Historia Britonum*.—177, 308
- Nero (Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus)* (37-68)—Roman Emperor (54-68).—328
- Nest* or *Nesta*—daughter of Rhys ap Tewdwr, King of South Wales.—172
- Newell*—government spy in the United Irishmen society.—255
- Newenham, Sir Edward* (1732-1814)—participant in the volunteer movement in the early 1780s; member of the Irish Parliament (1769-97); supporter of the Anglo-Irish Union.—245
- Newport, Sir John* (1756-1843) — participant in the volunteer movement in the early 1780s; Whig, member of the British Parliament (1803-32); supporter of emancipation of the Catholics.—267
- Nicholas I* (1796-1855)—Emperor of Russia (1825-55).—429
- Nidegger, Louis*—209-10
- Niemtzik, Eduard Richard Julius* (1838-1897)—active in the Slovak working-class movement; an organiser of the workers' educational association *Vpred* (Forward) in Bratislava (Pressburg) (1869).—78
- North, Frederick, 2nd Earl of Guilford* (1732-1792) — British statesman, Tory; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1767), Prime Minister (1770-82), Home Secretary in Portland's Coalition Cabinet (1783).—222, 226, 231, 240, 270-71, 273, 274, 295
- Nothor, Labeo* (c. 952-1022)—German monk who taught at the monastic school of St. Gall, Switzerland.—175
- O
- Oates, Titus* (1649-1705)—English Protestant clergyman.—289
- O'Braein, Tighearnach* (d. 1088)—Irish annalist and abbot.—168-69, 309
- O'Brien*—government spy in the United Irishmen society.—255
- O'Brien, James* (literary pseudonym *Bronterre*) (1805-1864)—British journalist, Chartist leader; editor of *Poor Man's Guardian* (1830s); author of several social reform projects; founder of the National Reform League (1849).—26

- O'Brien, Sir Lucius Henry* (d. 1795)—member of the Irish Parliament, member of the Privy Council from 1787, clerk of the High Court of Chancery.—225
- O'Brien, Michael* (d. 1867)—Irish Fenian, executed by sentence of an English court.—3, 13
- O'Byrnes*—noble Irish family.—301
- O'Clery, Michael* (1575-1643)—Irish monk, chronicler, a compiler of *Anales IV Magistrorum*.—168, 309
- O'Connell, Daniel* (1775-1847)—Irish lawyer and politician; leader of the liberal wing in the national liberation movement.—192, 194, 201
- O'Connor, Arthur* (1763-1852)—a prominent figure in the Irish national liberation movement; in 1797-98 a leader of the United Irishmen society and editor-in-chief of its organ, *The Press*; arrested on the eve of the 1798 uprising; emigrated to France in 1803.—169, 255, 281
- O'Connor, Brian* (or *Bernard*) (c. 1490-c. 1560)—Leinster chieftain, Lord of Offaly.—289, 297
- O'Connor, Feargus Edward* (1794-1855)—Left-wing Chartist leader, editor-in-chief of *The Northern Star*; reformist after 1848.—169
- O'Connors*—noble Irish family from Offaly County (later King's County) in Leinster Province.—297
- O'Conor, Charles* (1764-1828)—Irish priest and collector of antiquities, translator and editor of Irish chronicles.—168
- O'Conor, Matthew* (1773-1844)—Irish historian, author of *The History of the Irish Catholics*...—283, 300, 304
- O'Curry, Eugene* (1796-1862)—Irish historian, authority on the chronicles; from 1852 member of the government commission for translating and publishing the ancient Irish laws; author of a work on ancient Irish manuscripts.—170
- 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, London; 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.—26, 55, 344, 356, 412
- O'Dogherty, Sir Cahir* (1587-1608)—Irish feudalist, leader of the 1608 uprising.—300
- O'Donnell*—see *M'Donnell*
- O'Donnell, Hugh Mac-Manus, Lord of Tyrconnel from 1566*—North Irish chieftain; father of Irish insurgent leader Hugh O'Donnell.—298
- O'Donnell, Hugh Roe (Red Hugh), Lord of Tyrconnel* (c. 1571-1602)—a leader of the anti-English insurrection.—298
- O'Donnell, Rory, 1st Earl of Tyrconnel* (1575-1608)—North Irish chieftain, brother of Hugh O'Donnell.—293
- O'Donovan, John* (1809-1861)—Irish philologist and historian, from 1852 member of government commission on the translation and publication of ancient Irish laws.—168, 169-70, 173-74
- O'Donovan Rossa, Jeremiah* (1831-1915) a leader of the Fenian movement; publisher of *The Irish People* (1863-65); in 1865 was arrested and sentenced to life imprisonment; amnestied in 1870; emigrated to the USA where he headed the Fenian organisation; retired from political

- life in the 1880s.—101, 103, 410, 414, 415, 416-22, 423-24, 427-28, 436, 438, 450
- O'Donovan Rossa, Mary J.*—wife of Jeremiah O'Donovan Rossa; organised the collection of funds for the families of the Irish political prisoners in 1865-66; author of an appeal to Irish women published in *The Workman's Advocate* on January 6, 1866 by the decision of the General Council.—417
- O'Leary*—see *Murphy* (called *O'Leary*)
- O'Mahony, Thaddeus*—Irish philologist; jointly with Hancock he published two volumes of *Senchus Mor*, a collection of ancient laws.—170
- O'More, Guilpatrick*—chieftain of the big Irish clan; owner of the County Leix; fought against English domination until 1542.—289, 297
- O'Mores*—Irish clan from County Leix (later Queen's County) in Leinster Province.—297
- O'Neill, Conn Bacach* (c. 1484-c. 1559)—descendant of the ancient Irish feudal clan in Northern Ireland; Earl of Tyrone (from 1542).—297
- O'Neill, Hugh, Earl of Tyrone* (c. 1540-1616)—head of an influential clan in Ulster; leader of an insurrection against the English (1595-1603).—293, 298
- O'Neill, John, 1st Viscount O'Neill* (1740-1798)—member of the Irish Parliament, Governor of the County of Antrim; killed during the Irish uprising of 1798.—224, 242, 244
- O'Neill, Sir Phelim* (c. 1604-1653)—Irish nobleman, participant in the 1641 uprising.—293
- O'Neill, Shane, Earl of Tyrone* (c. 1530-1567)—leader of a rebellion against the English (1559-67).—288
- O'Neills*—an Irish family from Northern Ireland.—289
- Orde*, afterwards *Orde-Powlett, 1st Baron Bolton* (1746-1807)—English lawyer; member of the Irish Parliament (1784-90); member of the Privy Council of Ireland and its Chief Secretary (1784-87).—236, 237, 239-42, 276-78
- Oriel*—see *Foster, John, Baron Oriel*
- Ormonde*—see *Butler, James, 12th Earl and 1st Duke of Ormonde*
- Orr, William* (1766-1797)—Irish farmer, member of the United Irishmen society; executed for taking part in the movement.—255, 280
- O'Shea, William Henry* (1840-1905)—Irish public figure; came out in support of the imprisoned Fenians in 1869.—83
- Ospakr*—Irish soldier, fought at the battle of Clontarf (1014).—182
- Owen, Robert* (1771-1858)—English utopian socialist.—331, 382

## P

- Palmerston, Henry John Temple, 3rd Viscount* (1784-1865)—British statesman, Tory, from 1830 Whig; Foreign Secretary (1830-34, 1835-41, 1846-51), Home Secretary (1852-55) and Prime Minister (1855-58, 1859-65).—193, 322, 331, 435
- Parkinson-Fortescue, Chichester Samuel, Baron Carlingford* (1823-1898)—British Liberal statesman, M.P. (1847-74), Chief Secretary for Ireland (1865-66, 1868-70).—408
- Parnell, Sir John* (1744-1801)—Irish lawyer, Protestant; member of the Irish Parliament from 1761, Chancellor of the Exchequer from 1799; opposed the Anglo-Irish Union.—261, 266
- Parsons, Sir Lawrence, 2nd Earl of Rosse* (1758-1841)—Irish politician, member of the Irish Parliament.—254, 261
- Parsons, Sir William* (1570-1650)—Lord Justice of Ireland (1640-43), inspired

- policy of Ireland's colonial subjugation.—300, 302
- Patrick, St.* (c. 389-c. 461)—Christian missionary in Ireland; founder of the Irish Catholic Church and its first bishop.—171, 176, 178, 433
- Patterson, William*—Irish physician, author of *Observations on the Climate of Ireland*.—164
- Peel, Sir Robert* (1788-1850)—British statesman, moderate Tory, Prime Minister (1834-35, 1841-46); repealed the Corn Laws in 1846.—28-30, 158, 382
- Pelagius* (c. 360-c. 420)—a British theologian; condemned as a heretic for preaching the doctrine of righteousness by the exercise of free will.—176-77
- Pelham, Thomas, Earl of Chichester* (1756-1826)—member of the Irish Parliament, Whig; opposed emancipation of Catholics; Chief Secretary of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland Camden in 1795-98.—254, 280
- Pellaton, S.*—Secretary of the Bakers' Co-operative Society in Geneva; member of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, withdrew from it in February 1869.—210
- Pellegrin-Druart, A.*—210
- Pelletier, Claude* (1816-1881)—French democrat; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (1848-51); exiled from France after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; emigrated to the USA; the International's correspondent for the French-language section in America.—442
- Perret, Henri*—prominent figure in the Swiss working-class movement; engraver, a leader of the International in Switzerland, General Secretary of the Romance Federal Committee (1868-73); member of the *Égalité* editorial board; delegate to the Geneva (1866) and Basle (1869) congresses and to the London Conference (1871) of the International; member of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy; in 1869 broke with the Bakuninists, but adopted a conciliatory stand after the Hague Congress of the International (1872).—84, 117, 123, 210
- Perrié*—210
- Perron, Charles Eugène* (1837-1919)—active in the Swiss working-class movement; enamel painter, then cartographer; delegate to the Lausanne (1867) and Brussels (1868) congresses of the International; follower of Bakunin; member of the Central Bureau of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy; an editor of *L'Égalité* (1869) and *La Solidarité*; a leader of the Jura Federation; subsequently left the working-class movement.—114, 123, 210
- Perrot, Sir John* (c. 1527-1592)—Lord President of Munster (1570-73), Lord Deputy of Ireland (1584-88).—298
- Petrie, George* (1789-1866)—Irish scholar, archaeologist; member of the Irish Royal Academy; author of works on ancient Irish architecture; from 1852 member of the government commission for translating and publishing the ancient Irish laws.—165, 169, 170
- Petty, Sir William* (1623-1687)—English economist and statistician, founder of the classical school of bourgeois political economy in Britain.—268-69, 303, 305
- Phelan, William* (1789-1830)—Irish scholar; author of works on the history of Ireland.—290
- Philip, Prince* (1837-1905)—Count of Flanders, son of Leopold I of Belgium.—48
- Philip II* (1527-1598)—King of Spain (1556-98), Mary I's husband.—298
- Pichegru, Charles* (1761-1804)—French general; in 1794-95 conducted military operations in Holland.—246
- Pigott, Richard* (c. 1828-1889)—Irish journalist, publisher of *The Irishman* (1865-79); supporter of the Fenians;

- sided with the British government in the 1880s.—415, 437
- Pinière* (or *Pinier*) (d. after 1898)—Swiss shopkeeper; Bakunist; member of the editorial board of *L'Égalité* (1869).—123, 210
- Pirmez, Eudore* (1830-1890)—Belgian statesman, Liberal M.P. (1857-90); Home Minister (1868-70), Director of the National Bank.—48
- Pisteur, Fr.*—210
- Pitt, William* (1759-1806)—British statesman, a Tory leader; Prime Minister (1783-1801, 1804-06).—227, 235, 236, 240-42, 246, 252, 256-62, 265, 276, 281, 282, 290, 295
- Placide, Margarittaz*—210
- Plantagenets*—English royal dynasty (1154-1399).—292
- Pliny the Elder* (*Gaius Plinius Secundus*) (A.D. 23-79)—Roman scholar, author of *Natural History* in 37 volumes.—175, 312
- Plunket, Oliver* (1629-1681)—Irish Archbishop in Armagh County.—289
- Plunket, Thomas Span, 2nd Lord Plunket of Newtown* (1792-1866)—elder son of William Conyngham Plunket; Bishop in Ireland from 1839.—266
- Plunket, William Conyngham, 1st Baron Plunket* (1764-1854)—Irish lawyer; Lord Chancellor of Ireland from 1830, member of the King's Council from 1797; M.P.; opponent of the Anglo-Irish Union; after the Union was a member of the government.—261, 266
- Poerio, Carlo* (1803-1867)—Italian politician, Liberal; Prefect of Police and Minister of Education in Naples in 1848; imprisoned in 1849-59 for taking part in the national movement; Vice-President of Parliament (1861-67).—105
- Pollock, George D.*—British army doctor; member of the commission, which in June 1867 submitted to the Parliament a report on the treatment of the political prisoners in the English convict prisons.—418, 424, 427-29, 438
- Ponsonby, George* (1755-1817)—lawyer; member of the Irish Parliament from 1776; Lord Chancellor of Ireland.—227, 254, 273, 280
- Portland, William Henry Cavendish Bentinck, 3rd Duke of* (1738-1809)—English statesman, a Whig leader; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1782-83); Home Secretary (1794-1801), Prime Minister (1783, 1807-09).—226, 227-31, 273-74
- Postleb, Charles*—210
- Potemkin, Grigory Alexandrovich, Prince Tavrishesky* (1739-1791)—Russian statesman, field marshal-general, Commander-in-Chief of the Russian army in the Russo-Turkish war of 1787-91.—288
- Potot, John*—210
- Potter, George* (1832-1893)—British worker, carpenter; a reformist leader of the trade-union movement; member of the London Trades Council and a leader of the Amalgamated Union of Building Workers; founder, editor and publisher of *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*.—26, 37
- Poynings, Sir Edward* (1459-1521)—British statesman, Henry VII's Attorney-General, Lord Deputy of Ireland (1494-96).—212, 215, 225, 270, 272, 287
- Pratt, John Jeffreys, 2nd Earl and 1st Marquis of Camden* (1759-1840)—British statesman; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1795-99); English Secretary for War (1804-05); advocated Orangeism.—245, 252-54, 257, 258, 279, 280
- Prendergast, John Patrick* (1808-1893)—Irish historian, Liberal, author of works on the history of Ireland.—303
- Proudhon, Pierre Joseph* (1809-1865)—French writer, economist and sociologist; a founder of anarchism.—56-57, 61, 344, 393, 399



- Ptolemy (Claudius Ptolemaeus)* (2nd cent.)—Greek mathematician, astronomer and geographer; founder of the geocentric conception of the universe.—175
- Pyat, Félix* (1810-1889)—French journalist, playwright and politician; democrat; took part in the 1848 revolution; emigrated in 1849 to Switzerland and later to Belgium and England; opposed independent working-class movement; conducted a slander campaign against Marx and the First International; member of the Paris Commune (1871).—7
- R
- Radcliffe, Thomas, 3rd Earl of Sussex* (c. 1526-1583)—Lord Deputy of Ireland from 1556.—298, 300
- Raleigh, Sir Walter* (c. 1552-1618)—British military figure and explorer; favourite of Elizabeth I; took part in suppressing uprisings in Ireland.—288
- Raspail, François Vincent* (1794-1878)—French naturalist and writer; socialist; sympathised with the revolutionary proletariat; took part in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848; after the revolution of 1848 was imprisoned, then lived in exile in Belgium; returned to France in 1863; deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1869).—71
- Rau, Wilhelm*—member of the Central Committee of the German-speaking sections in Geneva.—210
- Raymond, Charles*—delegate to the first congress of the Romance Federation of the International (January 1869); Secretary of the Central Section in Geneva (1870).—210
- Reilly, Henry*—Sheriff of the County of Dublin; supporter of reforms; in 1784 was prosecuted for an attempt to organise, in the county, election of members to a national congress.—237, 276
- Rémy, Theodor*—Swiss teacher; Secretary of the Central Committee of the German-speaking sections in Geneva; follower of Bakunin; member of the Geneva Section of the International named Alliance of Socialist Democracy.—209
- Reynolds, Thomas* (1771-1836)—joined the United Irishmen society in 1797; reported to the government on the plan for the uprising; later an English official.—256
- Rhys ap Iewdwr* (d. 1093)—King of South Wales (1078-93).—173
- Richard, Albert* (1846-1925)—French journalist; a leader of the Lyons Section of the International; member of the secret Alliance of Socialist Democracy; took part in the Lyons uprising of September 1870; after the suppression of the Paris Commune, a Bonapartist.—108
- Richelieu, Armand Jean du Plessis de* (1585-1642)—French statesman, Cardinal, Chief Minister of Louis XIII.—293
- Robin, Paul* (1837-1912)—French teacher; Bakunist; a leader of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy; member of the General Council (1870-71); delegate to the Basle Congress (1869) and the London Conference (1871) of the First International; an editor of *L'Égalité* (1870).—123
- Rochambeau, Jean Baptiste Donatien de Vimeur, comte de* (1725-1807)—Marshal of France; commanded a French corps during the American War of Independence.—217
- Rochat, François*—210
- Rochefort, Henri, marquis de Rochefort-Luçay* (c. 1831-1913)—French journalist and politician; Left-wing republican; publisher of the journal *La Lanterne* (1868-69) and the newspaper *La Marseillaise* (1869-70); after the revolution of September 4, 1870, a member of the Government of

- National Defence; monarchist from the end of the 1880s.—414, 436
- Rochow, Gustav Adolf Rochus von* (1792-1847)—Prussian Minister of the Interior (1834-42).—43
- Rockingham*—see *Watson-Wentworth, Charles, 2nd Marquis of Rockingham*
- Rogers*—English army officer, major of artillery, served in Ireland (1799).—262, 264
- Ross, J.*—English worker; member of the General Council of the International (1869).—55
- Rossa* (5th cent.)—according to tradition, a compiler of *Senchus Mor*, a collection of ancient laws.—171
- Rossety* (or *Rossetti*), *Biagio (Blaise)*—Italian worker; President of the Italian Section in Geneva; member of the Romance Federal Committee from 1870.—210
- Rouher, Eugène* (1814-1884)—French statesman, Bonapartist; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; Minister of Justice (1849-52, with intervals); held several government posts during the Second Empire.—13, 365, 366, 374
- Rowan, Archibald Hamilton* (1751-1834)—Irish politician; English army officer; Secretary of the United Irishmen society in Dublin; in 1794 was prosecuted for the Proclamation to the Volunteers of Ireland.—245, 248, 251
- Ruchet, Charles*—210
- Ruge, Arnold* (1802-1880)—German radical journalist; Young Hegelian; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly in 1848 (Left wing); a leader of German petty-bourgeois refugees in England during the 1850s; National-Liberal after 1866.—61
- Rushworth, John* (c. 1612-1690)—English historian and statesman.—294
- Russell, John Russell, 1st Earl* (1792-1878)—British statesman, Whig leader; Prime Minister (1846-52, 1865-66), Foreign Secretary (1852-53, 1859-65).—28, 345
- Russell, Thomas* (1767-1803)—Irish army officer; a founder of the United Irishmen society in Belfast; executed for taking part in the movement in 1803.—219
- Rutland*—see *Manners, Charles, Duke of Rutland*
- Rutty, John* (1698-1775)—Irish physician and meteorologist; author of works on medicine and meteorology.—162-63

## S

- Saint-Paul, Wilhelm* (c. 1815-1852)—Prussian army officer, then an official in the Ministry of the Interior; censor of the *Rheinische Zeitung* in 1843.—60
- Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de Rouvroy, comte de* (1760-1825)—French utopian socialist.—66, 115, 208, 395
- Sampson, William* (1764-1836)—member of the United Irishmen society, was arrested and deported to France for taking part in the 1798 uprising.—255, 281
- Sanguinède, J.*—210
- Sanguinède, Rosalie*—210
- Saurin, William* (c. 1757-1839)—Irish lawyer; member of the Irish Parliament from 1799; Attorney-General of Ireland; opposed the Anglo-Irish Union.—261, 265
- Saxo Grammaticus* (mid-12th-beginning of 13th cent.)—Danish chronicler; author of *Gesta Danorum (Historia Danica)*.—184
- Schettel, Adrien*—French worker, mechanic; Left-wing Republican; took part in the revolution of 1848; an organiser of the Lyons Section of the International; delegate to the Geneva

- (1866) and Lausanne (1867) congresses of the International; was imprisoned for taking part in the revolutionary events in Lyons in September 1870.—108
- Schönburg, Prinz*—owner of coal-mines in Saxony (1869).—40, 41
- 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.—25, 37
- 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).—10, 32, 33, 90-91, 116, 122, 133-34
- Scopini, J. J.*—Chairman and then Deputy Secretary of the Geneva Section of joiners, mechanics and rollers; delegate to the Chaux-de-Fonds Congress of the Romance Federation (April 1870).—210
- Scott, John, Earl of Clonmel* (1739-1798)—Irish lawyer; member of the Irish Parliament; Attorney-General of Ireland.—227, 265, 273
- Senior, Nassau William* (1790-1864)—English economist, vulgarised Ricardo's theory; opposed reduction of the working day.—330
- Shakespeare, William* (1564-1616)—English poet and dramatist.—435
- Shannon*—Irish Lord (late 18th-early 19th cent.).—263
- 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, London; 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.—4, 17, 26, 51, 55, 92, 358
- Sheares, Henry* (1753-1798)—Irish lawyer; member of the United Irishmen society; executed as a leader of the 1798 uprising.—255, 281
- Sheares, John* (1766-1798)—Irish lawyer; member of the United Irishmen society; executed as a leader of the 1798 uprising; brother of Henry Sheares.—255, 281
- Sidney, Sir Henry* (1529-1586)—Lord Deputy of Ireland at the beginning of the 1580s.—298
- Sigurd Laudrisson* (11th cent.)—ruler of Orkney Islands.—181-83
- Sihtric or Sigtryggr* (d. 1042)—Norse King of Dublin.—182-83
- Sismondi, Jean Charles Léonard Simonde de* (1773-1842)—Swiss economist; representative of economic romanticism.—57
- Smith, Edward* (c. 1818-1874)—English physician and medical officer of the Privy Council to Inquire into the Nourishment of the Poorer Labouring Classes.—325
- Smith, Goldwin* (1823-1910)—British historian, economist and publicist; Liberal; supported British colonial policy in Ireland; went to the USA in 1868, and to Canada in 1871.—161, 166, 184, 283-96, 313
- Smith, Sir Thomas* (1513-1577)—British statesman, professor of civil law; in 1572 proposed a plan for establishing a colony of Scottish Protestants in Ireland.—288

- Snider, Jacob* (d. 1866)—American inventor of a breechloading rifle.—80
- Snorri, Sturluson* (c. 1178-1241)—Icelandic scald and chronicler.—179
- Solinus, Gaius Julius* (first half of the 3rd cent.)—Roman writer.—175, 312
- Souham, Joseph, comte* (1760-1837)—French general; commanded troops in the wars of the French Republic.—246
- Spencer, John Poyntz Spencer, 5th Earl* (1835-1910)—British statesman; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1868-74, 1882-85); First Lord of the Admiralty (1892-95).—435
- Spenser (Spencer), Edmund* (c. 1552-1599)—English poet and historian; private secretary to the Lord Deputy of Ireland (1580-82); author of the treatise *A View of the State of Ireland* and the poem *The Faerie Queene*.—173, 287, 288, 302, 308
- Speyer, Karl* (b. 1845)—joiner; Secretary of the German Workers' Educational Society in London in the 1860s; from 1870 member of the General Council of the First International in London and then in the USA.—32
- Stacpoole, William*—Irish army officer; Liberal M. P. (1860-80).—416
- Stampa, Gaspare*—member of the Central Council of the Italian workers' associations; delegate to the London Congress of the First International (1867).—341
- Stanley, Edward Henry, 15th Earl of Derby* (1826-1893)—British statesman, Tory, subsequently Liberal; Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs (1852), Secretary of State for Colonies (1858, 1882-85); Secretary of State for India (1858-59), Foreign Secretary (1866-68, 1874-78); son of Edward Derby.—12, 364
- Stepney, Cowell William Frederick* (1820-1872)—active participant in the British working-class movement; member of the Reform League; member of the General Council of the International (1866-72) and its Treasurer (1868-70); delegate to the Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses, and the London Conference (1871) of the International; member of the British Federal Council.—26, 51, 55, 82
- Stieber, Wilhelm* (1818-1882)—Prussian police officer; an organiser of and chief witness for the prosecution in the Cologne Communist trial (1852); jointly with Wermuth wrote *Die Communisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*; later chief of the Prussian political police.—72
- Stieler, Adolf* (1775-1836)—German cartographer.—154
- Stofflét, Jean Nicolas* (1751-1796)—French peasant; an organiser of the royalist mutiny in Vendée (1793-96) during the French Revolution; executed.—246
- Strabo* (c. 63 B.C.-A.D. c. 20)—Greek geographer and historian.—174
- Stafford, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of* (1593-1641)—English statesman; principal minister to Charles I from 1628; Lord Deputy of Ireland (1632-40); advocate of absolutism.—289, 300-01
- Stuart, James Francis Edward* (1688-1766)—James II's son, pretender to the British throne after the dynasty of the Stuarts was deposed.—290
- Stuarts* (also *Steuarts*)—royal dynasty in Scotland (1371-1714) and England (1603-49, 1660-1714).—196, 294, 295
- Stumpf, Paul* (1826-1912)—German mechanic; member of the German Workers' Society in Brussels (1847); member of the Communist League; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany, member of the First International; delegate to the Lausanne Congress of the International (1867); member of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party.—133-34

- Sullivan, Sir Edward* (1822-1885)—Irish lawyer, conducted the trial of Fenians in 1865; Attorney-General for Ireland (1868-70); Master of the Rolls and Lord Chancellor of Ireland (1883-85).—410
- Sumner, Charles* (1811-1874)—American politician, a leader of the Republican Party (Left wing); Senator (from 1851); Chairman of the Senate Committee for Foreign Affairs (1861-71), favoured revolutionary methods of struggle against the slave-owning South; after the victory of the North in the US Civil War (1861-65) spoke in support of political rights for the Negroes.—379
- Sussex, Earl of*—see *Radcliffe, Thomas, 3rd Earl of Sussex*
- Swift, Jonathan* (1667-1745)—Irish satirist.—212, 290
- Sylvia, William* (1828-1869)—prominent figure in the American working-class movement; a founder of the International Ironmoulders' Union (1859) and its President (1863-69); took part in the US Civil War (1861-65) on the side of the North; a founder of the National Labour Union of the United States (1866) and its President (1868-69); favoured affiliation to the International.—81, 82
- Symons, George James* (1838-1900)—English meteorologist.—164, 166
- T
- Tait, Archibald Campbell* (1811-1882)—Archbishop of Canterbury (1868-82).—423
- Tandy, James Napier* (1740-1803)—Irish politician, Whig; favoured free trade; a founder of the United Irishmen society.—223, 244, 248, 271, 279
- Terbert, Michael*—Irish Fenian, sentenced to seven years' penal servitude in 1866; died in prison in 1870.—104-07
- Thiers, Louis Adolphe* (1797-1877)—French historian and statesman, Prime Minister (1836, 1840); deputy to the Constituent (1848) and Legislative (1849-51) Assemblies, head of the Orleanists after 1848; dealt brutally with the Paris Communards (1871); President of the Republic (1871-73).—348
- Thorgils*—see *Thurkill, Thorkill or Turgesius*
- Thorgils*—son of Harald I Fairhair.—179
- Throsteinn Siduhallzson*—Norse Viking; fought at the battle of Clontarf (1014).—181-82
- Thurkill, Thorkill or Turgesius* (d. 845)—Danish King of North Ireland.—179, 181
- Thurloe, John* (1616-1668)—English politician, Secretary of State (1653-60).—303
- Thurneysen, Edward* (1824-1890)—Swiss politician, jurist; member of the Basle Grand Council (1869).—69
- Tierney, George* (1761-1830)—English statesman, M.P. (1796-1830); member of the Privy Council; opposed Pitt's government policy, and the Anglo-Irish Union.—266
- Tighearnach*—see *O'Braein, Tighearnach*
- Tippoo Saib (Tipu Sahib)* (1750-1799)—Sultan of Mysore (1782-99); waged wars against the British conquerors of India in the 1780s and 1790s.—259
- Tirrel, John*—Mayor of Dublin (1602).—299
- Todd, James Henthorn* (1805-1869)—Irish scholar, philologist; from 1852 member of the government commission for translating and publishing the ancient Irish laws; President of the Irish Royal Academy (1856-60).—170

*Toirdhealbhach*—grandson of Brian Borumha; killed at the battle of Clontarf (1014).—183

*Tolain, Henri Louis* (1828-1897)—French engraver; prominent figure in the French working-class movement, Proudhonist; a leader of the Paris Section of the International; delegate to the London Conference (1865) and the Geneva (1866), Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868) and the Basle (1869) congresses of the International; deputy to the National Assembly after September 4, 1870; sided with the Versaillesists during the Paris Commune; expelled from the International in 1871; subsequently senator.—366-68, 369, 370

*Tone, Peter* (d. 1805)—father of Theobald Wolfe Tone.—219

*Tone, Theobald Wolfe* (1763-1798)—Irish bourgeois revolutionary, democrat; founder and leader of the United Irishmen society; an organiser of the 1798 uprising in Ireland.—194, 198, 219, 236, 247, 248, 249, 251, 253-54, 280-82

*Touchet, James, Baron Audley of Hely or Heleigh, 3rd Earl of Castlehaven* (c. 1617-1684)—Anglo-Irish aristocrat, Catholic; supporter of the Stuart dynasty.—302

*Townshend, George, 4th Viscount and 1st Marquis Townshend* (1724-1807)—British soldier and politician; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1767-72).—233, 245

*Tremenheere, Hugh Seymour* (1804-1893)—British official and journalist; member of various government commissions inspecting labour conditions.—327

*Trevellick*—member of the National Labour Union of the United States.—16

*Troy, John Thomas* (1739-1823)—Catholic Bishop of Dublin; supported the Anglo-Irish Union.—263

*Tudors*—royal dynasty in Britain (1485-1603).—292

*Turgesius*—see *Thurkill, Thorhill* or *Turgesius*

*Tyrconnel*—see *O'Donnell, Rory, 1st Earl of Tyrconnel*

*Tyrone*—see *O'Neill, Hugh, Earl of Tyrone*

## U

*Ulfr Hraeda*—Irish soldier, fought at the battle of Clontarf (1014).—182-83

*Underwood, Thomas Nelson*—Irish public figure, spoke in defence of the imprisoned Fenians.—421

*Urban VIII (Maffeo Barberini)* (1568-1644)—Pope from 1623.—293

*Ure, Andrew* (1778-1857)—English chemist and economist, Free Trader.—330

## V

*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; took part in the Paris Commune; shot by the Versaillesists on May 28, 1871.—371

*Victoria* (1819-1901)—Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1837-1901).—421

*Vindry, Augustin*—French worker, dyer; member of the Lyons Section of the International.—108

*Virgilius, Saint* or *Fergil* (d. 785)—Irish missionary, Bishop of Salzburg.—178

*Vogt, August* (c. 1830-c. 1883)—prominent in the German and Ameri-

- can labour movement; shoemaker; member of the Communist League; participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; member of the General Association of German Workers; together with Liebknecht opposed Lassalleanism; member of the International; in 1867 emigrated to the USA; member of the New York Communist Club; an organiser of the International's sections in the United States; correspondent of the General Council; supporter of Marx and Engels.—443
- Vogt, Karl* (1817-1895) — German naturalist; petty-bourgeois democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848-49; one of the five imperial regents (June 1849); left Germany in 1849; later received subsidies from Napoleon III; slandered Marx and Engels.—18, 63
- Vollrath, C. W.*—publisher and printer of the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt* (1868 to April 1869).—354
- Voltaire, (François Marie Arouet)* (1694-1778)—French philosopher, writer and historian of the Enlightenment.—423
- Vyrubov, Grigory Nikolayevich* (1843-1913)—Russian crystallographer and positivist philosopher; lived in Paris from 1864; a founder and publisher of *La Philosophie positive*; member of the League of Peace and Freedom.—113
- W
- Wakefield, Edward* (1774-1854)—English statistician and agronomist, author of *Ireland, Statistical and Political*.—156, 157, 158, 160, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 175, 288, 312
- Walpole, Spencer Horatio (Horace)* (1806-1898)—British statesman, Tory, Home Secretary (1852, 1858-59, 1866-67).—362
- Walsh, David*—member of the Irish Parliament (1782).—228
- Walton, Alfred Armstrong* (b. 1816)—participant in the British democratic movement; architect; member of the Reform League, President of the National Reform League; member of the General Council of the International (1867-70); delegate to the Lausanne Congress (1867).—26
- Warren, John*—British worker, trunk-maker; member of the General Council from the London Trunk-Makers' Society (1869); member of the Reform League.—55
- Warren, Josiah* (c. 1799-1874)—American utopian socialist; follower of Owen; preached theory of just exchange according to labour value.—399
- Washington, George* (1732-1799)—American statesman, Commander-in-Chief during the war of the North American colonies for their independence (1775-83); first President of the United States (1789-97).—217
- Watkin, Sir Edward William* (1819-1901)—English railway promoter, Liberal M. P.—29
- Watson-Wentworth, Charles, 2nd Marquis of Rockingham* (1730-1782)—M.P., Whig, Chancellor in the Coalition Government after capitulation of the North (1782).—226, 231, 273, 274
- Weiss, Ludwig (Louis)* (d. before 1898)—Swiss worker, jeweller; a founder of the first section of the International in Switzerland; member of the Central Committee of the German-speaking sections headed by Johann Philipp Becker.—210
- Weldon, James* (died c. 1795)—Irish cavalryman; member of a secret organisation of Defenders in Dublin.—253
- Wellesley, H.*—see *Cowley, Henry Wellesley, Earl of*

- Wenckheim, Béla* (1811-1879)—Hungarian statesman; Liberal, Home Minister (1867-69).—79
- Wentworth*—see *Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of*
- Westmoreland*—see *Fane, John, Earl of Westmoreland*
- Weston, John*—active in the British labour movement; carpenter; subsequently manufacturer; follower of Owen; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall, London; 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.—4, 26, 55, 139, 393, 406
- Westphalen, Ferdinand Otto Wilhelm Henning von* (1799-1876)—Prussian statesman, Minister of the Interior (1850-58); step-brother of Jenny Marx, Karl Marx's wife.—61
- Westphalen, Johann Ludwig von* (1770-1842)—Jenny Marx's father; Privy Councillor in Trier.—61
- 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; fought in the US Civil War on the side of the North; helped to disseminate the ideas and documents of the International in the USA; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—56
- Wigand, Otto W.* (1795-1870)—German publisher and bookseller; owner of a publishing firm in Leipzig which printed works by radical writers.—56
- William I the Conqueror* (c. 1027-1087)—King of England (1066-87).—292
- William III* (1650-1702)—Prince of Orange, Stadtholder of the Netherlands (1672-1702); King of England, Scotland and Ireland (1689-1702).—140, 194, 196, 197, 305, 317
- William IV* (1765-1837)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1830-37).—268
- William, Duke of Leinster*—see *Fitzgerald, William Robert, 2nd Duke of Leinster*
- Williams, Charles Owen*—British worker, plasterer; co-operator; member of the General Council of the International (1866-68); at the Brussels Congress (1868) was re-elected to the Council but did not take part in its work.—26
- Williams W.*—correspondent of *The Times*; in December 1866 and January 1867, together with Creed H. Herries, published a series of articles on Belgian industry.—357
- Wolsey, Thomas* (c. 1475-1530)—English prelate and statesman.—287
- Woodward, Richard* (1726-1794)—English bishop; wrote books and pamphlets defending the rights of the Irish poor and the Irish Church.—244
- Wucher, Leopold* (d. before 1898)—German worker, tailor; member of the International; Chairman of the tailors' section in Geneva.—210

## Y

- Yelverton, Barry, 1st Viscount Avonmore* (1736-1805)—Irish lawyer; member of the Irish Parliament from 1774; Attorney-General of Ireland.—234
- Yonge, Sir George, 5th Baronet* (1731-1812)—member of the British Parliament; Vice-Treasurer of Ireland (1782).—232, 275
- York, Duke of*—see *James II*
- York, Frederick Augustus, Duke of York and Albany, Earl of Ulster* (1763-



- 1827)—second son of George III of Great Britain; field marshal from 1795; Commander-in-Chief of the British army (1798-1809, 1811-27).—246, 251
- Young, Arthur* (1741-1820)—English economist, writer on agriculture, supporter of the quantity theory of money.—155-56, 157, 158, 162
- Young, Sir George*—see *Yonge, Sir George, 5th Baronet*
- 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).—4, 51, 55
- Zagorsky, Jean*—Polish refugee in Switzerland; member of the committee of the League of Peace and Freedom; in the late 1860s left for Italy and deserted the movement.—210-11
- Zampérini, J.*—Italian worker, hatter; member of the Italian Section of the First International in Geneva.—210
- Zhukovsky, Nikolai Ivanovich* (1833-1895)—Russian anarchist, a refugee in Switzerland from 1862; member of the committee of the League of Peace and Freedom; a leader of the secret Bakuninist Alliance of Socialist Democracy.—210
- Zimmermann, Wilhelm* (1807-1878)—German historian, democrat; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing), author of the *Allgemeine Geschichte des großen Bauernkrieges* published in 1841-43.—93, 94
- Zöller, Phil.*—210

#### INDEX OF LITERARY AND MYTHOLOGICAL NAMES

- Aeneas* (Gr. Myth.)—son of Anchises and Aphrodite, a chief defender of Troy, legendary ancestor of the Romans, the hero of Virgil's epic poem *The Aeneid*.—169
- Arthegall*—a character in Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene*.—288
- Beowulf*—title character of an Anglo-Saxon epic poem.—185
- Ceasair*—grand-daughter of Noah.—169
- Comus*—personification of revelry.—294
- Fingal*—hero of the poems *Fingal* and *Temora* by James Macpherson.—138, 176
- Finn MacCumhal (Cumhaill)*—hero of the Irish epic, who, according to legend, reorganised the Irish troops.—140, 176
- George, Saint*—mythological dragon-slayer.—287
- Hildebrand*—hero of the ancient German epic series *Das Hildebrandslied (Hildebrand, Lay of), Nibelungenlied*, and others.—184
- Japheth* (Bib.)—Noah's son.—169
- Judas Iscariot* (Bib.)—one of the twelve apostles, betrayed Christ for thirty pieces of silver.—415
- Lycurgus*—legendary legislator of ancient Sparta, said to have lived in the 9th-8th centuries B.C.—43
- Medusa* (Gr. Myth.)—one of the three

- snake-haired Gorgons, whose terrifying aspect turned the beholder to stone.—326
- Michael* (Bib.)—one of the seven archangels.—69
- Moloch*—a Sun-God in Carthage and Phoenicia; his worship was accompanied by human sacrifice.—330
- Moses* (Bib.)—a prophet.—169
- Noah* (Bib.)—a patriarch; said to have built an ark in which he and his family were saved from the Deluge.—169
- Odin* (*Othin*)—supreme deity of ancient Scandinavian mythology.—181
- Oliver*—a character in the French epic *Chanson de Roland*, mentioned in Shakespeare's *Henry VI*.—435
- Paul* (Bib.)—one of Christ's twelve apostles.—70
- Penelope*—in Homer's *Odyssey*, the hero's wife and the personification of conjugal fidelity. She waited more than twenty years for her husband's return from the Trojan War and kept her importunate suitors at bay for three years by weaving a shroud for her father-in-law, but unravelling it secretly every night so that it was never finished.—130
- Ragnar Lodbrok*—Viking, legendary hero in the Scandinavian epos.—180
- Roland*—hero of the French epic *Chanson de Roland*, mentioned in Shakespeare's *Henry VI*.—435
- Samuel* (Bib.)—a prophet.—58
- Sangrado*—a character in Le Sage's *L'Histoire de Gil Blas de Santillane*, a physician who held that all ailments could be cured with hot water and blood-letting.—428
- Solomon* (Bib.)—King of Israel, reputed to be very wise.—423
- Stiggins*—character in Charles Dickens' *The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club*, a hypocrite.—430
- Tuathal*—semi-legendary King of Ireland.—310

## INDEX OF QUOTED AND MENTIONED LITERATURE

### WORKS BY KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

Marx, Karl

*To Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America* (present edition, Vol. 20). In: *The Daily News*, No. 5813, December 23, 1864; *The Miner and Workman's Advocate*, No. 95, December 24, 1864.—54, 361

*Address to the National Labour Union of the United States*. London, May 12, 1869 (this volume).—81

*The Belgian Massacres. To the Workmen of Europe and the United States*. London, May 4, 1869 (this volume).—72

*Capital. A Critique of Political Economy*, Vol. I, Book One: *The Process of Production of Capital* (present edition, Vol. 35)

— *Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Oekonomie. Erster Band, Buch I: Der Produktionsprocess des Kapitals*. Hamburg, 1867.—63, 386

*The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850* (present edition, Vol. 10)

— *Die Klassenkämpfe in Frankreich 1848 bis 1850* (published in 1850 under the title *1848 bis 1849*). In: *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, Erstes Heft, Januar 1850; Zweites Heft, Februar 1850, Drittes Heft, März 1850; Fünftes und Sechstes Heft, Mai bis Oktober 1850.—94

*A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (present edition, Vol. 29)

— *Zur Kritik der politischen Oekonomie, Erstes Heft*. Berlin, 1859.—59, 63

[*Draft Resolution of the General Council on the Policy of the British Government Towards the Irish Prisoners*] (this volume). In: *Reynolds's Newspaper*, No. 1006, November 21, 1869; *Le Courrier français*, 24 novembre 1869.—87, 89, 119, 121, 410, 411

*The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (present edition, Vol. 11)

— *Der 18te Brumaire des Louis Napoleon*. In: *Die Revolution*. Eine Zeitschrift in zwanglosen Heften. Erstes Heft. New York, 1852.—56, 62, 94

— *Der achtzehnte Brumaire des Louis Bonaparte*. 2. Ausg. Hamburg, 1869.—56, 62

*The Fenian Prisoners at Manchester and the International Working Men's Association* (this volume)

— À M. G. Hardy, secrétaire d'État de sa Majesté. In: *Le Courrier français*, No. 163, 24 novembre 1867.—13, 89, 121, 363

- The Fourth Annual Report of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association* (this volume). In: *The Times*, No. 26225, September 9, 1868.—47
- The General Council of the International Working Men's Association to the Central Bureau of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy* (this volume)  
— Le Conseil Général au Comité Central d'Alliance Internationale de la Démocratie Socialiste. 9 mars 1869.—115
- The General Council of the International Working Men's Association to Committee Members of the Russian Section in Geneva* (this volume)  
— Главный Совет Международного Товарищества Рабочихъ. Членам Комитета Русской секции въ Женевѣ. Лондон, 24 марта 1870 г. In: *Народное Дѣло*, № 1, 15 апреля 1870 г.—124
- The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland* (this volume)  
— Le Conseil général au Conseil fédéral de la Suisse Romande. Londres, 1-er janvier 1870.—116-22
- Herr Vogt* (present edition, Vol. 17)  
— Herr Vogt. London, 1860.—18, 63
- 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* (present edition, Vol. 20)  
— 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.—53, 112, 323-24, 361, 367-68, 444
- Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional Central Council. The Different Questions* (present edition, Vol. 20). In: *The International Courier*, Nos. 6-7, February 20, and Nos. 8-10, March 13, 1867.—336-41
- The International Working Men's Association and the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy* (this volume)  
— L'Association Internationale des Travailleurs et l'Alliance Internationale de la Démocratie Socialiste. Londres, 22 décembre 1868.—114
- Outline of a Report on the Irish Question Delivered to the German Workers' Educational Society in London on December 16, 1867* (this volume).—191
- 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.—61, 344
- Preface to the First Edition of Volume I of "Capital"* (present edition, Vol. 35)  
— Vorwort. London, 25. Juli 1867. In: Marx, K. Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Oekonomie. Erster Band, Buch I: Der Produktionsprocess des Kapitals. Hamburg, 1867.—326, 380
- Proceedings of the Sixth Rhine Province Assembly. First Article. Debates on Freedom of the Press and Publication of the Proceedings of the Assembly of the Estates* (present edition, Vol. 1)  
— Die Verhandlungen des 6. rheinischen Landtags. Erster Artikel. Debatten über Pressfreiheit und Publikation der Landständischen Verhandlungen. In: *Rheinische Zeitung*, Nr. 125, 128, 130, 132, 135 und 139; 5., 8., 10., 12., 15. und 19. Mai 1842, Beilage.—60

- Proceedings of the Sixth Rhine Province Assembly. Third Article. Debates on the Law on Thefts of Wood* (present edition, Vol. 1)  
 — Verhandlungen des 6. rheinischen Landtags. Dritter Artikel. Debatten über des Holzdiebstahls-Gesetz. In: *Rheinische Zeitung*, Nr. 298, 300, 303, 305 und 307; 25., 27. und 30. Oktober; 1. und 3. November 1842.—60
- Provisional Rules of the Association* (present edition, Vol. 20). 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.—89, 121-22, 323-24, 337, 444
- [*Resolution on Changing the Place of the International's Congress in 1868*] (this volume)  
 — Considering 1-st, that the Belgian Parliament.... In: *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 347, June 6, 1868.—320-21
- Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association* (present edition, Vol. 20). In: *Rules of the International Working Men's Association. Founded September 28th, 1864*. London. Printed by the Westminster Printing Company, 1867.—6, 35, 45, 85, 117-18, 131-33, 209, 337, 367-68
- Statuts de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs votés à la séance du 5 septembre au Congrès de Genève*. In: *Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Statuts et Règlements*. Londres, 1866.—323-24
- Engels, Frederick
- Chronology of Ireland*.—287, 299, 300, 308-09
- On the Dissolution of the Lassallean Workers' Association* (this volume)  
 — Zur Auflösung des Lassalleanischen Arbeiter-Vereins. In: *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, Nr. 40, 3. Oktober 1868.—24
- The Peasant War in Germany* (present edition, Vol. 10)  
 — Der deutsche Bauernkrieg. In: *Neue Rheinische Zeitung-Politisch-ökonomische Revue*. London-Hamburg-New York, 1850, Heft 5-6, Mai-Oktober.—93-95, 97  
 — Der deutsche Bauernkrieg von Friedrich Engels. Zweiter, mit einer Einleitung versehener Abdruck. Leipzig, 1870.—93, 100  
 — Der deutsche Bauernkrieg. Dritter Abdruck. Leipzig, 1875.—93, 100
- The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party* (present edition, Vol. 20)  
 — Die preussische Militärfrage und die deutsche Arbeiterpartei. Hamburg, 1865.—20-24
- Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick
- Fictitious Splits in the International. Private Circular of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association* (present edition, Vol. 23)  
 — Les prétendues scissions dans l'Internationale. Circulaire privée du Conseil Général de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Genève, 1872.—35-36, 46, 90-91
- Manifesto of the Communist Party* (present edition, Vol 6)  
 — Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei. London, 1848.—61

## WORKS BY DIFFERENT AUTHORS

- Alfred the Great. *Anglo-Saxon Version of the Historian Orosius*.—177
- Ammianus Marcellinus. *Rerum gestarum. Libri qui supersunt ex recensione Valesio—Gronoviana*. Liber XX. Lipsiae, 1773.—177
- Anonymus Ravennatis qui circa saeculum VII. Vixit. *De Geographiae libri quinque*. Ex. Ms. Codice Bibliothecae Regiae eruit et Notis illustravit D. Placidus Porcheron. Parisiis, 1688.—177
- Bakounine, M. *Discours de M. Bakounine*. In: *Discours prononcés au Congrès de la Paix et de la Liberté à Berne* (1868). Par M. M. Mroczkowski et Bakounine. Genève, 1869.—112-14  
 — *Hertzen*. In: *La Marseillaise*, No. 72, 73; 2, 3 mars 1870; *Le Progrès*, No. 10, 11, 12; 5, 12, 19 mars 1870.—123
- Bara, J. [Speech in the Chamber of Deputies on May 16, 1868.] In: *La Liberté*, No. 47, 17 mai 1868 (in the article "Le droit de réunion en Belgique").—14-15, 50, 320, 375
- Barry, C. [Letter to the Home Minister Bruce, February 22, 1870.] In: *The Irishman*, No. 37, March 12, 1870.—422
- Bazard, Amand. *Doctrine de Saint-Simon. Exposition*. Première année. 1829. Paris, 1830.—66
- Beaufort, D. A. *Memoir of a Map of Ireland*. London, 1792.—157
- Becker, B. *Enthüllungen über das tragische Lebensende Ferdinand Lassalle's*. Schleiz, 1868.—24  
 — *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.—24
- Becker J. Ph. *Die Internationale Arbeiter-Association und die Arbeiterbewegung in Basel im Winter 1868 auf 1869*. Genf, 1869: [Circular letters of Basle manufacturers. 1868].—69, 70  
 — *Die Internationale Arbeiter-Association und die Arbeitseinstellung in Genf im Frühjahr 1868*. Genf, 1868.—137, 348-53
- Beda Venerabilis. *Historiae Ecclesiasticae libri quinque*.—177
- Beowulf*.—185
- St. Bernard. *De Vita S. Malachiae*. In: *Florilegium insulae sanctorum seu Vitae et acta sanctorum Hiberniae; quibus accesserunt non vulgaria monumenta, hoc est, Sancti Patricii Purgatorium, S. Malachiae Prophetia de summis pontificibus, aliaque nonnulla ... omnia nunc primum partim ex MS, codicibus, partim typis editis collegit et publicabat T. M[essingham]*. Parisiis, 1624.—172, 285, 308
- Bible*  
*The New Testament*  
 Matthew.—440
- Blackwood, F. T. H. *Mr. Mill's Plan for the Pacification of Ireland Examined*. London, 1868.—428
- Boate, G. *Natural History of Ireland*. London, 1652.—162
- [Boileau-Despréaux, N.] *Les satires de Nicolas Boileau-Despréaux*. Jena, 1834.—426

- Borlase, Ed. *The History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion traced from many preceding acts to the grand eruption, the 23 of October, 1641, and thence pursued to the Act of Settlement.* MDCL XII. Parts I-II. London, 1680.—302
- Bruce, H. A. [Speech in the House of Commons on June 4, 1869.] In: *The Irishman*, No. 3, July 17, 1869.—103, 408  
 — [Speech in the House of Commons on June 7, 1869.] In: *The Times*, No. 26442, June 8, 1869.—81  
 — [Letter to Th. N. Underwood dated January 11, 1870.] In: *The Irishman*, No. 37, March 12, 1870.—426  
 — [Speech in the House of Commons on February 18, 1870.] In: *The Times*, No. 26975, February 19, 1870.—104  
 — *To P. Callan, Esq., M. P., Home Office, January 19.* In: *The Irishman*, No. 32, February 5, 1870 (in the article “The Political Prisoners and the Government”).—103
- Burgh, H. [Amendment to the Address to His Majesty George III of October 12, 1779.] In: Mitchel, J. *The History of Ireland...*, Vol. I. Dublin, 1869.—222
- Burnet, G. *The Life of William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore in Ireland. (The copies of certain letters ... in matter of religion, concerning the general motives to the Roman obedience....)* London, 1685.—302
- Caesar, Gaius Julius. *Commentarii de bello Gallico.*—185
- [Caird, J.] *The Plantation Scheme; or, the West of Ireland as a Field of Investment.* By James Caird. Edinburgh and London, 1850.—158
- Callan, Ph. *To the Right Hon. H. A. Bruce, Home Secretary. Reform Club, January 18.* In: *The Irishman*, No. 32, February 5, 1870 (in the article “The Political Prisoners and the Government”).—103
- [Camden, W.] *Britannia: or a Chorographical Description of Great Britain and Ireland, together with the Adjacent Islands.* Written in Latin by William Camden and Translated into English, with Additions and Improvements. The Second Edition. Vols. I-II. London, 1722.—173  
 — *Annales rerum anglicarum et hibernicarum regnante Elizabetha* [1615].—298
- [Campion, E.] *A Historie of Ireland, Written in the Year 1571 by Edmund Campion, sometime fellow of St. John's Colledge, in Oxford.* Vol. I. Dublin, 1809. In: *Ancient Irish Histories. The Works of Spencer, Campion, Hanmer, and Marleborough.* In two volumes. Dublin, 1809.—173
- [Carlisle, F.] *A Letter ... to Earl Fitzwilliam, in Reply to his Lordship's Two Letters.* London, 1795.—251
- Carte, Th. *An History of the Life of James, Duke of Ormonde, from his Birth in 1610, to his Death in 1688.* In two volumes, to which is added..., in another volume, a collection of letters.... London, 1736.—299-300, 302, 303
- Charras, J. B. A. *Histoire de la campagne de 1815. Waterloo.* Bruxelles, 1857.—57  
*The Chronicles of Eri, being the History of the Gaal Sciôt Iber, or the Irish People, translated from the original manuscripts in the Phoenician dialect of the Scythian Language by O'Connor,* Vols. 1-2. London, 1822.—169
- Clarendon, E. H. *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in Ireland Begun in the Year 1641.* Oxford, 1712.—294
- Claudianus. *De IV Consulatu Honorii Augusti panegiricus.*—177

- Claudius Ptolemaeus, *Geographia*, Book II, Chapter 2. Lipsiae, 1845.—175
- Costello, A. E. *Barbarism as illustrated in British Bastiles*. In: *The Irishman*, Nos. 19, 20, 22, November 6, 13, 27, 1869: *Costello's Jail Narrative*.—422
- *The English Bastiles*. In: *The Irishman*, No. 5, July 31, 1869: *Augustine Costello's Jail Journal*.—422
- *Important letter from Augustine E. Costello*. 4 September, 1869. In: *The Irishman*, No. 13, September 25, 1869.—422
- *Barbarism as illustrated in British Bastiles*. In: *The Irishman*, No. 17, October 23, 1869: *Costello's Jail Narrative*.—422
- Creed, H. Herries and Williams, W. *Foreign Competition with British Manufactures. To the Editor of the Times*. Brussels, Dec. 4. In: *The Times*, No. 25678, December 11, 1866.—357
- *Foreign Competition with British Manufactures. To the Editor of the Times*. Dover, Dec. 10. In: *The Times*, No. 25689, December 24, 1866.—357
- *The Belgian Ironworks. To the Editor of the Times*. West Bromwich, December. In: *The Times*, No. 25692, December 27, 1866.—357
- *Foreign Competition in the Iron Trade. To the Editor of the Times*. West Bromwich, Dec. 29. In: *The Times*, No. 25695, December 31, 1866.—357
- *Foreign Competition. To the Editor of the Times*. Jan. 12. In: *The Times*, No. 25708, January 15, 1867.—357
- [Curran, J. Ph.] *The Speeches of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran*. Edited, with *Memoir and Historical Notices*, by Thomas Davis. Dublin, 1855.—216, 234, 236-39, 240, 241, 243-44, 247-51, 253-54, 256, 276-80
- [Speech at the General Election in Newry on October 17, 1812.] In: *The Speeches of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran*. Dublin, 1855.—267
- Davies, J. *Historical Tracts*. London, 1786.—173, 285-87, 299, 308, 310
- Deane, R. [Address to George III, October 12, 1779.] In: Grattan, H. *The Speeches...*, Vol. I. London, 1822.—222
- Defoe, D. *The History of the Union of Great Britain*. Edinburgh, 1709.—269
- Delescluze, Ch. *Le droit d'Association. Devant la justice*. In: *Le Réveil*, No. 2, 9 juillet 1868.—374, 381
- Delfosse, N. J. A. [Speech in the House of Representatives on March 1, 1848.] In: *Les Annales Parlementaires 1847-1848. Chambre des Représentants*. Séance du 1<sup>er</sup> mars 1848.—51
- Diodorus Siculus. *Bibliothecae historicae liber quintus. Insularis*. Argentorati, 1798.—174
- Edda*.—185
- Eginhard. *Annales Regum Francorum Pipini, Caroli Magni et Lodovici, ab anno 741 usque at annum 829, autore quidem incerto, sed docto, Benedictinae religionis monacho*. Item, *Caroli Cognomento Magni, Imperatoris Occidentalis Primi vita et gesta*. Coloniae, Birckmannus, 1561.—177
- Ensor, G. *Anti-Union. Ireland as She Ought to Be*. Newry, 1831.—259-70, 281-82
- Erdmann, J. E. *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, 2 Aufl., Bd. I. Berlin, 1869.—179
- Fitzgibbon, J. [Speech in the Irish Parliament on Parliamentary Reform Bill, about November 10, 1783.] In: Grattan, H. *The Speeches...*, Vol. I.—234



- [Fitzwilliam.] *A Letter from Earl Fitzwilliam to the Earl of Carlisle*. 1795.—251-52
- Флеровский, Н. *Положение рабочего класса въ Россіи*. С.-Петербургъ, 1869.—110, 111
- Fourier, Ch. *Le nouveau monde industriel et sociétaire, ou invention du procédé d'industrie attrayante et naturelle distribuée en séries passionnées* [Paris, 1829].—175
- Garibaldi, G. *The Rule of the Monk, or Rome in the nineteenth century*. London, 1870.—101
- Gennadius. *Illustrium virorum catalogus*. Basiliae, 1529.—177
- Giraldus Cambrensis. *Topographia Hibernica, et Expugnatio Hibernica*. Edited by James F. Dimock. London, 1867. In: Giraldi Cambrensis, *Opera...*, London, Longman, 1861-1891. In eight volumes, Vol. V.—174, 185, 285, 286, 308  
— *The Historical Works of Giraldus Cambrensis*. Bohn, H. G., London, 1863.—172
- Gladstone, W. E. *Ecce homo*. London, Strahan, 1868.—417  
— *The Functions of Laymen in the Church*.—417  
— *The Government and the Fenians. Hawarden, Chester, Oct. 18*. In: *The Times*, No. 26579. October 23, 1869.—83, 105, 407-12  
— *Hawarden, Chester, Oct. 23*. In: *The Times*, No. 26583, October 27, 1869.—83, 105, 408, 410, 412  
— *Prayers*.—417  
— *Propagation of the Gospel*.—417  
— [Speeches in the House of Commons:]  
— April 16, 1863. In: *The Times*, No. 24535, April 17, 1863.—326-27  
— April 7, 1864. In: *The Times*, No. 24841, April 8, 1864.—324  
— February 15, 1870. In: *The Times*, No. 26673, February 16, 1870.—105  
— March 3, 1870. In: *The Times*, No. 26689, March 4, 1870.—417  
— *Two Letters to the Earl of Aberdeen on the State Persecutions of the Neapolitan Government*. London, 1851.—105, 410
- Gordon, J. *A History of Ireland, from the Earliest Account to the Accomplishment of the Union with Great Britain in 1801*, Vols. I-IV. London, 1805.—309  
— *A History of the Rebellion in Ireland in 1789*. Dublin, 1801.—309
- [Grattan, H.] *The Speeches of the Right Honourable Henry Grattan, in the Irish, and in the Imperial Parliament*. In four volumes. London, 1822-1830.—222, 224, 230, 231, 234, 236, 254, 271, 273-75, 277-78  
— [Amendment to the Address to His Majesty George III of October 12, 1779.] In: Mitchel, J. *The History of Ireland...*, Vol. I. Dublin, 1869.—222
- Gray, J. [Enquiry in the House of Commons concerning the treatment of the Irish prisoners.] In: *The Irishman*, No. 3, July 17, 1869.—103, 407
- Grenville, G. N. [Speech at the opening of the Irish Parliament on October 12, 1779.] In: Grattan, H. *The Speeches...*, Vol. I.—222
- Grimm, J. *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*. Göttingen, 1828.—175, 184
- Hallam, H. *The Constitutional History of England, from the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of George II*. Vols. I-III. London, 1869.—285
- [Hanmer, M.] *The Chronicle of Ireland, Collected by Meredith Hanmer, Doctor of Divinity, in the Year 1571*, Vol. II. Dublin, 1809. In: *Ancient Irish Histories. The Works of Spencer, Champion, Hanmer, and Marleburrough*. In two volumes. Dublin, 1809.—173

- Hansemann, D. [Speech in the first United Diet on June 8, 1847.] In: *Preussens erster Reichstag*, Th. 7. Berlin, 1847.—40
- Hegel, G. W. F. *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie*. Bd. 3. In: *Werke*, Bd. XV. Berlin, 1836.—178, 309
- Heine, H. *Neue Gedichte: Romanzen* 7, Anno 1829.—348
- Hieronymus S. Eusebius, *Commentariorum in Jeremiam Prophetam libri sex. Prologus*. In: *Patrologiae, cursus completus, seu bibliotheca universalis, integra, uniformis, commoda, oeconomica, ...* Series latina, 1865.—176
- Das Hildebrandslied*.—185
- Holinshed. *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. In six volumes. Volume VI. *Ireland*. London, 1807.—298
- Hugo, V. *Napoléon le petii*. 6<sup>e</sup> éd. Londres, 1852.—56
- Huriot, V. M. *Thiers a dit qu'en matière de relations internationales, il n'y avait point de politique nouvelle....* In: *Le Courrier français*, No. 12, 24 mars 1867.—348
- Huxley, T. H. *Professor Huxley on political ethnology. 9 January 1870*. In: *Manchester Daily Examiner and Times*, January 12, 1870.—174
- Isidorus Hispalensis. *Etymologiarum libri XX*.—177
- Johnstone, J. *Lodbrokar-Quida; or the Death-Song of Lodbroc*. London, 1782.—181
- [Jukes, J.] *The Student's Manual of Geology* by J. Beete Jukes, M. A. F. R. S. A New Edition. Edinburgh, 1862.—148. 151-52
- Kane, R. *The Industrial Resources of Ireland*. Second Edition. Dublin, 1845.—152, 163-64
- Kickham, Ch. J. *Political Articles and Literary Sketches*. In: *The Irishman*, Nos. 1-11, July 3, 10, 17, 24 and 31, August 7, 14, 21 and 28, September 4 and 11, 1869: *Ireland's Cause*.—422
- Kohl, J. G. *Reisen in Irland*. Bd. I-II, Dresden und Leipzig, 1843.—284
- Krākumāl.—180
- Lassalle, F. *Offenes Antwortschreiben an das Central-Comité zur Berufung eines Allgemeinen deutschen Arbeiter-Congresses zu Leipzig*. Zürich, 1863.—21
- Laurier, C. [Speech in the Haute Cour de Justice, 25 mars 1870.] In: *La Marseillaise*, No. 97, 27 mars 1870.—438
- Lavelle, P. *The Irish Landlord since the Revolution; with Notices of Ancient and Modern Land Tenures in Various Countries*. Dublin, 1870.—434  
— *To the Tenants and Tenant-Farmers of Ireland*. In: *The Freeman's Journal*, March 29, 1870.—434
- [Lavergne, Léonce de.] *The Rural Economy of England, Scotland and Ireland*. Translated from the French. Edinburgh and London, 1855.—159, 160, 283
- Ledru-Rollin, A. A. *The Decline of England*, 2nd ed. London, 1850.—411
- Leland, Th. *The History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II*, Vols. I-III. London, 1773.—298-300, 302-03
- Leslie, Cliffe. [Article on the Economic Position of Ireland.] In: *The Economist*, February 9, 1867.—191, 205

- Liddell, A. F. O. [Reply to Underwood's enquiry made on behalf of Bruce] January 11, 1870. In: *The Irishman*, No. 30, January 22, 1870.—422  
 — [Reply to a letter from C. Barry.] February 24, 1870. In: *The Irishman*, No. 37, March 12, 1870. In the article "Colonel Richard Burke".—422
- Liebknrecht, W. *Erklärung*. Leipzig, 18. Februar 1869. In: *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, Nr. 8, 20. Februar 1869.—91, 122
- [Lincoln, A.] *Mr. Lincoln and the International Working Men's Association*. London, Jan. 31. In: *The Times*, No. 25101, February 6, 1865.—362
- Lingard, J. *A History of England, from the First Invasion by the Romans*. Vols. I-VIII. London, 1819-1830.—303, 305
- Lucas, Ch. *Barber's Letters*. Dublin, 1747.—212
- Macaulay, Lord. *The History of England from the Accession of James the Second*, Vols. I-VIII. London, 1862.—294, 301, 313
- MacGeoghegan, J. *History of Ireland*. Translated by O'Kelly. Dublin, 1844.—290, 299
- [Macpherson, J.] *Fingal, an Ancient Epic Poem in six Books, together with Several Other Poems composed by Ossian, the Son of Fingal, translated from the Gaelic Language*. In: *The Works of Ossian*. 1765.—140, 176
- Massey, W. *A History of England during the Reign of George the Third*. Vols. I-IV. London, 1855-1863.—290
- Mela Pomponius. *De Situ Orbis libri III*. Lipsiae, 1831.—161
- Meyers, J. [Official report on Richard Burke's state of health, dated January 11, 1870.] In: *The Irishman*, No. 37, March 12, 1870. In the article "Colonel Richard Burke".—422
- Mitchel, J. *The History of Ireland, from the Treaty of Limerick to the Present Time: Being a Continuation of the History of the Abbé MacGeoghegan*, Vols. I-II. Dublin, 1869.—222, 224-25, 232, 251, 256, 257, 260, 266
- Molyneux, W., Esq. *The Case of Ireland's Being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England Stated*. Dublin, 1698.—197, 212
- [Moore, G. H.] *Mr. G. H. Moore's Motion upon the Treatment by England of Irish Political Prisoners*. In: *The Irishman*, No. 1, July 3, 1869.—103, 408, 415  
 — [Speech in the House of Commons on March 14, 1870.] In: *The Times*, No. 26699, March 15, 1870.—313  
 — [Speech in the House of Commons on March 17, 1870.] In: *The Times*, No. 26702, March 18, 1870.—425
- Moore, Th. *The History of Ireland*. Paris, 1835-1846. Vols. I-IV.—287, 309, 310
- Morhardt, E. *Genève, le 2 mai (lisez juin) 1869. Le Chancelier de la République et Canton de Genève*. In: *L'Égalité*, No. 20, 5 juin 1869.—71
- Moryson, F. *An Itinerary Containing Ten Years Travels through the Twelve Dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Denmark, Poland, Italy, Turkey, France, England, Scotland and Ireland*. London, 1617.—173
- Murphy, J. N. *Ireland, Industrial, Political, and Social*. London, 1870.—297-305

- Nennius. *Historia Britonum*, with an English version by Gunn. London, 1819.—177, 308  
*Njál's Saga*.—181-84
- O'Connor, M. *The History of the Irish Catholics from the Settlement in 1691, with a View of the State of Ireland from the Invasion by Henry II to the Revolution*. Dublin, 1813.—283, 300, 310
- O'Donnell, J. F. *The Barbarous Treatment of O'Donovan Rossa. To the Editor of the Irishman*. In: *The Irishman*, No. 12, September 18, 1869.—104  
 — *Leaves from the Diary of a Fenian Prisoner at Chatham* (Communicated by John F. O'Donnell). In: *The Irishman*, No. 15, October 9, 1869.—104
- O'Donovan, J. *Annala Rioghachta Eireann. Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters, from the earliest period to the year 1616*. Dublin, 1856.—168, 169, 170, 171, 174
- O'Donovan Rossa. [Letter] 5 mars 1870. In: *La Marseillaise*, No. 79, 9 mars 1870.—436  
 — [Letter.] In: *Der Volksstaat*, Nr. 22, 16. März 1870: *Politische Uebersicht*.—436  
 — *Letter from the Member for Tipperary*. In: *The Irishman*, No. 32, February 5, 1870.—419
- O'Neill, Ph. [Address to His Majesty of October 9, 1781.] In: Grattan, H. *The Speeches...*, Vol. I. London, 1822.—224
- Orde, Th. [Propositions regarding the trade between Ireland and Great Britain made on February 11, 1785.] In: Grattan, H. *The Speeches...*, Vol. I. London, 1822.—236, 276
- Palmerston, J. [Speech in the House of Commons on June 23, 1863.] In: *The Times*, No. 24593, June 24, 1863.—331
- Patterson, W. *Observations on the Climate of Ireland*. Dublin, 1804.—164
- Petrie, G. *The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland, anterior to the Anglo-Norman Invasion*. Dublin, 1845.—165, 169
- Petty, W. *The Political Anatomy of Ireland*. In: *Tracts; Chiefly Relating to Ireland...* Dublin, 1769.—268, 269, 303, 305
- Phelan, W. *The Remains. With a biographical memoir by John [Jebb], Bishop of Limerick*. Vols. I-II. London, 1832.—290
- Plinius Gaius Secundus (Pliny the Elder). *Historiae naturalis*, Lugduni Batavorum, 1635.—175
- Portland, W. H. [Speech in the Irish Parliament on May 27, 1782.] In: Grattan, H. *The Speeches...*, Vol. I. London, 1822.—228  
 — [Speech at the closing of the Irish Parliament on July 27, 1782.] In: Grattan, H. *The Speeches...*, Vol. I. London, 1822.—231
- Prendergast, J. P. *The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland*. London, 1865.—303
- Proudhon, P. J. *La Révolution sociale démontrée par le coup d'état du 2 décembre*. 2<sup>e</sup> éd. Paris, 1852.—56  
 — *Système des contradictions économiques, ou Philosophie de la misère*. T. 1-2. Paris, 1846.—61
- Pyat, F. [Speech at a Public Meeting at Cleveland Hall in London on June 29, 1868.] In: *L'Espiegle*, No. 25, 5 juillet 1868.—7

- Raspail, F. V. [Speech in the *Corps législatif* on July 8, 1869.] In: *Annales du Sénat et du Corps législatif. Session extraordinaire du 28 juin au 6 septembre 1869.* Paris, 1869.—71
- Romieu, A. *Le spectre rouge de 1852.* Bruxelles, 1851.—78
- Rouher, E. [Interview with a delegate of the Paris Executive Committee of the International Working Men's Association. March 10, 1867.] In: *Le Courrier français*, No. 112, 1 mai 1868.—13, 365
- Rushworth, J. *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, Weighty Matters in Law. Remarkable proceedings in Five Parliaments. Beginning The Sixteenth Year of King James, Anno 1618. And ending the Fifth Year of King Charles, Anno 1629.* London, 1682.—294
- Rutty, J. *An Essay towards a Natural History of the County of Dublin.* In two volumes. Dublin, 1772.—162, 163
- Schweitzer, J. B. *An Herrn Carl Marx in London.* Berlin, 6. Juli 1868. In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 95, 14. August 1868.—10  
 — *An die Mitglieder des Allgemeinen deutschen Arbeiter-Vereins.* (Die bevorstehende Generalversammlung betreffend.) In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 80, 10. Juli 1868.—10  
 — *Politischer Theil.* Berlin, 15. Juli 1869. In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 82, 16. Juli 1869.—90, 122
- Shakespeare, W. *King Henry the Sixth.*—435
- Simondi, J. C. L. Simonde de. *Études sur l'économie politique.* T. 1. Paris, 1837.—57
- Smith, G. *Irish History and Irish Character.* Oxford and London, 1861.—161, 166, 184, 283-96
- Snorri Sturlason. *Haraldsaga.*—179
- Solinus, C. J. *Cosmographia.*—175
- Spenser, E. *The Faerie Queene....* London, 1862.—288  
 — *A View of the State of Ireland, written Dialogue-wise, between Eudoxus and Irenaeus by Edmund Spenser, Esq. In 1596.* Vol. I. Dublin, 1809. In: *Ancient Irish Histories. The Works of Spenser, Campion, Hanmer, and Marleburrough.* In two volumes. Dublin, 1809.—173, 302
- Stacpoole, W. [Speech in the House of Commons on March 3, 1870.] In: *The Times*, No. 26689, March 4, 1870.—417
- Stieler, A. *Hand-Atlas über alle Theile der Erde und über das Weltgebäude.* Gotha, 1864.—154
- Strabo, *Geographie*, translated by K. Kärcher, Buch 7. Tübingen, 1835.—174
- [Strafford, Th. W.] *Letters and dispatches, with an essay towards his life by Sir G. Radcliffe.* Vols. I-II. London, 1739.—300-02
- Swift, J. *Drapier's Letters.* Dublin, 1725.—212  
 — *A Short View of the State of Ireland.* Dublin, 1727.—212  
 — *A Modest Proposal for preventing the Children of the Poor from being a Burden to their Parents or Country, and for making them beneficial to the Publick.* In eight volumes. Dublin, 1729.—290

- Sylvis, W. H. [Reply to the General Council's letter, May 26, 1869.] In: *The Bee-Hive*, No. 400, June 12, 1869 (in the article "The International Working Men's Association").—82
- Symons, G. J. *British Rainfall over the British Isles*. London, Stanford, 1862.—164, 166
- [Thurloe, J.] *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esq; ... Containing Authentic memorials of the English Affairs from the Year 1638, to the Restoration of King Charles II.* Vols. I-VII. London, 1742.—303
- Thurneysen, E. [Description of the sanitary condition in primary public schools.] In: Becker, J. Ph. *Die Internationale Arbeiter-Association und die Arbeiterbewegung in Basel im Winter 1868 auf 1869*. Genf, 1869.—69
- [Tone, Th. W.] *An Argument on behalf of the Catholics of Ireland, by a Northern Whig* [Belfast, 1791].—219  
— *Memorial on the present state of Ireland, drawn up for the Rev. W. Jackson, to be presented to the French Government* [1794, MS].—253
- [Touchet, J.] *The Memoirs of James Touchet ... Earl of Castlehaven, his engagement and carriage in the wars of Ireland from the year 1642 to the year 1651*. Written by himself.—302
- Triads*.—177
- Underwood, Th. N. [Letter to Bruce, the Home Secretary.] In: *The Irishman*, No. 28, January 8, 1870: *Shall O'Connell die?*—421
- Voltaire, F.-M. *L'Enfant Prodigue*. In: *Chefs-d'oeuvre dramatiques de Voltaire*. Tome second. Paris, 1824.—423
- [Wakefield, Ed.] *An Account of Ireland, Statistical and Political*. By Edward Wakefield. In two volumes. London, 1812.—156-58, 160-66, 175, 315
- Watkin, E. W. [Speech in the House of Commons on July 31, 1866.] In: *The Times*, No. 25565, August 1, 1866.—29
- White, C. W. [Speech in the House of Commons on February 18, 1870.] In: *The Times*, No. 26975, February 19, 1870.—103
- Young, A. *Tour in Ireland in 1776, 1777 and 1778*. 2 vols. Dublin, 1780.—155-56, 158, 162
- Zimmermann, W. *Allgemeine Geschichte des grossen Bauernkrieges*. Th. 1-3. Stuttgart, 1841-1843.—93

DOCUMENTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING  
MEN'S ASSOCIATION<sup>a</sup>

*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.—53, 112, 126, 444

<sup>a</sup> Documents written by Marx see in the section "Works by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels; Marx, Karl".

- Address of English to French Workmen.* In: *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 112, December 5, 1863.—322
- Address of the Land and Labour League to the Working Men and Women of Great Britain and Ireland.* London, 1869.—401-06
- [*Address of the Paris Bureau to the workers of Paris in support of the Geneva strike.*] In: *Le Courrier français*, No. 101, 20 avril 1868, in the section "Tribune des travailleurs".—370, 371
- Adresse au Conseil d'État de la République de Genève. Genève, le 31 mai 1869.* In: *L'Égalité*, No. 20, 5 juin 1869.—71
- Adresse collective au Congrès de la paix à Genève de la part des Travailleurs réunis en Congrès à Lausanne.* In: *Rapports lus au Congrès Ouvrier réuni du 2 au 8 septembre 1867 à Lausanne.* Chaux-de-Fonds, 1867.—342
- Adresse des ouvriers de la fabrique de Genève aux ouvriers du bâtiment.* In: *L'Égalité*, No. 24, 18 juin 1870.—138
- Die Arbeiter Wien's an die französischen und englischen Arbeiter.* In: *Der Vorbote*, Nr. 8, August 1868.—15
- Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Statuts et règlements.* Londres, 1866.—324
- Bulletin de la grève.* Supplément au No. 23 de *L'Égalité*.—138
- Central Council of the International Working Men's Association to the Miners and Iron-Workers of Great Britain.* In: *The International Courier*, No. 8, March 13; *Le Courrier International*, No. 11, 16 mars; and *The Working Man*, No. 4, April 6, 1867.—357-58
- Congrès de Genève. Mémoire de délégués français.* Bruxelles, 1866.—12-13, 364-66, 368
- Congrès ouvrier. Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Règlement provisoire* [Paris, 1864].—89, 121
- Congrès ouvrier de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs tenu à Genève du 3 au 8 septembre 1866.* Genève, 1866.—85, 117
- Die Generalversammlung des Allg[emeinen] deutsch[en] Arbeiter-Vereins.* In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 100, 102, 28. August, 2. September 1868.—14-15, 23
- The International Working Men's Association.* In: *The Bee-Hive*, August 22, 1868.—16
- The International Working Men's Association. Resolutions of the Congress of Geneva, 1866, and the Congress of Brussels, 1868.* London [1869].—11, 31, 35, 143, 399-400
- Leipziger Hochverrathsprozess. Ausführlicher Bericht über die Verhandlungen des Schwurgerichts zu Leipzig in dem Prozeß gegen Liebknecht, Bebel und Hejner wegen Vorbereitung zum Hochverrath vom 11.-26. März 1872.* Leipzig, Verl. der Expedition des "Volksstaat", 1872.—445
- Manifeste de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs suivi du règlement provisoire.* Bruxelles, 1866.—90, 122, 366
- À Monsieur Bara, ministre de la justice. In: *La Tribune du peuple*, No. 5, 24 mai 1868.—375-76

- À M. le ministre de l'intérieur. Vendredi, 9 mars 1867.* In: *Le Courrier français*, No. 112, 1 mai 1868 (in the article "Cour imperiale de Paris").—13, 365
- Programm und Statuten der social-demokratischen Arbeiter-Partei.* In: *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, Nr. 33, 14. August 1869.—79
- Procès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Bureau de Paris.* Paris, 1868.—366-74
- Protestation votée en Assemblée populaire nationale tenue au Bâtiment Electoral 7 juin 1870.* In: *L'Égalité*, No. 23, 11 juin 1870.—138
- [Protest by the Brussels Committee against J. Bara's statement.] In: *La Tribune peuple*, No. 5, 24 mai 1868.—321
- Rules of the International Working Men's Association. Founded September 28th, 1864.* London. Printed by the Westminster Printing Company, 1867.—6, 35, 45, 85, 117, 131-33, 209, 337, 367-68
- Rapports lus au Congrès ouvrier réuni du 2 au 8 septembre 1867 à Lausanne.* Chaux-de-Fonds, 1867.—341, 376
- Report of the Conference of Trades' Delegates of the United Kingdom, held in Temperance Hall, Townhead Street, Sheffield, on July 17th, 1866, and Four following Days.* Sheffield, 1866.—344
- Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association, held at Basle, in Switzerland from the 6th to the 11th September, 1869.* London [1869].—67, 100, 108
- [Resolution adopted at the General Congress of British Trades Unions in Birmingham on September 4, 1869.] In: *The Bee-Hive*, No. 412, September 4, 1869.—81
- Richard, A. *Aux membres du Conseil général des sections belges. 6 juillet 1869.* In: *L'Internationale*, No. 26, 11 juillet 1869.—77
- Third Annual Report of the International Working Men's Association.* In: *The Bee-Hive*, No. 309, September 14, 1867 (see present edition, Vol. 20).—346
- Verhandlungen des IV. Congresses des internationalen Arbeiterbundes in Basel.* Nr. 1-7, 7-14. September 1869, Basel [1869].—86
- Der Vorort der Deutschen Arbeitervereine wird dem Vereinstage zu Nürnberg folgende Anträge zur Annahme vorschlagen....* In: *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*; Nr. 35, 29. August 1868.—15
- Первая русская секция. Программа.* In: *Народное Дѣло*, № 1, 15 апреля 1870 г.—110, 124
- Уставъ Русской Секціи.* In: *Народное Дѣло*, № 1, 15 апреля 1870.—110, 124

## DOCUMENTS

- An Act for the better securing of the dependency of the Kingdom of Ireland upon the Crown of Great Britain* (The Declaratory Act, 1719).—212, 225, 229, 230, 232, 270, 272-74



- An Act for Continuing and Amending the Act for Facilitating the Sale and Transfer of Encumbered Estates in Ireland* (1853).—202
- An Act for the Extension of the Factory Acts* [15th August, 1867].—63-64
- An Act for the preservation of the Health and Morals of Apprentices and others, employed in cotton and other mills, and cotton and other factories* (The Health and Morals of Apprentices Act, 1802).—63
- An Act for punishing officers or soldiers who shall mutiny or desert their majesties' service* (Mutiny Act, 1689).—224
- An Act for regulating the Hours of Labour for Children, Young Persons, and Women, employed in Workshops; and for other purposes relating thereto* [21st August, 1867].—64
- An act for the relief of his majesty's popish, or Roman catholic subjects of Ireland* (The Catholic Relief Act [1793]).—220, 250-52
- An act for removing and preventing all doubts which have arisen, or might arise, concerning the exclusive rights of the Parliament and Courts of Ireland, in matters of legislation and judicature; and for preventing any writ of error or appeal from any of His Majesty's courts in that kingdom from being received, heard, and adjudged, in any of His Majesty's Courts in the Kingdom of Great Britain* (The Renunciation Act, 1783).—198, 232, 261, 275
- An act for the union of Great Britain and Ireland* (1801).—88, 258-59, 261-62, 264-70
- An act that no parliament be holden in this land until the acts be certified into England, 1495* (Poynings' Law).—212, 270, 272
- An Act to Amend an Act of the Tenth Year of Her Present Majesty, for Amending the Laws Relating to the Removal of the Poor* (1847).—202
- An Act to limit the Hours of Labour of Young Persons and Females in Factories, June 8, 1847*.—382
- An act to prevent tumults and riotous assemblies, and for the more speedy and effectual punishing* [Riot Act, 1715].—81
- An Act to Regulate the Issue of Bank Notes, and for Giving to the Governor and Company of the Bank of England Certain Privileges for a Limited Period, July 19, 1844*.—28-30
- An Act to Regulate the Labour of Children and Young Persons in the Mills and Factories of the United Kingdom. August 29, 1833*.—382
- An act to repeal an act, made in the sixth year of the reign of his late Majesty King George the first entitled: An act for the better securing of the dependency of the Kingdom of Ireland upon the Crown of Great Britain* (1782).—229, 230
- An Act to repeal the Laws relative to the Combination of Workmen; and for other purposes therein mentioned* (The Combination Act) [1824].—323
- An Act to repeal the Laws relating to the combinations of Workmen, and to make other Provisions in lieu thereof* (The Combination Act) [1825].—343
- Ancient Laws of Ireland. Senchus Mor. Introduction to Senchus Mor, and Athgabhair; or, Law of Distress, as contained in the Harleian Manuscripts. Vols. I-III. Dublin, London, 1865-1873*.—165, 170, 171, 172, 176, 308, 310
- Annales IV Magistrorum. Ex ipso O'Clerii Autographo in Bibliotheca Stowense. Nunc primum editi C. O'Conor. In: Rerum Hibernicarum Scriptores. T. 3. Buckinghamiae. 1826*.—168, 169, 171, 183, 309

- Annales Tigernachi*, ex Codice Bodleiano, Rawlinson, No. 488, *Annales Inisfalenses*, ex duobus Codicibus, Dubliniense et Bodleiano, itemque *Annales Buellianos*, ex Codice Cottoniano, Titus A. Nunc primum editit C. O'Conor. Ebdort, T. 2. Buckinghamiae, 1825.—168, 169, 182, 309
- Annales Ultonienses*, Ab anno DCCCCXXXI, ad annum DMCXXXI, ex Codice Bodleiano: itemque indicem generalem. Nunc primum editit C. O'Conor, Ebdort, T. 4. Buckinghamiae, 1826.—168-70
- Articles of Confederation, and Perpetual Union* [1777].—216
- The Bill for Relieving his Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects from Certain Pains and Penalties Imposed on Them by an Act of King William* [1704].—198
- Bonaparte, L. N. *Constitution faite en vertu des pouvoirs délégués par le peuple français à Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte, par le vote des 20 et 21 décembre 1851*. In: *Collection complète des lois, décrets, ordonnances, règlements et avis du Conseil d'État...* Par J. B. Duvergier, T. 52, Paris, 1852.—42
- Census of England and Wales for the year 1861*. London, 1863.—328
- Children's Employment Commission (1862). First Report of the Commissioners*. London, 1863.—327
- Clarendon, G. W. *Foreign office. May 12*. In: *The Times*, No. 25504, May 22, 1866 (in the article "The Recent Commercial Panic").—29
- Code Napoléon*. Paris, Leipzig, 1808.—312
- Code pénal, ou code des délits et des peines*. Cologne, 1810.—14, 215, 219-20, 230, 270, 317, 370
- Coercion Bill*—see *Peace Preservation Bill*
- A Collection of the Parliamentary Debates in England, from the Year, MDC LXVIII to the present Time*, Vol. VI, 1740: [Debates in the English House of Lords on the Union with Scotland, June 2, 1713].—270
- Criminal Justice Act* [1855].—193
- Declaration of Independence in Congress, July 4, 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America*.—216
- Desiderata Curiosa Hibernica; or a Select collection of state papers, consisting of royal instructions, directions, dispatches and letters, to which are added some historical tracts*. Vols I-II. Dublin, 1772.—301
- Deuxième Congrès de la Paix et de la Liberté convoqué pour le 22 septembre 1868 à Berne. Programme*. Berne [1868].—113
- [Draft Rules of Lassallean trade unions adopted at a General German Workers' Congress in Berlin.] In: *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 112, 25. September 1868, Beilage.—33
- Erlass der drei Zensurminister betr. Unterdrückung der Rheinischen Zeitung zum 1. April 1843*. Berlin 1843. 21. Januar.—60
- Flood, H. *A Bill for the more equal representation of the people in parliament*, November 29, 1783. In: Grattan, H. *The Speeches...*, Vol. I.—230, 275
- George III. [Message to the British Parliament of April 8, 1782] In: *The Parliamentary History of England, from the earliest period to the year 1803*. London, 1814, Vol. XXII.—226, 273

- Gladstone, W. E. and Russell, J. *To the Governor and Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England*. May 11, 1866. In: *The Times*, No. 25497, May 14, 1866.—28-29
- Habeas Corpus Act*. 1679.—104, 189, 225, 254, 258, 272, 280
- The Irish Land Bill*. 1870.—105, 428, 429, 434, 435
- The [Irish] Statutes at Large*. Vols. I-XX. Dublin, 1765-1801.—299
- [Judgement of tribunal at the trial of the Paris section of the IWMA, March 20, 1868.] In: *Procès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs*. Bureau de Paris. Paris, Chevalier, 1868.—14
- [Judgement of tribunal at the trial of the Paris section of the IWMA, May 22, 1868.] In: *Procès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs*. Bureau de Paris. Paris, Chevalier, 1868.—14
- [Knox, A. and Pollock, G.] *Report of the Commissioners on the Treatment of the Treason-Felony Convicts in the English Convict Prisons*, London, 1867.—102, 105, 424, 428
- La loi des étrangers*, 22 septembre 1835.—6, 14, 335
- La loi des étrangers*, mai 1868.—6, 375
- Leges barbarorum*.—185
- Loi sur les associations, 10-11 avril 1834*. In: *Collection complète des lois, décrets, ordonnances, règlements et avis du Conseil d'État...* Par J. B. Duvergier, T. 34. Paris, 1835.—14, 363, 365, 368, 370
- Onzième protocole de la Conférence tenue à Londres, le 20 janvier 1831*. In: Martens, G. F. *Nouveau Recueil de Traités d'Alliance, de Paix, de Trêve, de Neutralité, de Commerce...* [Groupe II]. T. 10. Goettingue, 1836.—49.
- Palmerston, H. J. T. and Lewis G. C. [*Letter to the Governor and Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England*. November 12, 1857.] In: *The Times*, No. 22837, November 13, 1857.—28
- Peace Preservation Bill (Coercion Bill)*, 1870.—428-30, 435, 444
- Programme et Règlement de l'Alliance internationale de la Démocratie Socialiste*. Genève [1868].—34-36, 45-46, 113-14, 207-09
- Public Health. Sixth Report of the Medical Officer of the Privy Council*. With appendix, 1863. London, 1864.—325-26
- 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.—327
- 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.—325
- Report of the Commissioners on the Treatment of the Treason-Felony Convicts in the English Convict Prisons*—see [Knox, A. and Pollock, G.] *Report of the Commissioners on the Treatment...*

- [Report of the Commission inquiring into the state of public schools in Switzerland.] In: Becker J. Ph. *Die Internationale Arbeiter-Association und die Arbeiterbewegung in Basel im Winter 1868 auf 1869*. Genf, 1869.—69
- Reports of the Inspectors of Factories to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department for the half year ending 31st October 1863*. London, 1864.—327-28
- Resolutions of the Ulster Volunteers at the convention of Dungannon, 15 February 1782*.—224-26
- Russell, J. and Wood, Ch. *To Governor and Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England*. October 25, 1847. In: *Report from the Secret Committee of the House of Lords appointed to inquire into the causes of the distress ... together with the minutes of evidence, and an appendix*. London, 1848.—28
- The Society of United Irishmen at Dublin. To the Volunteers of Ireland*.—248
- Speyer, K. *Der deutsche Arbeiter-Bildungsverein in London an die Arbeiter Deutschlands*. London am 9. Dezember 1868. In: *Der Vorbote*, Nr. 12, Dezember 1868; Nr. 1, Januar 1869.—32
- Victoria, R. [Address to the British Parliament on November 19, 1867.] In: *The Times*, No. 25973, November 20, 1867.—189
- Александр II. *Объ упраздненіи Правительственной Комисіи Внутренних Дѣлъ въ Царствѣ Польскомъ и дополнителныхъ правилъ къ Высочайше утвержденному 19 (31) декабря 1866 года Положенію о губернскомъ и уездномъ управленіи въ губерніяхъ Царства Польскаго*. 29 февраля 1868 г. In: *Полное собраніе законовъ Россійской имперіи*. Собрание 2, т. 43, Отд. I, СПб., 1873.—8

ANONYMOUS ARTICLES AND REPORTS PUBLISHED  
IN PERIODIC EDITIONS

- Allgemeine Zeitung*, Nr. 9, 9. Januar, 1869: *Schweiz. Aus Basel*, 5. Jan....—70  
— Nr. 13, 13. Januar 1869: *Deutschland, Augsburg*, 12. Jan.—70
- The Bee-Hive*, No. 392, April 17, 1869: *The International Working Men's Association. Council Meeting. Tuesday, April 13* [1869].—115  
— No. 400, June 12, 1869: *Riot at Mold*.—80
- Cobbett's Weekly Political Register*  
— Vol. XI, No. 7, February 14, 1807: *Mr. Perceval. Ireland*.—266-67  
— Vol. XVI, No. 23, December 9, 1809: *Danger to Ireland*.—267  
— Vol. XIX, No. 15, February 20, 1811: *Summary of politics*.—251, 267
- Le Constitutionnel*, 1 mai 1870: *Les principaux organisateurs*.—127
- La Coopération*, No. 18, 3 mai 1868: *Correspondance. Travail et Coopération. Londres*. 27 avril 1868.—372-73
- Le Courrier français*, No. 71, 14 mars 1868: *Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Bureau de Paris*.—370
- The Daily News*, No. 7445, March 11, 1870: *The "Marseillaise" of Tuesday last was*....—420
- The Daily Telegraph*, No. 4598, March 11, 1870.—421

- Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, Nr. 20, 16. Mai, Nr. 21, 23. Mai 1868: *Die Lage der belgischen Kohlenarbeiter*.—354-56
- The Echo*, No. 391, March 11, 1870: *O'Donovan Rossa's Woes*.—422
- The Economist*, February 9, 1867: [Article on the condition of the working class in Ireland].—191, 205
- L'Économiste belge*, No. 3, 9 février 1867: *La grève de Marchienne-au-Pont*.—357
- L'Égalité*
- No. 10, 27 mars 1869: *Grève des Typographes*.—71
  - No. 11, 3 avril 1869: *Suisse. Genève, 2 avril 1869*.—71
  - No. 13, 17 avril 1869: *Genève, 16 avril 1869*.—71, 72
  - No. 42, 6 novembre 1869: *Le Bulletin du Conseil général*.—116
  - No. 43, 13 novembre 1869: *L'Organisation de l'Internationale*.—116
  - No. 47, 11 décembre 1869: *Réflexions*.—84, 85, 87, 89-91, 116, 117, 119, 121-23
  - No. 2, 8 janvier 1870: *Aux sections romands*.—123
  - No. 3, 15 janvier 1870: *Avis de la Rédaction*.—123
  - No. 24, 18 juin 1870: *Appréciation de la grève*.—138
- The Evening Standard*, March 10, 1870.—423
- La Figaro*, No. 122, 2 mai 1870: *Le complot*.—127
- L'International*, No. 2345, 3 août 1868: *La Dictature universelle*.—75
- L'Internationale*, No. 14, 18 avril 1869: *Moralités de l'affaire de Seraing*.—48
- No. 15, 25 avril 1869: *Episodes de troubles de Seraing et du Borinage*.—48
  - [Announcement of the Belgian Central Committee about its intention to institute an inquiry into the massacres of Seraing and Le Borinage].—51
  - No. 16, 2 mai 1869: *Arrestations et condamnations*.—50
  - No. 26, 11 juillet 1869: *Déclaration au Conseil général de Londres*. Lyon, 6 juillet 1869.—77
  - No. 33, 29 août 1869: *L'Internationalomanie*.—77
- The Irishman*, No. 49, June 12, 1869: *O'Donovan Rossa. To the Editor of "The Irishman"; The Press on the Treatment of the Political Prisoners: The Treatment of O'Donovan Rossa*.—102
- No. 4, July 24, 1869: *The Gladstone Government and the Political Prisoners*.—407-08
  - No. 6, August 7, 1869: *The Meeting in Limerick*.—408
  - No. 7, August 14, 1869: *Director Murray*.—104, 407, 409
  - No. 12, September 18, 1869: *The Irishman in Paris. John O'Mahony and Pagan O'Leary*.—102
  - *The Amnesty Movement. Speech of G. H. Moore*.—407
  - No. 13, September 25, 1869: *The Political Prisoners*.—407
  - No. 16, October 16, 1869: *The Great National Demonstration in Dublin. Speeches of Isaac Butt Q. C., George Henry Moore, M. P.*—408
  - No. 17, October 23, 1869: *The Under-Secretary, the People, and the Police. A Letter to Thomas Burke, Esq. Under-Secretary to the Lord lieutenant by Isaac Butt Q. C.*—408
  - No. 18, October 30, 1869: *The Bursting of the Bubble*.—410
  - No. 19, November 6, 1869: *Inspector Murray*.—105, 409
  - No. 20, November 13, 1869: *No Amnesty*.—409
  - *Gladstone and His Victims. To the Editor of the Irishman*.—102, 409
  - *Seven Centuries of Unlimited Tyranny*.—410
  - No. 27, January 1, 1870: *More Prison Horrors. Irish Political Prisoners Being*

- Done to Death in English Prisons.*—102, 421
- No. 30, January 22, 1870: *The Political Prisoners—Misguided Men and their Desires.*—102
  - *The Irish Political Prisoners and Her Majesty's Government.*—102
  - No. 34, February 19, 1870: *Inquest at Spike Island.—Condemnation of the Prison Treatment.*—104, 106-07, 415
  - No. 37, March 12, 1870: *Lord Dufferin's Lease.—Landlord Confiscation.*—435
  - No. 38, March 19, 1870: *The Fenian Prisoner Burke.*—431
  - No. 40, April 2, 1870: *The Irishman in New York.*—436
- La Liberté*, No. 105, 27 juin 1869: *Massacres de Saint-Étienne.*—76
- La Marseillaise*, No. 60, 18 février 1870: [An article from *The Daily News* about the election of O'Donovan Rossa.] In the section "Les journaux".—414
- Le Moniteur universel*, No. 172, 21 juin 1869: [Subscriptions for the victims of the miners of St. Étienne].—76
- No. 121, 1 mai 1870: *Le complot contre la vie de l'empereur.*—127
  - No. 122, 2 mai 1870: *Le complot.*—127
  - No. 125, 5 mai 1870: *Nous recevons de Marseille....*—127
  - No. 128, 8 mai 1870: *Nous n'avons pas....*—127
- Neue freie Presse*
- Nr. 1286, Beilage, 29. März 1868: *Genf, 25. März, Abends [Orig.-Corr.] (Der Strike der Bau-Arbeiter).*—350
  - Nr. 1288, 31. März 1868: *Genf, 27. März. [Orig. Corr.] (Weiterer Verlauf der Arbeiterbewegung).*—350
  - Nr. 1291, 3. April 1868: *Genf, 30. März, Nachts [Orig.-Corr.] (Schreitern der Verständigung zwischen Meistern und Arbeitern. Französische Interventions-Gelüste).*—350
- La Presse*, 2 mai 1870: *Le complot.*—127
- Le Progrès*, No. 25, 4 décembre 1869: *Chronique du travail.*—84, 89-90, 116, 117, 121
- Reynolds's Newspaper*, March 20, 1870.—429
- Der Social-Demokrat*, Nr. 24, 24. Februar 1869: [Concerning the conflict between Karl Liebknecht and Johann Schweitzer].—90, 122
- Nr. 47, 21. April 1869: *Vereins Theil (Für den Allgem. Deutschen Arbeiterverein). Generalversammlung (Fortsetzung).*—79
- The Spectator*, No. 2176, March 12, 1870.—423
- The Times*, No. 24372, October 9, 1862: *Mr. Gladstone in the North.*—83, 409
- No. 25909, September 6, 1867: *International Working Men's Congress (From a Correspondent). Lausanne, Sept. 2.*—342
  - No. 25911, September 9, 1867: *International Working Men's Congress (From a Correspondent). Lausanne, Sept. 4.*—342
  - No. 25912, September 10, 1867: *International Working Men's Congress (From a Correspondent). Lausanne, Sept. 5.*—342
  - No. 25913, September 11, 1867: *International Working Men's Congress (From a Correspondent). Lausanne, Sept. 7.*—342
  - No. 25974, November 21, 1867: *London Meetings.*—363
  - No. 26225, September 9, 1868: [The Leader].—25
  - No. 26228, September 12, 1868: [The Leader].—25
  - No. 26230, September 15, 1868: [The Leader].—25

- No. 26234, September 19, 1868: [The Leader].—25
  - No. 26694, March 10, 1870: *The Fenian Convict O'Donovan Rossa*.—420
  - No. 26699, March 16, 1870: [An article refuting the facts cited by O'Donovan Rossa].—424
  - No. 26723, April 8, 1870: *House of Commons. London, Friday, April 8*.—440
- Volksstimme*, Nr. 9, 8. August 1869: *Der Prozeß gegen die Sozial-Demokraten Most und Brüßhaver*.—79
- *Die neue Ära in Transleithanien. Ein Muster von einem Bourgeois-Minister*.—79
- Der Vorbote*, Nr. 8, August 1868: *Neuenburg 9. August*.—16
- Nr. 12, Dezember, 1868: *Bericht über die Arbeiterbewegung in Basel*.—69

## INDEX OF PERIODICALS

- Allgemeine Zeitung*—a conservative daily founded in 1798; published in Augsburg from 1810 to 1882.—26, 27, 70
- Augsburgerin*—see *Allgemeine Zeitung*
- 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 International; in view of the growing influence of the bourgeois radicals on the newspaper editorial board, the General Council of the International broke off relations with it in April 1870.—26, 37, 38, 82, 89, 115, 126, 322, 378, 444
- The Chronicle*—a weekly of the Catholic trend published in London in 1867 and 1868.—189
- La Cigale*—a weekly newspaper published in Brussels from December 1867 to July 1869, organ of the Belgian sections of the First International.—378
- Cobbett's Weekly Political Register*—a radical weekly published in London from 1802 to 1835 under different titles.—266, 411
- Le Constitutionnel*—a daily published in Paris from 1815 to 1817 and from 1819 to 1870; in the 1840s it voiced the views of the monarchist bourgeoisie (Thiers' party) and after the coup d'état of 1851 those of the Bonapartists.—127.
- La Coopération. Journal du progrès social*—a bi-monthly newspaper published in Paris from September 1866 to June 1868, organ of the workers' co-operative societies which were under the influence of the republicans.—372
- Le Courrier français*—a Left-republican newspaper published in Paris from 1861 to 1868, first as a weekly and from June 1867 onwards as a daily; from May 1866 it was the *de facto* organ of the International in France.—4, 13, 348, 365, 367, 370, 376, 378
- The Daily News*—a liberal daily of the British industrial bourgeoisie published in London from 1846 to 1930.—414, 420, 430
- The Daily Telegraph*—a liberal and, from the 1880s, conservative daily published in London from 1855 to 1937.—421, 430



- Demokratisches Wochenblatt*—a workers' newspaper published under this title in Leipzig from January 1868 to September 1869 under the editorship of Wilhelm Liebknecht; at the Eisenach Congress in 1869 it was declared Central Organ of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party and renamed *Der Volksstaat*.—15, 79, 91, 122, 354, 378
- Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*—a German-language yearly published in Paris under the editorship of Karl Marx and Arnold Ruge; only the first issue, a double one, appeared in February 1844. It carried a number of works by Marx and Engels.—61
- Le Devoir*—a Belgian weekly which appeared in Liège from March 1865 to May 1869; from 1868 it was the organ of the Liège Section of the International.—378
- The Echo*—a liberal daily published in London from 1868 to 1905.—422
- The Economist. Weekly Commercial Times, Bankers' Gazette, and Railway Monitor: a Political, Literary, and General Newspaper*—a weekly published in London since 1843, mouthpiece of the big industrial bourgeoisie.—191, 205
- L'Économiste belge. Organe des intérêts politiques et économiques des consommateurs*—a magazine published in Brussels from 1855 to 1920.—357
- L'Égalité*—a French-language daily published in Geneva from December 1868 to December 1872, organ of the Romance Federation of the International; from 1869 to January 1870 it was controlled by the Bakuninists.—71, 72, 84-87, 89-90, 114-19, 121-23, 138
- L'Eguaglianza. Giornale degli operai*—a weekly organ of the Naples Section of the International; published from November 1869 to January 1870; was under the influence of Bakuninists.—115
- L'Espiègle. Journal satirique, politique, artistique et littéraire*—a satirical weekly of the anti-Bonapartist and anti-clerical trend; it appeared in Brussels from 1864 to 1869. The newspaper published material on the activity of the International.—7, 378
- The Evening Standard*—a conservative daily founded in London in 1827.—423, 439
- The Evening Star*—a newspaper of the United Irishmen published in Dublin after January 1792.—247
- La Federacion*—a Spanish-language newspaper which appeared in Barcelona from August 1869 to November 1873; the weekly organ of the Barcelona Section and, later, of the Federal Council of the International in Barcelona.—80, 115
- Le Figaro*—a conservative daily, published in Paris since 1854; was connected with the government of the Second Empire.—127
- The Fortnightly Review*—a historical, philosophical and literary magazine founded in 1865 by a group of radicals; subsequently it became liberal in character; under this title it was published in London till 1934.—87, 119
- Freeman*—see *The Freeman's Journal*
- The Freeman's Journal*—a liberal daily published in Dublin from 1763 to 1924; from the 1840s to the 1860s it supported the demand for the repeal of the Union and defended the Irish tenants' rights.—434

- The Galway Mercury and Connaught Weekly Advertiser*—an Irish weekly.—202
- Hibernian Journal or Chronicle of Liberty*—an Irish newspaper published approximately from 1771 to 1820.—250
- L'Indépendance belge. Journal mondial d'informations politiques et littéraires*—a liberal daily founded in Brussels in 1831.—359
- L'International*—a French-language daily published in London from 1863 to 1871; semi-official organ of the French Government.—75
- L'Internationale*—a weekly published in Brussels from 1869 to 1873; organ of the Belgian sections of the International.—48, 51, 72, 77, 106
- The Irishman*—a weekly published from 1858 to 1885 first in Belfast and then in Dublin; came out in defence of Fenians.—102, 103, 104-06, 107, 206, 407-08, 409, 410, 415, 419, 421-22, 426, 430-31, 435-36, 437
- The Irish People*—a weekly, the main organ of the Fenians which appeared in Dublin from 1863 to 1865; was banned by the British Government.—101, 414, 416, 420
- Journal de Genève national, politique et littéraire*—a conservative daily published in Geneva from 1826.—350
- Kölnische Zeitung*—a daily published in Cologne from 1802 to 1945; during the 1848-49 revolution and in subsequent years it expressed the interests of the Prussian liberal bourgeoisie.—379
- La Liberté*—a Belgian democratic newspaper published in Brussels from 1865 to 1873; from 1867, an organ of the International Working Men's Association in Belgium.—15, 50, 76, 375, 378
- La Liberté*—a conservative evening daily published in Paris from 1865 to 1940.—378
- La Marseillaise*—a daily newspaper, organ of the Left republicans, published in Paris from December 1869 to September 1870; the paper carried material on the activity of the International and the working-class movement.—123, 414, 415, 422, 423, 424, 425, 436
- Le Mirabeau*—a daily which appeared in Verviers, Belgium, from 1868 to 1874, organ of the Belgian sections of the International.—378
- Moniteur*—see *Le Moniteur universel*
- Le Moniteur universel*—a daily published in Paris from 1789 to 1901; from 1799 to 1869 it was an official government newspaper; it appeared under this title from 1811.—76, 127, 435
- The Morning Chronicle*—a daily published in London from 1770 to 1862; in the 1840s the newspaper of the Whigs, in the early 1850s of the Peelites and then of the Conservatives.—268
- The Morning Star*—a daily of the English Free Traders published in London from 1856 to 1869.—27
- Narodnoye Dyelo*—a magazine (from April 1870, newspaper) published in Geneva in 1868-70 by a group of Russian revolutionary émigrés; the first issue was

- prepared by Bakunin; in October 1868, the editors, among whom was Nikolai Utin, broke off relations with Bakunin and opposed his views; in April 1870 it became the organ of the Russian Section of the International Working Men's Association which pursued the policy of Marx and the General Council; it published documents of the International.—110, 124
- Neue freie Presse*—a daily newspaper which appeared in Vienna from 1864 to 1939.—350
- Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie*—a daily newspaper of the German revolutionary-proletarian democrats during the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; it was 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); Engels was one of its editors.—61
- Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*—a journal published by Marx and Engels from December 1849 to November 1850, theoretical organ of the Communist League.—62, 93-94
- Neue Zürcher-Zeitung*—a German-language liberal newspaper published under this title in Zurich from July 1, 1821; from 1780 to 1821 it came out under the title *Zürcher-Zeitung*.—350
- New-York Daily Tribune*—a newspaper founded by Horace Greeley and published from 1841 to 1924; until the mid-1850s it spoke for the Left wing of the American Whigs and subsequently for the Republican Party. In the 1840s and 1850s it voiced progressive views and opposed slavery. Marx and Engels contributed to it from August 1851 to March 1862.—62
- New-York Irish People*—409
- New-Yorker Handelszeitung*—379
- North German Correspondence*—an English-language daily information bulletin of Bismarck's government published in Berlin in 1869-70.—135
- The Northern Star*—the newspaper of the United Irishmen founded in Belfast in January 1792 by Samuel Neilson; at the beginning of 1798 it was banned by the government.—247, 248
- L'Opinion Nationale*—a daily published in Paris from 1859 to 1874.—367
- L'Opinion Publique*—an illustrated weekly, published in Montreal from January 1870 to December 1883.—378
- The Pall Mall Gazette*—a conservative daily which appeared in London from 1865 to 1921.—87, 119, 430
- Le Peuple Belge*—a daily newspaper published in Brussels from January 1867 to September 1877; an official organ of the International from 1871.—378
- La Philosophie positive*—a philosophical magazine published in Paris from 1867 to 1883; it advocated the positivism of Auguste Comte.—113
- Political Register*—see *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register*
- The Press*—a newspaper of the United Irishmen, published from September 1797 to 1798.—247
- Le Progrès*—a Bakuninist newspaper which opposed the General Council of the International; it was published in French in Le Locle under the editorship of

- James Guillaume from December 1868 to April 1870.—84-85, 89-90, 114-17, 121-23
- Le Réveil*—a weekly and, from May 1869 onwards, daily newspaper of the Left Republicans published in Paris under the editorship of Charles Delescluse between July 1868 and January 1871.—374, 381
- Die Revolution*—a communist German-language journal published in New York in 1852 by Joseph Weydemeyer. On January 6 and 13 two weekly issues appeared, in May and June two “non-periodic” issues appeared.—56
- La Révolution sociale*—a weekly published in Geneva in 1871 and 1872, organ of Bakunin’s Alliance of Socialist Democracy.—210
- Revue Positiviste*—see *La Philosophie positive*
- Reynolds’s Newspaper. A Weekly Journal of Politics, History, Literature and General Intelligence*—a radical newspaper published by George William Reynolds in London from 1850; was close to the working-class movement.—429, 430
- Rheinische Zeitung für Politik, Handel und Gewerbe*—a daily founded on January 1, 1842 as the organ of the Rhenish bourgeois opposition. It was published in Cologne till March 31, 1843. From October 15, 1842 to March 17, 1843 it was edited by Marx and assumed a strongly pronounced revolutionary-democratic complexion, which led to its suppression. Engels was one of its contributors.—60
- 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.—90
- Saturday Review*—see *Saturday review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*
- Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*—an English weekly published in London from 1855 to 1938.—27, 87, 119, 363, 412
- Le Siècle*—a daily published in Paris from 1836 to 1939.—367, 378
- Der Social-Demokrat*—organ of the Lassallean General Association of German Workers. It was published under this title in Berlin from December 15, 1864 to 1871; in 1864-65 it was edited by Johann Baptist von Schweitzer.—10, 24, 90-91, 122
- The Spectator*—a weekly published in London since 1828, originally liberal, later conservative.—87, 119, 423
- Standard*—see *The Evening Standard*
- Telegraph*—see *The Daily Telegraph*
- The Times*—a daily newspaper published in London since 1785.—25, 27, 28, 29, 81, 83, 103-04, 105, 206, 313, 326, 342, 357, 362, 363, 409, 410, 412, 416, 420, 425, 430, 439-40
- Le Travail*—a weekly of the Paris sections of the International published in Paris from October 3 to December 12, 1869.—85, 116-17
- La Tribune du Peuple*—a democratic newspaper of the socialist and atheistic society “Peuple” published in Brussels from May 1861 to April 1869; from August 1865 the *de facto* and from January 1866 official newspaper of the International in Belgium.—321, 375, 376

- La Voix de l'Avenir*—a weekly published in La Chaux-de-Fonds from 1865 to 1868; from 1867 official organ of the Romance sections of the International in Switzerland; was under the Proudhonists' influence.—321, 375, 378
- Der Volksstaat*—Central Organ of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party published in Leipzig from October 2, 1869 to September 29, 1876, first twice and, from 1873, three times a week.—134, 436
- Volksstimme*—a newspaper of the Austrian Social-Democrats published in Vienna from April to December 1869; it supported the General Council of the International.—79
- Volks-Zeitung*—a liberal daily published in Berlin since 1853.—25
- 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, it 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.—15, 32, 69, 336, 348, 378
- De Werkman*—a newspaper published in Amsterdam from 1868 to 1874; weekly organ of the Dutch Central Section of the International from 1869.—80
- Weser-Zeitung*—a liberal daily published in Bremen from 1844 to 1930.—26, 27
- The Workingman's Advocate*—a weekly published in Chicago from 1864 to 1877; printed material dealing with the trade union movement, and documents of the International; organ of the National Labour Union.—378
- The Workmen's Advocate*—see *The Workingman's Advocate*
- Die Zukunft*—a democratic newspaper, organ of the People's Party, published in 1867 in Königsberg, and from 1868 to 1871 in Berlin; printed Marx's preface to Volume One of *Capital* and Engels' review of this volume.—134
- Народное Дѣло*—see *Narodnoye Dyelo*

## SUBJECT INDEX

## A

- Agriculture*  
 — and natural conditions—154-60  
 — in various historical periods—94, 203  
 — and use of machines—166, 384
- Alemanni*—178
- Alliance of Socialist Democracy*—see *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*
- Ancient Egypt*—169, 203
- Ancient Rome*—89, 120  
 — slaves, their labour—57, 394  
 — agriculture—203  
 — family—394  
 — classes, class struggle—57  
 — Roman Empire—328, 395  
 See also *Navy*—of Ancient Rome
- Anglo-American war, 1812-14*—271
- Anglo-Saxons*—147, 174, 178
- Aristocracy, nobility*  
 — Austrian—78  
 — English—193, 292, 317, 319, 363, 395, 410, 423; see also *Landlords, landlordism*—in England  
 — French—22  
 — German—22, 94, 97, 100  
 — Irish—194, 197, 292, 317, 318; see also *Landlords, landlordism*—in Ireland  
 — US financial aristocracy—54

*Army*

- as a tool of reaction and means for suppressing revolutionary movements—47-50, 88, 89, 120, 404, 405  
 — standing—54, 89, 120, 405  
 — demand for abolishing the standing army—400, 405  
 — in slave society—176  
 — Belgian—47-50  
 — British—49, 88, 119-20, 193, 198, 218, 225, 268, 273  
 — French—217  
 — German—97, 99  
 — US—49

- Austria (Austria-Hungary from 1867)*—291, 296  
 — home policy, its anti-labour character—16, 77-78, 79, 95, 407  
 — and Germany—96  
 — and Italy—296  
 — and Prussia—95, 98

See also *Aristocracy, nobility* — Austrian; *Austro-Prussian war, 1866*; *Bourgeoisie*—Austrian; *International Working Men's Association in Austria*; *Working-class movement in Austria*

- Austro-Prussian war, 1866*—13, 77, 94, 96, 312, 362

## B

- Bakuninism, Bakuninists*  
 — as a variety of petty-bourgeois socialism—46

- untenability of theoretical tenets—46, 112-15, 207-09, 394-96
  - sectarian character—113
  - Bakuninists' disorganising activities in working-class movement—34-36, 46, 90-91, 112-24, 394, 395, 445, 446; see also *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*; *International Working-Men's Association*—struggle against Bakuninism and Bakuninists
    - in France—123, 445
    - in Italy—114
    - in Spain—114
    - in Switzerland—113-16, 123, 445
  - Bank of England*—28-30
  - Basques*—174
  - Belgium*—47, 353
    - economics—353, 357, 358
    - reactionary, anti-labour character of its home policy—6, 14, 47-51, 72-73, 80, 89, 320, 335, 353, 358, 359-61
    - the press—51
    - its neutrality—49
    - and France—48-49, 198, 336
  - See also *Army*—Belgian; *Bourgeoisie*—Belgian; *International Working Men's Association in Belgium*; *Working class in Belgium*
  - Bonapartism*—57
    - manoeuvring between contending classes—12-13
    - and working class—12-14, 74-75
    - Prussian—15
  - See also *International Working Men's Association*—struggle against Bonapartism
  - Bourgeoisie*—96-98, 311
    - its economic domination—66, 90, 396
    - and political (state) power—49-50, 94, 96-97
    - petty—97-98
    - and working class—97; see also *Classes, class struggle*—in bourgeois society
      - and peasantry—99-100
      - Austrian—78, 94, 98
      - Belgian—47-51
      - English—88, 97, 120, 166, 401, 402
      - French—97
      - German—20-22, 94-99
      - Irish—194, 242
      - Prussian—94, 98
      - Swiss—68-72
      - US—54, 88, 120
  - Britons*—147, 174, 177
  - Bureaucracy*
    - as a prop of reaction—21, 22, 96, 97, 100
- C
- Canada*—410
  - Capital*
    - its definition—99
    - and wage labour—63, 383
    - control over production as its function—86, 118
  - "*Capital*" by *K. Marx*—59-64
  - Celts*—174, 175, 178, 185, 312
  - Chartism, Chartist movement*—329
  - Child's labour*
    - its exploitation in capitalist society—63, 69, 339-40, 357, 382, 383
    - demand for its regulation by law—340, 387
    - under communism—339
  - China*—318
  - Christianity*—176-78, 395
    - See also *Ireland*—spread of Christianity,—Protestants,—Catholics, their persecution; *Reformation*
  - Church*—285, 395, 399, 440
  - Cimbri*—184
  - Classes, class struggle*
    - in ancient society—see *Ancient Rome*—classes, class struggle

- in feudal society—93
  - in bourgeois society—12, 57, 74, 86, 97-98, 118, 403
  - class prejudices—403
  - and religion—94
  - abolition of classes under communism—46, 90, 114, 121
  - See also *Aristocracy, nobility; Bourgeoisie; Peasantry; Revolution, bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic; Revolution proletarian, socialist; Working class*
  - Clergy, the*—178, 439
    - as advocate of class interests of exploiters—22, 78, 97
    - and national liberation movements—194, 197-98, 318
  - Communism (socialism), scientific*
    - its theoretical sources—61; see also *Fourierism; Saint-Simonism, Saint-Simonists*
    - Marxist political economy as its foundation—63
    - dissemination of its ideas—87, 119
  - Communist League, the*—59, 61
  - Co-operation, co-operative movement*—98, 100, 331, 392
    - See also *International Working Men's Association*—and co-operative movement
  - Corn Laws (England)*—200, 201, 401
- D
- Denmark*—179, 184
- E
- Economic crises*—329, 345, 358
  - Economic struggle of workers*—74, 89-90, 121
    - See also *Co-operation, co-operative movement; Strikes, strike movement; Trade(s) unions, trade union movement; Working-class movement*—necessity to combine workers' economic and political struggle; *Working day*—struggle for its reduction
  - Education, training*—391, 398-99, 404
  - Emigration*
    - as a result of capitalist development—201, 329, 403
    - political—62, 329
 See also *Ireland*—mass emigration as a result of colonial oppression
  - England (Great Britain)*
    - natural conditions—157, 160-61
    - population—86, 118, 312; see also *Anglo-Saxons; Britons, Norsemen*
    - English nation, national character—193, 197, 288
    - history—147-48, 170, 192, 194-99, 286-88, 293-94, 295, 317-18
    - in the 1860s—29-30, 80, 81
    - as leading capitalist country, industrial and trade monopoly—29, 86, 87, 96, 118, 119, 328
    - industry—29, 73, 201, 330, 353, 357, 383
    - agriculture—166, 202, 392
    - concentration of landed property—86, 99, 118, 167, 192, 328
    - possibility of land nationalisation, by the state—393
    - trade—29, 212, 218, 221, 324, 401-02; see also *Corn Laws*
    - classes, class struggle—86, 118, see also *Aristocracy, nobility*—English; *Bourgeoisie*—English; *Peasantry*—English; *Working class in England*
    - class, oligarchic character of government—101, 171, 191, 192, 404, 423
    - illusory character of bourgeois democracy—101-07, 408, 411
    - legislation, judicial system—80, 193, 212, 287, 301, 313, 362, 395, 410, 414
    - election system—97, 98



- political parties of the ruling classes, their corruption in the 1860s—16, 423; see also *Liberal Party; Tories; Whigs*
  - the press—25, 87, 103, 119, 135, 189, 193, 343, 430
  - prerequisites and prospects of proletarian revolution—87, 88, 97, 118-19, 121, 372
  - and India—259
  - colonial policy in Ireland—88, 101-06, 119-20, 148, 152, 162, 189-206, 212, 218, 221, 223-24, 271, 287, 289, 292-93, 297-98, 307, 313, 317-18, 407-12, 428-30, 434; see also *Ireland; Irish question, the*
  - and Canada—410
  - and France—217, 218
  - and Holland—218
  - and Italy—105
  - and Poland—8, 193, 412
  - and Russia—8, 29-30
  - and Spain—217
  - and the USA—53, 54, 83, 88, 120, 215, 319, 409, 411; see also *Anglo-American war, 1812-14; War of North American colonies for independence, 1775-83*
- See also *Army*—British; *Bank of England*; *International Working Men's Association in England*; *Navy*—British; *Parliament*—British; *Scotland*; *Wales*

## F

- Famine* (as social phenomenon)—191, 192, 200, 201, 204, 318, 403
- Farmhands*—22, 166, 191, 199, 203
- Female labour*
  - its exploitation under capitalism—63, 357, 382, 383
  - demand for its regulation by law—387
- Fenians, Fenianism*
  - character and specific features of the movement—193, 194, 318
  - conspiratorial tactics of struggle—12, 409, 423

- in the USA—193, 194, 206, 408-09, 436
- struggle against persecution of Fenians by the British government, and International Working Men's Association—3-4, 13, 83, 101-07, 189, 314, 362-63, 407-12, 414-27, 430-31, 435-36

*Feudalism*—383, 395

*First International*—see *International Working Men's Association*

*Fourierism*—175

*France*

- French nation, its formation—185
  - during the First Republic and First Empire—198, 408
  - coup d'état of December 2, 1851—12-14, 56, 62, 374
  - economics—22, 37-38, 73, 96, 353, 358, 388
  - possibility of nationalisation of land by the state—393
  - reactionary character of home policy—21, 104
  - suffrage—21, 22, 74, 98
  - the press—21, 74-77, 342, 362
  - prospects of proletarian revolution—86, 118
  - and Belgium—48-49, 198, 335
  - and England—217, 218
  - and Germany—362
  - and Prussia—362
  - and Spain—217, 270
  - and Switzerland—137
  - and the USA—216, 270, 442
- See also *Aristocracy, nobility*—French; *Bonapartism*; *Bourgeoisie*—French; *French Revolution, 1789-94*; *International Working Men's Association in France*; *Peasantry*—French; *Revolution of 1848-49*—in France; *Wars of the First French Republic*; *Working class in France*
- French Revolution, 1789-94*—236, 238, 239, 242, 278, 312, 318

*Frisians*—147, 312

## G

*Gaels*—176, 177, 192

*General Association of German Workers*—  
15, 21-24, 32-33  
— sectarian character—23, 90, 122,  
123  
— relations with the Prussian Gov-  
ernment—20, 21, 23, 134  
— and International Working  
Men's Association—10, 15, 23,  
32-33, 90-91, 122-23, 134  
— its congresses—10, 15, 32-33

*Geographical environment*

— its role in development of so-  
ciety—147-67

*Germanic tribes*—169, 179, 185

*German People's Party* (from 1865)—96

*German Social-Democracy*

— Social-Democratic Workers' Par-  
ty, Eisenachers (1869-75)—32-  
33, 78-80, 90, 122, 132-34

*German Workers' Educational Society in  
London, 1840-1918*—32, 386

*Germany*

— population—22  
— Germans, national character of  
—185  
— history—286  
— economic development in 1850-  
60s—96-98, 165  
— social progress—96  
— burghers—94, 97-98  
— political system—100, 110  
— bureaucracy—22, 96, 97-98, 100  
— suffrage—21-23, 95, 99-100  
— the press—25, 26  
— prospects of revolution—96  
— and Austria—96  
— and France—362  
— and Poland—110  
— and Russia—110

See also *Aristocracy, nobility*—Ger-  
man; *Army*—German; *Bour-  
geoisie*—German; *Germanic tribes*;  
*German People's Party*; *Internation-  
al Working Men's Association in Ger-  
many*; *National-Liberals*; *North-Ger-*

*man Confederation*; *Peasantry*—Ger-  
man; *Prussia*; *Revolution of 1848-49*  
—in Germany; *Working class in Ger-  
many*

*Great Britain*—see *England*

## H

*Habeas Corpus Act*—189, 225, 272, 280,  
429

*Hegel, Hegelianism*—60-61, 178

*Historical materialism, materialist concep-  
tion of history*—94

*Historical sources*—168-74, 184-85, 306

*Historiography*

— its class character—161  
— of Middle Ages—168, 173  
— bourgeois (19th cent.), its apologetic  
and nationalistic features—57,  
93-94, 169-70, 173, 175, 179, 184,  
283-96, 313  
— creation and development of Marx-  
ist historiography—57, 94

See also *Historical sources*

*History (as science)*—57, 93-94

See also *Historical materialism, mate-  
rialist conception of history*; *Historiog-  
raphy*

*Hungary*—95, 296, 407

See also *International Working Men's  
Association and Hungary*; *Revolution of  
1848-49*—in Hungary; *Working-class  
movement in Hungary*

## I

*Iberians*—174

*India*—259, 383

*International Alliance of Socialist Democ-  
racy*—34-36, 45-46, 48, 85, 113-15,  
207-10, 394, 395, 446

*Internationalism, proletarian*—see *Work-  
ing-class movement*—internationalism  
as its inherent feature

*International Working Men's Association  
(First International)*

— general characteristics, its histori-  
cal significance—12, 17, 45, 46,  
64, 91, 122, 127  
— foundation of—322-23, 332, 333

- first programme documents (Inaugural Address and Provisional Rules)—89, 121, 322, 324-35, 337
  - emancipation of workers as its aim—45, 89, 121, 127, 332, 333
  - struggle for class proletarian character of—12-14, 126, 323
  - struggle for international solidarity and united actions of the working class in all countries—10, 17, 45, 138, 323, 334, 337, 386, 442-43
  - socialist principles in its programme—100, 143, 385, 391, 393
  - and political struggle of working class—10, 87-89, 119-21, 127, 333
  - and trade unions—5, 16, 25-26, 37, 74, 78-81, 87, 89, 92, 119, 125, 343-44, 347-51, 391
  - and strikes—13, 14, 16, 47-51, 68-78, 137-39, 345-53, 357-61, 388
  - struggle for reduction of the working day—10, 11, 16-17, 338, 385-87
  - questions of female and child's labour, education—69, 339-41, 383, 387, 391, 398-99
  - and co-operative movement—26, 143, 334, 385
  - and agrarian question—143, 385, 391-93
  - and national question—87-89, 119-21, 423
  - and the Irish question—3, 13, 83, 87-89, 101-07, 116, 119-21, 189-91, 362-63, 407-41, 444; see also *Fenians*, *Fenianism*—struggle against persecution of Fenians by the British government, and International Working Men's Association
  - and the Polish question—8, 110, 322, 362
  - struggle against Bonapartism—12-15, 74
  - struggle for independent stand of proletariat in foreign policy, against wars of conquest—8, 13, 53-54, 80-81, 143, 332, 342, 361
  - struggle against Mazzinism and Mazzinists—323
  - struggle against Proudhonism and Proudhonists—364-65, 393, 399
  - struggle against Lassalleism and Lassalleans—23, 33, 90, 122, 134
  - struggle against reformism—92, 126
  - struggle against Bakuninism and Bakuninists—34-36, 46, 65-67, 84-91, 110-24, 209, 394-97, 446
  - and League of Peace and Freedom—35, 78, 112-13, 342
  - and Reform League—362
  - organisational principles (general points)—35, 45, 84, 108-09, 117, 127, 323, 334, 336, 337, 364
  - Rules and Regulations—6, 35, 45, 46, 77, 79, 84-86, 108, 110, 112, 114, 116-18, 127, 132, 133, 209, 444
  - General (Central) Council, its functions and activities—3, 6-8, 10, 13, 15-16, 31, 34-38, 45-46, 51, 52, 54, 68, 73-74, 77-83, 84-87, 89-92, 108, 110, 112-19, 121-26, 131-37, 138-39, 142, 143, 209, 320, 322, 333-35, 337, 344, 346, 348, 350, 352, 357, 358, 360-64, 369, 376, 378, 385, 387, 391, 394, 412, 413, 442-46
  - Sub-Committee, Standing Committee—10, 391
  - Marx's role in founding the International and in its activities—10, 64, 324
  - Marx as Corresponding Secretary *pro tem* for Belgium—37, 84-91
  - Marx as Corresponding Secretary for Germany—32-33, 51, 91, 122, 131-32, 378, 389, 443
  - Marx as Corresponding Secretary for Russia—110-11, 124
  - its press—26, 45, 72, 80, 84-86, 114, 116-18, 123, 126, 336, 378, 444
  - and ruling classes, and police and judicial persecution—12-14, 50, 70-73, 74-79, 131, 346, 350, 363-76
- See also *International Working Men's Association. Congresses; International*

- Working Men's Association* (in different countries)
- International Working Men's Association. Congresses*
- their functions and aims—45, 333
  - Geneva Congress (1866)—11-13, 31, 34, 37, 85, 108, 117, 143, 324, 335-41, 343, 345, 364, 387, 399
  - Lausanne Congress (1867)—34, 37, 108, 320, 337, 341-42, 345, 364, 375, 387
  - Brussels Congress (1868)—6, 9-17, 25, 31, 34, 35, 37, 50, 92, 320, 375, 376, 385-87, 393, 400
  - Basle Congress (1869)—68-82, 86, 100, 108, 113, 115, 118, 132, 391, 446
  - Mainz Congress (1870, reasons for postponing the congress)—132-34, 143, 445
- International Working Men's Association and Hungary*—78
- International Working Men's Association and Russia*—110, 124
- See also *International Working Men's Association*—Marx as Corresponding Secretary for Russia
- International Working Men's Association and the USA*—16, 53-54, 126, 127, 377
- International Working Men's Association in Austria*—15-16, 77-79, 131
- International Working Men's Association in Belgium*—14-16, 25, 37, 50-51, 72, 123, 320, 350, 352-53, 358, 360, 375-77
- See also *International Working Men's Association*—Marx as Corresponding Secretary *pro tem* for Belgium
- International Working Men's Association in England*—16, 25-26, 86-87, 92, 118-19, 126, 127, 336, 377
- International Working Men's Association in France*—12-14, 16, 72-77, 123, 127-31, 336, 347-48, 352, 360, 362, 364-74, 376-77, 381
- See also *International Working Men's Association*—struggle against Bonapartism,—struggle against Proudhonism and Proudhonists,—struggle against Bakuninism and Bakuninists
- International Working Men's Association in Germany*—15, 16, 33, 37, 78-80, 90, 122, 133-34, 349, 378, 381
- See also *General Association of German Workers*—and *International Working Men's Association*; *German Social-Democracy*; *International Working Men's Association*—Marx as Corresponding Secretary for Germany; *Union of German Workers' Associations*
- International Working Men's Association in Ireland*—377
- See also *International Working Men's Association*—and the Irish question
- International Working Men's Association in Italy*—15, 79, 341-42, 377
- See also *International Working Men's Association*—struggle against Mazzinism and Mazzinists
- International Working Men's Association in the Netherlands*—79, 377
- International Working Men's Association in Spain*—79, 377
- International Working Men's Association in Switzerland*—16, 37, 77, 84-85, 91, 113-17, 123, 136, 349-53, 360, 376-78, 446;
- See also *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*; *International Working Men's Association*—struggle against Bakuninism and Bakuninists
- Ireland*—103-04, 148, 175, 317, 319, 324, 432
- natural conditions—147-67, 192, 283, 306
  - population—173-85, 190-92, 197, 200, 203-05, 215, 299, 317, 403; see also *Celts*; *Gaels*; *Picts*; *Scots*
  - Irish nation, national character—147, 148, 161, 169, 174, 185, 192, 193, 195-97, 221, 223, 232, 235, 275
  - gens, tribe, commune, clan, sept—174, 284, 307-09
  - before British conquest in the 12th cent.—165, 168-85, 307-12
  - ancient laws—165, 169-73
  - spread of Christianity—171, 176-78, 307
  - British conquests in 12th-15th cent.—147, 172-73, 194-95, 285, 306, 317
  - completion of British conquest of the country in 16th-17th cent.—

- 140, 165, 168, 173, 192, 195-96, 289, 307, 317, 318
- and English Revolution (17th cent.)—189, 192, 194-96
  - in 18th cent.—165, 169, 194, 196-99, 215-82, 317
  - Anglo-Irish Union of 1801—88, 89, 120, 121, 192, 193, 198, 202, 212, 226, 234, 251, 261, 281-82, 307, 318
  - as British colony and citadel of British landlordism—88, 119-20, 162, 192, 194-206, 212, 218, 307, 317-19
  - under British ruling classes—88, 103-06, 120, 192-93, 194-95, 218, 221, 223, 271, 287, 289, 292, 297-98, 312, 317, 428-30, 434
  - famine as a result of British rule—191-92, 200-02, 204, 205, 318, 403
  - industry and its destruction by British competition—152, 197-201, 215, 218, 221, 224, 271, 272, 317, 318
  - agriculture, agrarian relations—105, 165, 166, 190-92, 200-06, 284, 285, 300, 318, 403, 427, 432-33
  - trade, struggle against British monopoly—197, 198, 215, 218, 221-23, 271, 276
  - and abolition of Corn Laws in England—200, 201, 318
  - legislation, judicial system—199, 224, 231-32, 245, 255-56, 272, 287, 410, 414
  - crime (as social phenomenon)—193, 206
  - mass emigration as a result of colonial oppression—88, 120, 141, 161, 167, 190-92, 201, 204, 284, 318, 403
  - interconnection between national liberation and economic struggle (the land question as social basis of the national question)—88, 120, 319
  - national movements and uprisings in 17th cent.—194, 196-97, 198, 293, 318, 411
  - national movements and uprisings in 18th-19th cent.—193, 194, 198,

- 200, 218; 220, 239, 250-53, 255-58, 277, 280-81, 307, 318, see also *Fenians, Fenianism*
- the Volunteer movement—218-26, 227-28, 229-36, 248, 270-77
  - religious antagonism, its social character—193, 195, 197, 215, 220, 252, 317-18, 410, 439
  - Protestants—194, 195, 197, 215, 217, 218, 220, 221, 242, 252, 270-72, 279, 302, 314
  - Catholics, their persecution—140, 178, 194-98, 215-16, 219-20, 230, 231, 235, 236, 247, 251, 270-72, 274, 275, 279, 280, 282, 285, 290, 293, 299, 314
- See also *Aristocracy, nobility*—Irish; *Bourgeoisie*—Irish; *International Working Men's Association in Ireland*; *Irish question, the*; *Landlords, landlordism*—in Ireland; *Parliament*—Irish; *Peasantry*—Irish; *Working class in Ireland*
- Irish question, the*
- its character, significance—87-89, 119-21, 319, 407, 409, 413
  - ways of settlement—194, 319

### Italy

- anti-labour character of home policy—15
  - and Austria—296
  - and England—105
- See also *International Working Men's Association in Italy*; *Revolution of 1848-49*—in Italy; *Sicily*; *Working class in Italy*

### J

- Jamaica*—49, 359
- June insurrection of Paris proletariat, 1848*—12, 97

### L

- Land and Labour League* (England, from 1869)—87, 119, 401-06
- Landed property*
- and land rent—65
  - liquidation of feudal landed property—392
  - its monopolisation under capitalism—86, 118, 192, 392

- ousting of small peasant property under capitalism—99, 192, 392, 393
- historical necessity of replacement of private property in land by common property—100, 392, 393, 397, 405
- according to Saint-Simonists—66
- Landlords, landlordism*
- in England—86-88, 101, 105, 118-20, 191-92, 193, 396, 402, 423
- in Ireland—192, 197, 202, 277, 314, 428, 434, 435

*Lassalleanism, Lassalleans*

- Lassalle and his role in German working-class movement—59
- dogmatic and sectarian character of Lassalleanism—23, 90, 122
- and demand for universal suffrage—21
- See also *General Association of German Workers; International Working Men's Association*—struggle against Lassalleism and Lassalleans

*Law*

- as superstructure, its dependence on economic basis—65-67
- abstract—392
- civil—44, 65
- critique of Hegel's philosophy of law by Marx—60-61

*League of Peace and Freedom* (from 1867)—35, 78, 112-13, 342-43*Liberal Party* (England)

- policy in the Irish question—83, 104, 189, 407-12
- and working class—87, 119

*Literature*

- folklore—140-41, 168-69, 177, 180, 184
- satire and humour—57
- ancient German—185
- ancient Scandinavian—172, 179-80, 185
- French—56-57
- Icelandic—181-84
- Irish—140-41, 168-69, 171-74, 177, 308, 310, 312
- Lock-out*—37, 70, 137-38, 345-46, 347, 351

*Lumpenproletariat*—98

## M

- Machinery* (machine production)—9, 166, 324, 329, 382-85, 387
- Malthusianism*—383
- Marxism*—60-61, 63
- See also *Communism (socialism), scientific; Historical materialism, materialist conception of history; Marxist political economy*
- Marxist political economy*—64
- Mongols*—318

## N

- National Labour Union of the United States*—16, 53-55, 81, 377
- National-Liberals* (Germany, from 1866)—95, 96
- National movement*
- as part of bourgeois-democratic revolutions—88, 119
- and working class—88, 120
- Navy*—147
- of ancient Rome—147
- British—218, 280
- French—217, 218, 270
- Spanish—217, 218, 270
- Neoplatonism*—178
- "*Neue Rheinische Zeitung*"—61-62
- Norsemen*—147, 177, 179-84
- North-German Confederation* (1867-71)—75, 311
- Norway, Norwegians*—182-83, 291

## P

- Pan-Slavism*—123, 124
- Parliament* (in bourgeois society)
- its use by working class—95, 98, 396
- British—87, 119, 189, 193, 196, 215, 217, 222-23, 226-27, 229, 230, 232, 233, 271-76, 278, 281, 290, 325-26, 330, 331, 345, 362, 396, 410
- Irish—195-98, 212-19, 220-21, 222, 224-27, 229, 232-37, 247, 268, 270-80, 282, 290, 317

*Pauperism*

- as consequence of capitalism—  
324, 328-29, 402-04

*Peace*

- as one of the main concerns of  
working class—53-54, 81

*Peasantry*

- big—99, 100
- small—99, 393
- its ideologists—393
- and bourgeoisie—98-99
- and working class—98-100
- English—195,
- French—21, 22
- German—22, 98-99; see also *Peasant War in Germany, 1524-25; Working class in Germany—agricultural*
- Irish—99, 198-205, 206, 220, 318

*Peasant War in Germany, 1524-25—93, 94, 98**Phoenicians—169**Picts—177-78**Poland*

- Tsarist Russia's policy towards Poland—8, 110, 148, 296, 429-30
- and England—8, 193, 412

See also *International Working Men's Association—*and the Polish question  
*Political economy—61, 63, 330-31*

See also *Marxist political economy*

*Politics, political struggle*

- as a form of class struggle—94
- political struggle of working class—  
10, 89-90, 116, 120-21, 127, 143,  
332-33

See also *Working-class movement—*  
necessity to combine workers' economic and political struggle

*Press, the*

- freedom of the press and its  
significance for working-class  
movement—20, 21, 61-62
- illusory character of freedom of  
the press in bourgeois society—  
20, 60, 101, 428
- persecution of the proletarian  
press in bourgeois society—20,  
62, 78, 329

See also *Belgium—the press; England—the press; France—the press; Germany—the press; International Working Men's Association—its press;*

*"Neue Rheinische Zeitung"; Prussia—the press*

*Production*

- social—9, 383
- application of science—328-29,  
330-31
- its capitalist form—86, 118
- under communism—9, 330-31

See also *Machinery*

*Proudhonism, Proudhonists—364-65, 393, 399*

See also *International Working Men's Association—*struggle against Proudhonism and Proudhonists

*Prussia*

- in the 1840s—61
- home policy—408
- finances—95
- legislation—15, 33, 395
- the press—75
- education—399
- and Austria—94-95, 98
- and France—362
- and German states—95-96
- and Switzerland—137

See also *Austro-Prussian war, 1866; Bonapartism—Prussian; Bourgeoisie—Prussian; North-German Confederation (1867-71); Trade(s) unions, trade union movement—in Prussia*

## R

*Red Indians—195**Reformation—317**Reform League (England, from 1865)—  
26, 193, 345, 362**Religion*

- as superstructure, form of social  
consciousness—94
- religious struggle as reflection of  
class struggle—93
- religious strife, its utilisation by  
ruling classes—88, 120; see also  
*Ireland—*religious antagonism, its  
social character

See also *Christianity; Church; Clergy, the*

*Revolution, bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic*

- and working class—97-98
- and national question—88, 120,  
121

See also *French Revolution, 1789-94; Revolution of 1848-49; US Civil War, 1861-65; War of North American colonies for independence, 1775-83*

*Revolution, economic*—86, 118

*Revolution of 1848-49*—329

- in France—61, 97; see also *June insurrection of Paris proletariat, 1848*
- in Germany—59, 61-62, 93-98
- in Hungary—411
- in Italy—105

*Revolution, proletarian, socialist*

- prerequisites for—9, 66, 86-87, 97, 118-19, 384, 396
- as the highest form of class struggle of proletariat against bourgeoisie—12
- international character of—86, 118
- and radical socio-economic and political changes—66-67, 99, 397, 404
- and national question—88, 89, 120, 121
- and trade unions—92

*Revolution, social*—66, 86-89, 113, 118-21, 396

See also *Revolution, bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic; Revolution, proletarian, socialist*

*Right*

- of inheritance—65-67, 112-13, 115, 391, 394-97
- property right—65, 192, 197, 434

*Romania*—96, 165

*Russia*

- history—218, 270
- economics—29-30, 53, 96, 165
- reactionary character of its home policy—408
- revolutionary movement—110-11
- international significance of the Russian revolution—110
- Marx's contacts with Russian revolutionaries—110-11, 123-24
- annexation of the Caucasus—332
- Tsarist policy towards Poland—8, 110, 148, 296, 318, 332, 429-30
- and England—8, 29-30
- and Germany—110
- and Switzerland—137
- and the USA—53

## S

*Saint-Simonism, Saint-Simonists*—66, 115, 208, 395

*Scandinavia, Scandinavians*—147, 170, 179-85

See also *Literature*—ancient Scandinavian; *Norway, Norwegians; Sweden*

*Schiller Institute, the* (Manchester, 2nd half of 19th cent.)—18-19

*Scotland*—147, 176-78, 179, 192

See also *Scots*

*Scots*—147, 169, 173-74, 176-78, 310

*Sicily*—203

*Slavery*—65, 310

- in ancient Rome—57, 394
- in the USA—54, 88

*Society, bourgeois*

- economic basis of—65, 66, 404
- contradictions of—328-29

See also *Bourgeoisie; Capital; Peasantry; Wage labour; Working class*

*Society, slave*—57

See also *Ancient Rome*

*Spain*—173, 217

See also *International Working Men's Association in Spain*

*State power*

- its social functions—403-04
- as a tool of class domination of exploiters—48-49, 192, 353, 403-04

See also *Bureaucracy*

*Strikes, strike movement*—47-50, 68-75, 343, 345-46, 348

*Sweden*—154, 184-85, 291

*Switzerland*—69, 137

See also *Bourgeoisie*—Swiss; *International Working Men's Association in Switzerland; Working class in Switzerland*

## T

*Taxes*—66, 396, 398, 404, 405

*Tories* (England)—313, 345, 401, 423

*Trade(s) unions, trade union movement*

- their tasks and role in the class struggle of proletariat—92, 343-44, 391
- critique of reformist views of trade union leaders—43-44, 92, 389-90



- in England—16, 25-26, 37, 73, 81, 86, 87, 92, 118, 119, 322, 343-45, 347-48, 357, 377, 443
  - in France—73-74, 347-48
  - in Germany—37, 43-44, 79, 98, 389-90
  - in Prussia—79
  - in Switzerland—350, 351
- See also *Economic struggle of workers; International Working Men's Association*—and trade unions

## U

- Union of German Workers' Associations*—15, 32-33, 381
  - United States of America*
    - history—216, 217
    - immigration, its role in composition of population—88, 120, 141, 216, 319, 329
    - trade—53, 165
    - financial policy—54
    - bourgeois parties—54
    - home policy—54, 386, 407
    - legislation—395
    - system of education—398
    - and England—53, 54, 83, 88, 120, 215, 319, 409, 411
    - and France—216, 270, 442
    - and Russia—53
    - and Spain—217, 270
- See also *Anglo-American war, 1812-14; Aristocracy, nobility*—US financial aristocracy; *Army*—US; *Bourgeoisie*—US; *Fenians, Fenianism*—in the USA; *International Working Men's Association, and the USA, Slavery*—in the USA; *US Civil War, 1861-65; War of North American colonies for independence, 1775-83; Working class in the USA*
- US Civil War, 1861-65*
    - its results and significance—53, 54
    - and US working class—54
    - and England—83, 409, 411
    - and English working class—53, 325
    - and European working class—47, 380, 391
    - and International Working Men's Association—53, 54

## W

- Wage labour*
  - and capital—63, 383
  - as specific form of slavery—383
  - necessity of abolition of wage labour system—9
- Wales*—283
- War(s)*
  - influence on economy and social progress—53-54
  - See also *Anglo-American war, 1812-14; Army; Austro-Prussian war, 1866; Navy; Peasant War in Germany, 1524-25; US Civil War, 1861-65; War of North American colonies for independence, 1775-83; Wars of the First French Republic*
  - War of North American colonies for independence, 1775-83*—53-54, 198, 212-18, 259, 270, 271, 318, 361, 380, 386
  - Wars of the First French Republic*—198, 246, 250, 280
- Whigs (England)*—230, 235, 276
- Workers' societies*
  - mutual aid—39-44
  - See also *Co-operation, co-operative movement; German Workers' Educational Society in London; Trade(s) unions, trade union movement; Union of German Workers' Associations*
- Working class*
  - its emergence and development—45, 97
  - world-historic role—10, 17
  - development of its class consciousness—23, 98
  - and revolutionary theory—87, 119
  - and peasantry—99-100
  - and urban petty bourgeoisie—97-99
  - See also *Classes, class struggle*—in bourgeois society; *Wage labour; Working class* (in different countries); *Working-class movement; Working day*—importance of its reduction for working class
- Working class in Belgium*—354-56
- See also *Working-class movement in Belgium*
- Working class in England*

- living and labour conditions—5, 86, 87, 118, 119, 324-30, 354, 357, 402
- and suffrage—98
- and the Irish question—88, 120, 212
- See also *Liberal Party (England)*—and working class; *Working-class movement in England*
- Working class in France*
  - its condition—21-22, 37-38, 98, 354, 388, 442
  - and Bonapartism—12-14, 74
  - and suffrage—21-22, 74, 98
- See also *Working-class movement in France*
- Working class in Germany*
  - during 1848-49 revolution—98
  - its composition—22
  - its condition—5, 39-44, 389
  - and suffrage—21, 23, 95, 98
  - and bourgeoisie—94, 96-98
  - and petty bourgeoisie—98, 99
  - and peasantry—99-100
  - and lumpenproletariat—98
  - agricultural—22, 23, 99-100
- See also *Working-class movement in Germany*
- Working class in Ireland*—87-88, 120
- Working class in Italy*—15
- See also *Working-class movement in Italy*
- Working class in Switzerland*—137-39
- See also *Working-class movement in Switzerland*
- Working class in the USA*—54, 81, 442
- See also *Working-class movement in the USA*
- Working-class movement*
  - its aims and tasks—10, 45, 46, 64, 88-90, 120-21, 127, 143, 331-32, 333, 344
  - significance of its organisation and unity—10, 17, 45, 331, 334, 386
  - objective laws of its rise—17
  - necessity to combine workers' economic and political struggle—10, 90, 121, 333
  - and revolutionary theory—45
  - internationalism as its inherent feature—10, 15, 17, 53, 73, 74, 77, 89, 120, 138, 323, 331-33, 344, 346, 348, 350, 357, 358, 385, 442-43
  - and democratic freedoms—10, 20, 23, 77
  - and struggle against national oppression—77, 88, 120-21, 212
  - and struggle for peace, against wars—53-54, 81, 143, 332
- See also *Communist League, the; Economic struggle of workers; International Working Men's Association; Marxism; Parliament*—its use by working class; *Politics, political struggle*—political struggle of working class; *Revolution, proletarian, socialist; Strikes, strike movement; Trade(s) unions, trade union movement; Workers' societies; Working-class movement (in different countries)*
- Working-class movement in Austria*—15-16, 77-78
- See also *International Working Men's Association in Austria*
- Working-class movement in Belgium*—47-52, 72, 320-21, 357-60
- See also *International Working Men's Association in Belgium*
- Working-class movement in England*—16, 47, 80-81, 98, 377
- See also *Chartism, Chartist movement; International Working Men's Association in England; Land and Labour League; Reform League; Trade(s) unions, trade union movement*—in England
- Working-class movement in France*—13, 72-77
- See also *Bakuninism, Bakuninists*—in France; *International Working Men's Association in France; Revolution of 1848-49*—in France; *Trade(s) unions, trade union movement*—in France
- Working-class movement in Germany*—20-23, 59, 79, 95, 98, 100, 378, 381, 387
- See also *Communist League, the; General Association of German Workers; German Social-Democracy; International Working Men's Association in Germany; Revolution of 1848-49*—in Germany; *Trade(s) unions, trade union movement*—in Germany; *Union of German Workers' Associations*
- Working-class movement in Hungary*—78-79

- Working-class movement in Italy*—15, 377  
 See also *Bakuninism, Bakuninists*—in Italy; *International Working Men's Association in Italy; Revolution of 1848-49*—in Italy
- Working-class movement in Switzerland*—16, 79, 137-38, 349, 377-78  
 See also *Bakuninism, Bakuninists*—in Switzerland; *International Working Men's Association in Switzerland; Trade(s) unions, trade union movement*—in Switzerland
- Working-class movement in the USA*—16, 17, 54, 338, 377, 379, 380, 442-43
- See also *National Labour Union of the United States*
- Working day*  
 — and intensification of labour—382-83  
 — and introduction of machines—382-83, 387  
 — of women and children—63, 382, 387  
 — importance of its reduction for working class—11, 330, 382, 387  
 — struggle for its reduction—10, 11, 16-17, 330, 379-80, 383, 385, 387, 405